Joseph Ruddell

April 18, 1859

1856

S. Ruddell
April 18, 1859

Joseph Ruddell

April 18. 1859.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_KV-027-813

J. Campbell

S. Freeman

WILLIAM Mc GAVIN.

FROM THE ORIGINAL IN POSSESSION OF Mrs Mc GAVIN

BLACKIE & SON, GLASGOW, EDINBURGH & LONDON.

938

THE

PROTESTANT;

A SERIES OF ESSAYS,

IN WHICH ARE DISCUSSED, AT LENGTH,

THOSE SUBJECTS WHICH FORM THE DISTINGUISHING FEATURES

BETWEEN

TRUE AND FALSE RELIGION,

BETWEEN THE

CHRISTIANITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

AND

THE PAPAL SUPERSTITION WHICH HAS USURPED THE NAME.

BY WILLIAM M'GAVIN, ESQ.

BLACKIE AND SON:
FREDERICK STREET, GLASGOW; SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, EDINBURGH;
AND WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON.

MDCCCLVI.

3597230

GLASGOW:
W. G. BLACKIE AND CO., PRINTERS,
VILLAFIELD.

MEMOIR OF THE AUTHOR.

William M'Gavin, the author of this Work, was born August 12th, 1773, on the farm of Darnlaw, in the parish of Auchinleck, Ayrshire, which his father held on lease from Lord Auchinleck, and afterwards from his son James Boswell, the biographer of Johnson. A short attendance at the school of that parish, when about seven years of age, constituted the whole education of a regular kind, which our author ever enjoyed. His parents having removed in 1783 to Paisley, and being in by no means affluent circumstances, he was sent at an early period of life to earn his bread as a draw-boy in one of the manufactories. Subsequently he tried weaving of silk, but eventually was led by his taste for reading to become apprentice to Mr John Neilson, printer and bookseller; a situation highly congenial to his taste, and which afforded him the means of cultivating his mind to a considerable extent. Among various persons of talent and information who frequented Mr Neilson's shop was the unfortunate Alexander Wilson, poet, and afterwards the distinguished ornithologist, who, finding it necessary to remove to America, was assisted to no small extent by Mr M'Gavin. The popular opinions of that period were adopted in all their latitude by Mr M'Gavin; many fugitive pieces by him upon the question of parliamentary reform and other exciting topics, were received with approbation by those who professed similar sentiments; but it is not known that he took any more active part in the politics of the time.

The duty of reading proof-sheets in his master's shop was the circumstance which first led Mr M'Gavin to study the English language carefully; and, considering the limited nature of of his education, it is surprising that he should have been able to attract notice as an author under the age of twenty.

In 1793, having left Mr Neilson's shop, he was found qualified to assist his elder brother in the management of a school, where writing, arithmetic, and mathematics were taught. Of this seminary he afterwards became sole master; but he ultimately abandoned teaching as a pursuit not agreeable to his genius or temper, and in 1798, was engaged as book-keeper and clerk by Mr David Lamb, an American cotton merchant, to whose two sons he at the same time acted as tutor. Some years afterwards, on Mr Lamb removing to America, Mr M'Gavin became his partner; the business was carried on in Glasgow. In 1805, Mr M'Gavin married Miss Isabella Campbell of Paisley. As his business was of a light nature, and Mrs M'Gavin brought him no children, he enjoyed more leisure for the cultivation of his mind than falls to the lot of most merchants in the busy capital of the west of Scotland. At a later period, after the death of his original patron, he entered into partnership with the son of that gentleman, and carried on what is called a West India business under the firm of M'Gavin and Lamb. This ultimately proving unprofitable, he was induced, in 1822, to undertake the Glasgow agency of the British Linen Company's bank, which he conducted without intermission till his death.

Mr M'Gavin was brought up by his parents in the strictest tenets of the presbyterian faith, as professed by the congregations of original anti-burghers. About the year 1800, a conscien-

tious dissent from the views of this body respecting church government induced him to join the Rev. Mr Ramsay in the formation of an independent or congregational church. In this communion he began to exercise a gift of preaching, with which he was endowed in a remarkable degree, receiving from Mr Ramsay the ordination which was considered necessary for the pastoral office by this body of Christians. Eventually, circumstances so much reduced the society, as to make it cease to answer what he conceived to be the design and use of a church—namely, "not only the edification of its own members, but the public exhibition of their spirit and practice, for manifesting the glory of the grace of God, and promoting the salvation of men." For this reason, in 1808, he joined the kindred congregation of Mr Greville Ewing in the Nile Street meeting-house, Glasgow, where he was soon afterwards invested with the office of deacon. Here he might have also continued to preach, if he had been willing; but he was now unable, from the pressure of business, to give the duty that attention which he deemed necessary, and accordingly resisted Mr Ewing's frequent and urgent solicitations, though he occasionally consented to perform public worship in the neighbouring villages, or in places where he thought such ministrations eminently necessary.

Being a man of uncommon industry, and equally great benevolence, Mr M'Gavin found time, amidst his numerous mercantile avocations, to write a number of religious tracts and stories, for the improvement of the poorer and junior classes of society. Though these productions are of a class which do not usually attain a high place in literature, no reader, however indifferent to the subjects, or of however highly cultivated intellect, could peruse them, without remarking the extraordinary conciseness of style and moral force by which they are characterized. The most distinguished of all Mr M'Gavin's writings is his "Protestant," a series of papers, designed to expose the errors of the church of Rome, commenced in 1818, and finished in 1822. In the general decline of religious controversial writing, the celebrity acquired by this work, is a strong testimony to the powers of the author. In its previous form, in four volumes octavo, it went through no fewer than seven editions in the first ten years. According to Mr Greville Ewing, in a funeral sermon upon Mr M'Gavin, "the commencement of the work was casual, and the whole executed with hasty preparation. While engaged in a mercantile business of his own, he had at that time the winding up of an old concern of his partner, and the heavy charge of another concern, which in the end proved a severe loss to him, besides other business matters, as factorships, references, as sole arbiter, in cases both from private parties and from the Court of Session, which he decided in a manner satisfactory to all concerned; and many other things were devolved on him, which none but a man of clear judgment, and unusually industrious habits, could have undertaken. A work which, otherwise, would have been extremely irksome, was rendered pleasant by the continued and increasing favour with which it was received by the public in general, and by the approbation of distinguished individuals in each of the three kingdoms. One of the most eminent bishops of the church of England offered to give him holy orders. That, however, which was most gratifying to the author, was the interest which he was honoured to excite in the public mind, with regard to the subject of popery. It is matter of notoriety, that Mr M'Gavin was prosecuted for certain articles in The Protestant, and had a verdict against him, imposing on him a fine of £100, which, with expenses, amounted to above £1200. Into the merits of these things I shall not enter, further than to state, in round numbers, that £800 of the £1200, was raised by public subscription, and that the whole, it was believed, would have been more than paid, had not each subscriber been limited to a certain sum. As the case had been so arranged, Mr M'Gavin was obliged in the mean time, to pay the balance out of his own pocket; of which, great as the amount was, I never heard him complain. The publishers afterwards very handsomely came forward to reimburse the author, which, from the sale of the work, they were enabled to do without loss to themselves, though he had no claim upon them."

Mr M'Gavin, in 1827, superintended a new and improved edition of "The Scots Worthies," a work commemorating the lives of the most eminent Scottish clergy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and originally written by an unlettered individual named John Howie of

Lochgoin. The book was greatly improved by the notes of Mr M'Gavin. He soon after published a refutation of the peculiar views of Mr Cobbett in his History of the Reformation; and a similar exposure of the principles of Mr Robert Owen. Being a decided enemy to the connection of the church and state, he was induced to embody his sentiments on that subject in a pamphlet, entitled "Church Establishments considered; in a Series of Letters to a Covenanter." Not long before his death, Mr M'Gavin superintended a new and improved edition of Knox's History of the Reformation; and aided with an introduction, a work by the Rev. Mr John Brown of Whitburn, entitled "Memorials of the Nonconformist Ministers of the Seventeenth Century." In the midst of his divers labours, he suddenly died of apoplexy, August 23, 1832.

Of the intellectual vigour and religious fervour of Mr M'Gavin, his published writings afford a sufficient and lasting memorial. His personal qualities are not, however, fully shown in that mirror. His diligence in his ordinary secular employments, his zeal in promoting the religious and worldly interests of all who came under his notice, his mild and amiable character in private society, are traits which must be added. Two of his most conspicuous qualities—the power of a satirist, and a certain precision which appeared in all he either spoke or wrote—might be supposed incompatible with the tenderer lights of a domestic character. But in him the one set of qualities was not more conspicuous than the other. "His personal disposition," says Mr Ewing, "was that of the publican, who pleaded with God for mercy, when he went up into the temple to pray, and returned justified, because he that humbleth himself shall be exalted. Like Nathanael, he was an Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile. Like Paul, he was ready to call himself less than the least of all saints, and to ascribe his salvation to Jesus Christ having come into the world to save sinners, of whom he was a chief. He had, even in his natural temper, much tenderness of heart, much sincere and generous benevolence. If conscious of any quickness, which I have heard him acknowledge, but never saw, it was guarded by the vigilance of Christian meekness, and by the genuine modesty of superior good sense. Those, who knew him only from feeling the lash of his controversial writings, may have been tempted to think of him as an austere man. In truth, however, he was the very reverse.—The profits of The Protestant he once offered as a subscription to the society in this city for the support of the Catholic schools. The offer was declined, because some of the Roman Catholic persuasion regarded it as an insult. I do not wonder at the misunderstanding. But had they known him as I did, and as he was known by all his familiar friends, they would have accepted of his offer, as a mark of his cordial good-will to a valuable institution."

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Subjects of the Oratorio..... 11
Paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle..... 11
Letter to the Editor, animadverting on this paragraph..... 12
Reply by Amicus Veritatis..... 12
Answer by A Protestant. Subject of holy places discussed. A word on Indulgences... 13
Letter of Pax..... 14
Letter of Amicus Veritatis. Hervey quoted as an authority for regarding churches as holy places. Indulgences said to be granted by Luther, &c..... 15
Protestant's Reply. Word Catholic, &c..... 16
Indulgences. That preached by Tetzel. Bull of Indulgence granted by the present Pope to the people of Cork. Bull for exciting rebellion in Ireland. Indulgences from the modern French catechism. Reflections on the subject..... 17
Another Letter by Pax..... 20
Subject of Indulgences. Tax of the Apostolic Chancery. Testimony of Claude D'Espence. Of Dupin. Luther's alleged Indulgence..... 21
Another Letter by Amicus Veritatis..... 24
Protestant's Letter on the subject of Indulgences said to have been granted by Luther. 25
Protestant's discussion of the subject of Hervey and holy places. Means by which the Popish Chapel in Glasgow was built..... 26
Letter by Amicus Veritatis. Denies that the Church of Rome grants Indulgence to commit sin. Charge of Forgery against Protestants..... 27
Protestant's Reply to Pax. Papists preferring the state of things in the dark ages..... 29
Letter of Amicus Veritatis. Farther charges of forgery. A pretended quotation from Luther's works. Phillips' oration on bigotry. 30
Apparent amelioration of Popery as it appears in Protestant countries, while it is still the same..... 32
Letter to the Readers of the Glasgow Chronicle, announcing the publication of The Protestant in weekly Numbers..... 33
Advertisement by Amicus Veritatis..... 34
No. I. Reply to Pax. Indulgences granted by the Pope for thousands of years. Amazing rapacity of the Priests. Douay Catechism on penance and indulgence..... 35
II. Detection of a false quotation from Luther's works by Amicus Veritatis, and Luther vindicated. Term Catholic. Bull of the Pope for extirpating the Waldenses..... 38
III. Authority and character of Popish Priests. *Culpa* and *Pœna*. Wonderful miracle..... 42
IV. Authority and power of the Pope. His submission to Bonaparte. Transubstantiation..... 46
V. Infallibility of the Pope. Impious titles given to him. Singular excommunication.. 49
VI. Absurdity of calling the Pope Head of the Church. Monstrous wickedness of this Head. The body cannot be pure..... 53
VII. How Papists prove the Pope to be infallible. Peter's alleged supremacy..... 57
VIII. Peter never bishop of Rome. Taxes and Absolutions of the Romish Church..... 61
IX. A Parable. Censorship of Books..... 64
X. Censorship of Books continued. Manner of spending a day by a Papist. Reflections on giving countenance to Popish worship.... 68
XI. Popery the religion of corrupt human nature. Miraculous effects of Popish baptism. Popish persecution. Instanced in the present state of Protestants in France..... 72
XII. Charge of bigotry fixed upon Papists. Singular instance of it in the case of the Duke of Brunswick. Orthodox Journal against reading the Bible..... 75
XIII. Intolerance of Popery. Instances of persecution. Peter Waldo. Shocking cruelties committed upon the Waldenses. Their peaceful character..... 79
XIV. Establishment of Popery in Scotland. Some Waldenses in England cruelly murdered. Lollards burnt in Glasgow. Patrick Hamilton burnt at St Andrews. Other instances of persecution in Scotland..... 83
XV. Doctrinal Decision and intolerance of the Belgian Bishops, in the present day. The Protestant denounced and cursed in the

PAGE,

Popish Chapel, Glasgow, on occasion of celebrating High Mass, on Sabbath the 4th of October, 1818. Papists always sounding their own praise. Pope's Bull for licensing brothels. Spotless purity of the priests..... 87

XVI. Protestants regarding Popery with a favourable eye. Nature of Popish Charity. Anwers to several parts of Amicus Veritatis' Letters..... 91

XVII. The Douay and other catechisms compared. Their omission or mutilation of the second Commandment. Canisius' Catechism in Scotch..... 94

XVIII. The doctrine of Indulgences calculated to encourage the commission of sin. The doctrine of Christ the reverse of this..... 98

XIX. The subject of discipline in the Church of Scotland discussed. Cutty Stool. Discipline not punishment..... 102

XX. Popish discipline and Excommunication. Case of John, King of England. The Damnation and Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth by Pope Pius V..... 105

XXI. Excommunication of Henry VIII. The Pope's letter to the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, exciting them to rebellion against Queen Elizabeth. Indulgences granted by the Pope to Stuckley's crucifixes. Plots of Jesuits. Excommunication of rats, mice, &c..... 109

XXII. Merciful nature, and beneficial effects of church discipline properly conducted. Contrasted with the rigorous nature of Popish discipline and excommunication. Instances of cruelty..... 113

XXIII. Cruelty of Popish discipline illustrated in the case of Mr Bourke, a Popish priest in Ireland..... 117

XXIV. Form of Oath required of Papists by King James I. That by Act of King William. That at present in force. Bull of perpetual indulgence to the Kings and Queens of France, to break such oaths as they cannot conveniently keep..... 120

XXV. Concerning keeping faith with heretics. Lawfulness of breaking faith with them, proved by several authorities. By the Council of Constance. Recognized by the Council of Trent. Oath of obedience to that Council. Recent instance of a man leaving his wife on account of heresy..... 124

XXVI. The same subject continued. Further authorities. Declaration of the University of Alcala. Remarks upon it. Safe conduct granted to John Huss, violated..... 128

XXVII. The same subject continued. Modern Papists ashamed of the doctrine. Doctrine of not keeping faith exemplified by the Inquisition. Lawfulness of putting heretics to death. Modern Papists avow their hope of subverting the present establishment. Misrepresentations of the Orthodox Journal corrected..... 132

XXVIII. The same subject continued. Controversy between Dr Drummond and Bishop Hay of Edinburgh. Extract from Dr Porteous' Sermon. All the writers in the Church of Rome for ages maintaining the principle..... 136

PAGE.

XXIX. Farther evidence of the doctrine of the church of Rome with regard to breaking faith. Bishop Lanigan's five reasons for breaking faith. *Secreta Monita.* Profligacy of the Jesuits. First notice of The Catholic Vindicator..... 139

XXX. The Church of Rome withholds the Bible from the common people. Rule of the Council of Trent. Controversy between Mr Scott and W. M. Presumption of the Church of Rome, in assuming the power of permitting or hindering the reading of the Scriptures... 143

XXXI. The same subject continued. Church of Rome gradually departs from the doctrine of the Bible. Early translations. Wickliffe. The Pope's Bull against him. Pope Sixtus V. His edition of the Scriptures. Italian mutilated Bible. A correspondent of the Orthodox Journal declares that the Editor has written a better book than the Bible.... 147

XXXII. The same subject continued. The Rhemish Translators. Charge of perverting the Bible answered..... 152

XXXIII. The same subject continued. Proposed Society in London for reprinting and circulating the Douay Bible. Object defeated by the Papists who had promised to further it. Sentiments of a writer in the Orthodox Journal. Story of a Dutch lady. Bull of the present Pope against Bible Societies... 156

XXXIV. The same subject continued. Inquiry what evil the Bible has done? The Bible was intended for all men, and ought to be given to all. Opposition to this by Popish writers. Orthodox Journal against the distribution of the Bible..... 160

XXXV. The same subject continued. The word of God was meant to be made known to all men by the Scriptures. Popish objections to this answered. Decree of the Council of Trent. Dr Milner against the circulation of the Scriptures..... 164

XXXVI. The same subject continued. Affected regard for the Scriptures. Divine command to write the Word. Cause of the obscurity of some passages. Reflections on the general circulation of the Scriptures..... 168

XXXVII. The same subject continued. Anecdote of a Spaniard. Modern French intolerance. Instances in Ireland of priestly opposition to the Word of God. Effects of reading and preaching. Sentiments of the Popish Translators of the New Testament into French..... 172

XXXVIII. The circulation of cheap tracts recommended. Farther notice of The Catholic Vindicator and of his style. He maintains the lawfulness of breaking faith..... 176

XXXIX. Introduction to the subject of Popish idolatry. Glory of the Virgin Mary, by the Rhemish Translators. Wonderful account of St Ann, the mother of Mary..... 181

XL. Idolatry of Papists. Devotion to the Blessed Virgin by Mr Andrews. Prayers to her. Litanies, &c..... 184

XLI. Popish idolatry continued. Idolatrous addresses to the Virgin Mary. Mary exalted above all. Her miracles. How they encourage licentiousness..... 189

PAGE.

XLII. Short notice of THE VINDICATOR. Early indication of undue respect for the Mother of Jesus. Reproved by him. Vision of Mary to St Thomas. View of her glory. Distinctions of Popish worship. *Latria, Dulia, &c.* Immense number of prayers which the Virgin has to attend to, &c..... 193

XLIII. Idolatry of saint worship. Christian and saint the same. Affected humility of worshipping God through the medium of saints. Real pride. St Wenefride..... 197

XLIV. St Wenefride..... 201

XLV. Apology for giving so much of the nonsense of this saint. Other works published by Mr Andrews worthy of the dark ages. Popish division of labours among the saints. 205

XLVI. Discreet variety in objects of Popish worship. Nature of evangelical and Popish worship contrasted. Ridiculous multiplication of saints, &c. St Viar. Veronica. False ideas of the true God naturally lead to idolatry..... 209

XLVII. Beatification. Canonization. How saints are known by the smell of their bones. Farther proofs of idolatry from Mr Andrews' prayer to St Wenefride. How saints know what their votaries pray for, &c..... 212

XLVIII. Worship of images. Proved idolatrous. Great authorities for such worship. Council of Trent. Images of the Trinity, &c..... 216

XLIX. Image worship continued. The golden calf supposed to represent Joseph. Miraculous power ascribed to images. St Dominic. His character, and the worship which is paid to him. Detection of a Popish miracle in Scotland..... 221

L. Interview with two papists. Declarations of three witnesses, proving the truth of the story of the man in the Wynd. Reflections upon it..... 225

LI. Introductory observations. Subjects that remain to be discussed. The controversy between the Church of Rome and the Reformed involves the important question, Who is the Saviour of sinners? Papists trust in their own works. The Popish argument of antiquity and universality answered..... 232

LII. Popish relics. Use that is made of them, and the worship that is paid to them. Curious catalogue of relics. Impositions practised with regard to them..... 236

LIII. Popery a system of lying and imposition throughout. Miracles ascribed to relics. Catalogue of relics that belonged to Glasgow Cathedral. Farther impositions. Respect paid to the bones of the prophet, 2 Kings xxiii., and to the bones of Joseph, no argument for the worship of relics..... 240

LIV. Letter from Havannah, with an account of Popish ceremonies practised there. Superstitions practised by Irish Papists, at their holy wells..... 244

LV. Anecdote of Lord Derwentwater. Transubstantiation. The doctrine as defined by the Council of Trent. Hocus-pocus a corruption of *hoc est corpus*. Criticism, by Dr Clarke, on the original words translated

PAGE.

"this is my body." Doctrine of the French Catechism..... 248

LVI. The subject continued. Exposition of Christ's words on instituting the Lord's Supper. Transubstantion a most pernicious doctrine. He that professes to believe it, not to be believed in any thing that he says. 251

LVII. The subject continued. Pretended antiquity of transubstantiation discussed. Proved to be a novelty..... 255

LVIII. The subject continued. Ingenious method of putting the faith of a Priest to the test, by a lady. Absurdity of the doctrine farther exposed. The use of the senses, in judging of miracles. Extract from letters of Philopatris, in the Morning Post..... 259

LIX. The believer in transubstantiation in danger of committing fatal mistakes. The bloodshed which has been occasioned by enforcing the belief of the doctrine. Respect paid by the British Ambassador in Paris to the host. Remarkable speech of Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, on transubstantiation. Remarks upon it..... 263

LX. Transubstantiation continued. Anecdote of Queen Elizabeth. Various forms of worship paid to the sacrament. Anecdote by George Buchanan..... 267

LXI. Idolatrous worship of the host. Respect paid to the host by beasts and insects. On withholding the cup from the laity..... 270

LXII. Sacrifice of the mass. Doctrine of the mass as laid down by the Douay Catechism,—by the French Catechism. Nature of the mass sacrifice, by Father Pacificus Baker. Decree of the Council of Trent relative to the mass. Fundamental errors of the mass doctrine.... 274

LXIII. Scripture doctrine of sacrifice and atonement stated and illustrated. Popish doctrine sets aside the atonement of Christ. 278

LXIV. Examination of the alleged Scripture authorities for the mass sacrifice. Priesthood of Melchisedec. Consideration of Bishop Hay's arguments from Scripture.... 281

LXV. Farther consideration of Melchisedec's priesthood. Nothing in his offering to Abraham that resembled the mass sacrifice. *Index expurgatorius.* No dependence on what Popish authors give as quotations from the ancient Fathers. Misrepresentation of the apostle Paul by the Rhemish translators.... 285

LXVI. Popish Priests pretend to be mediators between God and man. Impiety and absurdity of this pointed out. Letter from Dublin, with four receipts for money paid to procure masses for the dead. Remarks thereon. 289

LXVII. Description of the sacred vestments used in celebrating the mass. The robes of the Jewish high priest no pattern for the dress of Christian ministers. What is to be done, when the consecrated wafer corrupts and breeds worms. Story of a dog swallowing the consecrated wafer, and what was the consequence..... 293

LXVIII. Conformity of Popish idolatry with that of heathenism. Extracts from Dr Middleton's letters from Rome..... 297

LXIX. The same subject. Extracts from letters by Ignotus. St Patrick's Purgatory... 300

PAGE.

LXX. Letter to THE PROTESTANT, by W. D., a Papist. Remarks upon it..... 304

LXXI. Further remarks on W. D.'s letter. Case of a Popish husband not keeping faith with his Protestant wife, in a letter to THE PROTESTANT, by the Rev. R. Cameron. Remarks upon it. Case of a Popish husband maltreating his Protestant wife, exposed in Glasgow police office..... 308

LXXII. The evil and danger of Protestants marrying Papists. Anecdote of a lady governess. Case of a poor widow being obliged to pay money for baptism to her child, in a letter from Mr Syme, clerk to the Town's Hospital. The money returned. Remarks thereon. Immense sums levied of the Papists in Ireland, from the Sun newspaper... 312

LXXIII. Lively description of the ceremony of baptizing bells in Canada, in a letter by J. M. D. Reference to a similar custom at Naples. Account of nunneries in Montreal. 316

LXXIV. Superstitions in Ireland, by A. O. Superstitions in the Highlands, by A Constant Reader. A proposal by a writer in the Orthodox Journal, that all the Papists in Britain and Ireland emigrate to Spain... 320

LXXV. The subject of Purgatory introduced. Purgatory bridge. Extract from the Douay Catechism. Remarks thereon. Extracts from "The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, by Pope Pius IV." from Gother's Papist Misrepresented and Represented. Decree concerning Purgatory, by the Council of Trent. The sin that shall not be forgiven, &c. furnishes no argument in favour of Purgatory..... 323

LXXVI. Purgatory continued. Not a place where sins are remitted, but where they are punished. Purgatory a doctrine of great antiquity. Derived from ancient heathens. Short history of it. Doctrine of Christ contrasted with the Popish Purgatory..... 327

LXXVII. Purgatory continued. Purgatorian Society in Dublin, from the Rev. James Carlile's pamphlet. Mr Carlile's remarks thereon. A similar Society in London. Curious particulars relating to Purgatory, from Mr Gavin's Master Key to Popery.... 331

LXXVIII. Purgatory continued. Use of the different apartments in it. Anecdote of the King of Spain. Souls delivered out of Purgatory appear in the likeness of crabs, dressed in black velvet. Souls in purgatory appear as lights flitting about graves. The late Queen of Spain lying in state at Rome. Money bequeathed in Ireland for masses..., 335

LXXIX. The subject of Purgatory taken up more seriously. No evidence of it in the Bible. Scriptures adduced by Papists in support of the doctrine, shown to have no bearing upon the subject. Proof from Apocryphal books considered..... 339

LXXX. Purgatory continued. Canting the corpse, as practised in Ireland, in order to obtain money to relieve the soul from purgatory, in a letter to THE PROTESTANT. Society of St John, in Dublin. Account of the demise of the notorious CATHOLIC VINDICATOR..... 342

PAGE.

LXXXI. A new bull of the Pope against the Bible and Bible schools. Letter from the Rev. Mr Graham, with part of his translation of Buchanan's Franciscan. Remarks on the said bull, and the Popish Archbishop of Tuam's letter to his clergy. Extract from a Report of the Hibernian Society..... 346

LXXXII. Charge by Dr Kelly, Popish Archbishop of Tuam, addressed to his clergy, against schools and the Bible. Remarks thereon. Irish Papists' appeal to the Pope against their own government. Exposure of their falsehood and impudence, by Mr Thorpe..... 350

LXXXIII. The Popish Archbishop of Tuam's letter further discussed. Extract from the Rev. Mr Thorpe's pamphlet. Lawfulness of tampering with persons living in ignorance and error, in order to gain them to the knowledge of the truth..... 354

LXXXIV. Further remarks on Dr Kelly's letter. Irish Papists' abuse of the British government, and of their own advocates. Mystery of iniquity, and the mystery of holiness, contrasted, by Dr Kelly. Influence over the people claimed by Popish priests.... 358

LXXXV. Letter to THE PROTESTANT, by a Papist. Remarks thereon. Letter by a gentleman in Ireland to THE PROTESTANT. General remarks with regard to the manner in which Popery is treated by lukewarm Protestants..... 362

LXXXVI. Auricular confession introduced. Another extract from the Rev. Mr Graham's translation of the Franciscan. Short notice of penance. The duty of auricular confession, according to Gother. Venial sins. Impiety of the doctrine..... 366

LXXXVII. Auricular confession. Capital sins, and sins which are not capital or mortal. According to the Jesuits, there is scarcely any sin mortal. Pascal's representation of their errors and impieties on this subject.... 369

LXXXVIII. The doctrine of the Jesuits relieves men from the obligation of loving their neighbours, as well as from the obligation of loving God. The immoral tendency of their doctrine shown in a number of particulars..... 373

LXXXIX. Letter of the Rev. Patrick Bradley, a Presbyterian minister, giving an account of his conversion from Popery..... 377

XC. Continuation of Mr Bradley's Letter. Auricular confession resumed. Instructions and devotions for confession, from the Garden of the Soul..... 381

XCI. Good resolutions. Vanity of them. Method of confession, from the Garden of the Soul. The divine revelation of mercy, for the salvation of sinners, according to the Scriptures. The only way of salvation revealed to men from the beginning of the world..... 385

XCII. The pernicious effects of auricular confession upon the minds of priests. Account of Mr Gordon, a Scotch gentleman, converted from Popery. His testimony of the wickedness of priests, in the matter of confession. Testimony of Gavin, a Spaniard, converted

PAGE.

from Popery, to the same effect. Children's Confession turned into a farce 389

XCIII. Testimony of Da Costa, a Portuguese Gentleman, of the wickedness connected with confession. Bull of Pope Paul IV. against *Solicitants*. Horrible exposure of the wickedness of priests, which this occasioned. Consideration of the passages of Scripture adduced in favour of auricular confession..... 393

XCIV. The Popish doctrine, with regard to satisfaction for sin, exposed. Extract from Gother, and remarks upon it. To satisfy Divine justice required a sacrifice of infinite value..... 397

XCV. Another letter from a Papist, with remarks upon it. Dr Copinger's Address to the Popish clergy of his diocese 400

XCVI. Resolutions by the Popish clergy of Cloyne and Ross, against the reading of the Bible in schools. Remarks thereon. Counsellor O'Connell's speech against the use of the Bible in schools. Remarks thereon..... 405

XCVII. The subject continued, with remarks on Bishop Copinger's Address. Examples of absurd interpretation of Scripture, by Popish divines. Note, by a correspondent, relating to the worship of each person in the blessed Trinity..... 409

XCVIII. Further remarks on O'Connell's speech against the use of the Bible in schools. Letters to THE PROTESTANT, on this subject, by an Irishman, and by J. S 413

XCIX. Letter to THE PROTESTANT, on the subject of Peter's supremacy. Critique on the words, "Thou art Peter," &c. Matt. xvi. 18. General exposure of the pretended supremacy of the Pope 416

C. Peter's supremacy farther discussed. No evidence of his being appointed president or head of the apostolic college, or prince of the apostles. To whom did Christ commit the keys of the kingdom of heaven? 420

CI. The subject continued. Table of St Peter, by the Rhemish translators. No evidence of Peter ever having been at Rome. Was not Bishop of Rome. No certainty with regard to the place or manner of his death.... 424

CII. The subject continued. Answers to Bishop Hay's arguments for Peter's supremacy. The Catholic or universal church of Christ, has no visible head on earth. The claim of the Pope to supremacy obstructs the conversion of Mahometan and heathen princes, from Lord Clarendon's "Religion and Policy." Peter's supposed successors, from Dupin..... 428

CIII. Absurdity of the Pope pretending to derive his dignity from Peter. Strange conceit of Papists, about the state of the church in Rome, in primitive times. Extract from Lord Clarendon, showing that there is nothing certainly known of the first ages of the church, except what we have in the New Testament. No evidence of the church or bishop of Rome exercising jurisdiction over other churches. The idolatry of Pope Marcellinus. The emperor becomes Christian,

PAGE.

and gives the Pope a rich crown. Remarks thereon 432

CIV. The Popes increase their power. Pope Gregory the Great. He condemns the title of universal bishop. Treason of Phocas countenanced by Pope Gregory. Phocas procures the title of universal bishop to be transferred from the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Pope of Rome. The Pope, by the help of king Pepin of France, becomes a temporal prince..... 436

CV. Papal usurpation. Bishop Hay on the headship of Peter, and the Pope. His doctrine refuted. Creed of Pope Pius IV. which is the standard of Roman orthodoxy..... 440

CVI. The Pope's excommunication of the French Emperor..... 444

CVII. The same continued. Remarks upon it. 448

CVIII. Remarks continued. Mode of electing a Pope. Case of Sixtus V. Character of a number of the Popes 452

CIX. Number of Catholics in England, and their rank. Consequence that would follow of their being admitted into parliament. Introduction of Christianity into Britain. Wales..... 456

CX. Calculation of the number of Papists in Glasgow. Mr Cleland's report vindicated. Reasons why a priest will not write against a layman. Letter from "a lover of truth," in Greenock. Letter II. from W. D. a Papist..... 460

CXI. Remarks on W. D.'s letter. Sects and differences of opinion in the Church of Rome, notwithstanding her pretended unity. 464

CXII. Farther remarks on W. D.'s letter. Showing that a man cannot honestly serve Christ in the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome establishes iniquity by law. Extract from the life of John Craig..... 468

CXIII. Controversy between the Bishop of Durham and some English Papists. Correspondence between Dr Troy of Dublin, and the Secretaries of the Sunday School Union. Remarks. Andrews's school book.. 472

CXIV. Letter from a clergyman in Ireland. Instance of conversion from Popery. Austerities of pilgrims at holy places. Character of several Popish publications..... 476

CXV. Introduction to the subject of clerical celibacy. Doctrine as laid down by Bishop Hay. Shown to be unscriptural. His sophistry exposed..... 480

CXVI. Celibacy continued. The arguments of Popish writers in favour of it exposed. Shocking immoralities occasioned by it..... 481

CXVII. Profligacy of the Romish clergy. They openly kept concubines. Proofs of this from Henry's History of Britain. Proved by other authors..... 488

CXVIII. Clerical celibacy. Anecdotes relating to it. Letter from "A friend to fair dealing.' Remarks by way of answer. Letter from "An Irishman."..... 492

CXIX. Long letter from Juvenis, a Papist Remarks upon it..... 496

CXX. Farther remarks on Juvenis's Letter. Return to Amicus Veritatis. His observa-

PAGE.
tions about Luther, and good works exposed. Justification by faith..... 500
CXXI. Luther and good works. Impudence of Popish writers in reference to the Reformer. Origin of Popery in the self-righteous bias of the human heart. The opening of Luther's mind to the truth. Justification by faith the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation..... 504
CXXII. Amicus Veritatis on the subject of satisfying divine justice. Absurd and anti-christian doctrine taught by Papists. Luther's doctrine and life. Absurd stories reported in relation to his death 507
CXXIII. State of Ireland. Extracts of letters on this subject. Method of keeping Lent..... 511
CXXIV. The Inquisition introduced. Horrible cruelty of it. Sufferings of the Albigenses and Waldenses. Limborch. His history, and his character..... 516
CXXV. More of the Inquisition. Crusade against the Waldenses. Jones's History of the Waldenses quoted and recommended..... 520
CXXVI. Origin and growth of the Inquisition. Heresy the chief object of its pursuit and vengeance. Galileo persecuted by the Inquisition for teaching that the earth moved round the sun. He is compelled to recant.. 524
CXXVII. Breaking up of the Inquisition at Saragossa, by French troops. Sixty young women found in the keeping of the holy fathers. Singular narrative of one of them. 528
CXXVIII. Narrative of a young lady found in the Inquisition continued. Mode of recruiting the holy Seraglio. More of the horrid cruelty of the holy office..... 531
CXXIX. Auto-da-fé. More of the Inquisition. Sufferings of Isaac Martin. Paris massacre. Irish massacre in 1641. Annals of Ireland, by the Rev. John Graham 535
CXXX. Revocation of the edict of Nantz, and the consequences. Impudence and falsehood of Bossuet, bishop of Meaux. Amicus Veritatis again comes into view. His complaint of persecution. The bishop of Meaux arguing the lawfulness of persecution..... 539
CXXXI. Juvenis on the word πετρος, and Peter's supremacy. Exposure of his mistakes..... 543
CXXXII. Farther reply to Juvenis. Sufficiency of the Bible..... 547
CXXXIII. The same subject continued. The Catholic Vindicator quoted, and answered, in reference to the sufficiency of the Bible.. 551
CXXXIV. How a Christian knows the Bible to be the word of God independently of human tradition. Recommendation of a late pamphlet by Thomas Erskine, Esq. Advocate. 556
CXXXV. *Bellum Papale.* Errors in the Pope's edition of the Bible. Letter on the state of Popery in Ireland, by J. A..... 560
CXXXVI. Extreme Unction. Doctrine laid down by Bishop Hay. Subject discussed... 564
CXXXVII. Extreme Unction continued. Shown to have no foundation in Scripture, in the sense in which Papists use it..... 568
CXXXVIII. The Jesuits. Extract of a letter relating to them, and The Protestant. Efforts of Jesuits in Lancashire. Petition of an Independent church for "Catholic emancipation." Remarks on it. Extract of a letter relating to the Jesuits..... 571
CXXXIX. The Jesuits continued. Letter relating to a society in Preston. Remarks on the acts of the Jesuits there. *Liberality* of Protestants in Manchester. "Modes of faith," discussed..... 575
CXL. Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits' Order. Strange stories of him. Compared with Luther. Dr Robertson's account of the Order. Story of one Heth... 580
CXLI. Dallas's defence of the Jesuits noticed. Decline and fall of the order. Their revival by the present Pope..... 584
CXLII. Letter from Preston. *Secreta Monita,* or secret rules of the Jesuits 588
CXLIII. *Secreta Monita* continued. Intrigues of the Jesuits. Their oath of secrecy..... 592
CXLIV. A hint about Catholic emancipation. Recommendation of letters by Philopatris, and letters to Mr Wilberforce, in the Morning Post. Another letter from J. A. on the state of Popery in Ireland..... 596
CXLV. Berington and Kirk's work introduced. Remarks on its title. Absurdity of supposing wicked men in the priesthood infallible teachers of a holy religion. Some of the propositions of B. and K. discussed..... 599
CXLVI. More of Berington and Kirk. More of their errors pointed out. An old story versified by the Rev. John Graham..... 604
CXLVII. A curious document from Rome, received from a correspondent, with a translation. Remarks on it..... 607
CXLVIII. Rome in the 19th century. Irish miracles. Continuation of a letter by J. A. Remarks on it, and on Maynooth College. Recipe for making Italian soup. Prayer of the king of France to the Virgin Mary... 611
CXLIX. Reply to Amicus Veritatis resumed. His misrepresentations and absurdities exposed..... 615
CL. Farther exposure of Amicus Veritatis. Defence of Luther's doctrine relating to divorce. Amicus challenged to prove his allegations against Luther, Knox, and others. 619
CLI. Commencement of Reply to the Catholic Vindicator. Character of this writer and of his work. A few of his absurdities exposed..... 623
CLII. The Vindicator admits the word Papist. Dr Geddes's distinction between Catholic and Papist. More of the Vindicator's absurdities pointed out..... 627
CLIII. Reply to the Vindicator continued. He asserts that Christianity owes its rise to the influence of Popery. His allegation that Popery is more favourable to good morals than Protestantism discussed..... 631
CLIV. The Vindicator's notice of Bourke's pamphlet. His assertion that the Covenanters became bound to extirpate Papists by force of arms, shown to be false. Slanders propagated in Preston against The Protestant. The Pope crowning Buonaparte admitted by the Vindicator. Remarks thereon. Reasons why the Pope cannot permit his sub-

PAGE.

jects to take the oath of supremacy, and the declaration against transubstantiation 634

CLV. Reply to the Vindicator on the subject of not keeping faith with heretics. His defence shown to be irrevelant, and the doctrine confirmed as a Popish tenet. Short notice of the cause between the Popish priest and The Protestant, decided in the Jury Court..... 638

CLVI. Farther account of the trial. Slanderous language of the Catholic Vindicator exposed. Reasons why Papists are incapable of holding places of power and trust..... 642

CLVII. Continuation of Reply to The Catholic Vindicator. Bible reading. The right of all to read the word of God..... 646

CLVIII. Reply continued. Whether the apostles had successors in their office? The Protestant doctrine no novelty. What ordinary pastors are commanded to teach. Story about typhus fever..... 650

CLIX. Happy effects of Bible reading. Reply to The Vindicator on saint-worship. His deification of the Virgin Mary. Impiety of his doctrine. Story of Tobit..... 654

CLX. Folly of idol-worship. The Vindicator's arguments for saint-worship answered. Bishop Cameron's opinion of The Vindicator. Claims of the Virgin Mary discussed. Forgery of ancient liturgies..... 658

CLXI. Farther account of pretended ancient liturgies. Other saints worshipped before Mary. Origin of saint-worship. Veneration for the memory of martyrs. How the Virgin came to take precedence of other saints. 662

CLXII. The life, death, and resurrection of the Virgin Mary. Intellectual idolatry of enlightened carnal men, compared with the gross idolatry of Popery. Strange story of the Virgin, and a wicked friar. The Vindicator's mode of defending the adoration of the Virgin..... 665

CLXIII. The same subject continued. Every Christian a saint. The Vindicator's own attachment to the Virgin. The morality of her worshippers in Glasgow..... 669

CLXIV. Final reference to the "Man-in-the-Wynd" story. Historic doubts relative to the existence of Bonaparte. Certificate in favour of Mr M'Hardy by one who knew both his merits and demerits. Justification by faith opposed by The Vindicator on the authority of Cobbett. Nature of good works. 673

CLXV. The Vindicator's defence of the Church of Rome against the accusation of falsehood. Remarks on it. The Vindicator himself verifies the charge. His defence of Transubstantiation 677

CLXVI. Reasons for replying to The Vindicator so fully. Transubstantiation resumed. Mr Gandolphy's defence of it. Remarks... 681

CLXVII. The same subject continued. Defence of Tillotson, and The Protestant's quotations from him. Quotations from ancient writers on the Eucharist. The Protestant accused by The Vindicator of forging ancient writings..... 685

CLXVIII. Subject of "Catholic Emancipation" introduced. Exclusion from power not persecution. What concessions have been made to Papists within the last fifty years..... 688

CLXIX. The same subject continued. Papists aim at the recovery of church lands and forfeited estates. For the attainment of this they reckon it lawful to murder Protestants 692

CLXX. Papists aspiring at civil power. Conduct of the primitive Christians in relation to civil rulers. Proofs that Papists wish to subvert the established government in church and state 696

CLXXI. Danger of admitting Papists to power in a Protestant state. Curious documents published by Mr Morrissy, a Popish priest, showing the inquisitorial and seditious practices of his brethren 700

CLXXII. Extracts from Morrissy continued 704

CLXXIII. The same continued, with remarks..... 708

CLXXIV. The same subject continued. Dispute between a priest in Philadelphia and his bishop. Curious pastoral charge by the Bishop of Philadelphia..... 712

CLXXV. Popery in the United States of America. Consecration of the Bishop of Charleston. Ridiculous titles assumed by Popish bishops. Letter from a man in the Highlands to his son in Glasgow. Remarks on it..... 715

CLXXVI. Review of the Report of the Jury Trial of Mr Scott's action against The Protestant. Remarks on Mr Cockburn's speech. Curious mode of proving a case. No evidence adduced to show that Mr Scott ever sustained injury from The Protestant. Great falling off of subscriptions for his chapel..... 719

CLXXVII. The same subject. Calculation of the amount of weekly subscriptions. Misrepresentations on this subject to the court and jury. Immense mischief done by The Protestant to the cause of Popery in Scotland..... 723

CLXXVIII. Miraculous way of keeping accounts without dates. Mr Scott's two affidavits on this subject,—confirmed by Bishop Cameron's deposition. Combination of Glasgow Papists to defame the author of The Protestant personally..... 727

CLXXIX. Number of Papists, and the amount of subscriptions for their chapel. Mr Scott's declaration on the number of his members inconsistent with the statement of his counsel. Origin and progress of the controversy. Queries to Mr Cockburn, and remarks on his speech..... 730

CLXXX. Remarks on Mr Cockburn's speech continued, and concluded. Conclusion of the Review of the Trial..... 734

CLXXXI. Letter to The Protestant relating to some incredible statements in his pages. Remarks on it. Bombastical account of a nun in Ireland taking the veil. A nunnery in London..... 738

PAGE

CLXXXII. Dr Milner's End of Religious Controversy introduced. General character of the work. Remarks on his Address to the Bishop of St David's. Defence of his lordship against the charge of recommending persecution. Popery a novelty in Ireland... 742

CLXXXIII. The same subject. Dr Milner's club of worthy Christians. Their characters examined and analyzed 746

CLXXXIV. Dr Milner's method of finding out the true religion exposed. The true religion not a hidden but a published thing. The absurdity of his Rule of faith. Ridiculous rant about differences among Protestants 749

CLXXXV. Dr Milner's second Rule. His gross imposition on his readers. What true religion is ; and reasons why some reject it. Shocking misrepresentation of the Bible by Dr Milner..... 753

CLXXXVI. Bishop Watson noticed. Dr Milner's cavil, that Protestants cannot be sure of what they believe, answered. The absurdity of believing as the Church believes without personal conviction..... 757

CLXXXVII. Dr Milner's shuffling mode of arguing. The vanity of mere traditional faith. False representation of true religion. That there are differences among Protestants admitted. The apparent union of Papists shown to be false..... 761

CLXXXVIII. The same subject. Farther exposure of false pretences to unity and certainty. Death-bed conversions. How Popery deceives and fascinates the ignorant and vicious. Duke of Brunswick The absurdity and impiety of his conduct pointed out... 765

CLXXXIX. Dr Milner's true Rule discussed. True religion the subject of revelation from the beginning—not of tradition. Meaning of the word, tradition, as used by the Apostles 769

CXC. Vanity and uncertainty of Popish tradition. The corrupt channel through which it is derived. The Apostles' Creed..... 772

CXCI. Sense in which Protestants use tradition. Illustrated by the cases of Milton and Ossian. Some practices alleged to have been derived from tradition considered. Change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. Strictness of observances as much enjoined as ever..... 776

CXCII. The Old and New dispensation compared. The Sabbath. Eating blood. Washing of feet. Gradual defection to Popery compared with that of the church in Geneva..... 780

CXCIII. Church of Rome claims exclusive right to the Scriptures. The duty of searching the scriptures. In what respects Papists are allowed to use their own eyes. The church proves the Bible, and the Bible proves the church..... 784

CXCIV. Hearing the church. Impossibility of finding the true church upon Dr Milner's principles. Her marks examined. Unity. Letter from J. E. on papal supremacy..... 788

CXCV. Union among Protestants greater than in the Church of Rome. Efforts of the Jesuits in France. Troubles in Ireland. Dr Owen's sentiments on the necessity of opposing Popery. Schisms in the Church of Rome. Popes and Antipopes 792

CXCVI. Sanctity, Dr. Milner's second mark of the true church,— proved not to belong to the Church of Rome. His gross misrepresentation of Protestant doctrine. Mutilated extracts from Luther and Calvin. His charge of Socinianism against the Church of Scotland, answered..... 795

CXCVII. Sanctity of doctrine claimed by the Church of Rome. Dr Milner's mistakes in stating Protestant doctrine. His absurd comparison of the holiness of individuals. Horrible corruption of manners in the Church of Rome, especially the clergy.....799

CXCVIII. The same subject. Depravity of the Popes. The Reformation vindicated on the ground of monstrous abuses in the church. Testimonies on this subject by churchmen themselves. Extract from Dr Sherlock on misrepresenting 803

CXCIX. Popish miracles related by Dr Milner. Mr Grier's remarks on them. The absurdity of them pointed out. Office in Rome for recording and trying miracles..... 807

CC. The third mark of the Church, Catholicity, proved not to belong to the Church of Rome. Dr Milner's arguments refuted. Apostolicity, the fourth mark, shown to be equally inapplicable. Short account of apostolic churches..... 811

CCI. Apostolic character of Christian pastors contrasted with that of Popish clergy. Socinianism of the Church of Rome, proved by *Roma Racoviana, et Racovia Romana ;* and from Dr Milner's own writings compared with those of Priestley and others..... 815

CCII. Popery and Socinianism agree in their fundamental principles. The Apostolicity of the Church resumed. Dr Milner's arguments answered. The apostolic succession of the clergy proved to be a mere figment 819

CCIII. Dr Milner's Apostolic Tree described. Popish conversions described. General account of the Third Part of Dr Milner's work. He admits that it belongs to the Pope to tell subjects when they may rebel against their sovereigns..... 823

CCIV. Death-bed conversions to Popery. Possibility of salvation in the Church of Rome admitted. Affidavit of Mr Daly, giving an account of a forcible attempt to convert a dying man..... 826

CCV. Remarks on the subject of Daly's affidavit. Statement of the Popish party. Sketch of Irish history for the use of schools. Its treasonable character..... 830

CCVI. Antichrist a subject of ancient prophecy. Illustration of Proverbs vii, viii, ix. in relation to this subject..... 834

CCVII. Allusion to Daniel's prophecy. Wearing out the saints by persecution. Father La Chaise's project for extirpating heretics. 838

CCVIII. Other prophecies relating to the Church of Rome. Thoughts on the means by which Popery will be destroyed ; and the probable period. Conclusion 842

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE Volumes of "THE PROTESTANT," of which a new edition is now offered to the Public, originated in a Newspaper puff about the pretended holiness of the Popish Chapel, lately erected in Glasgow. The exposure of the absurdity of the pretence led to a defence of it by some persons of the Romish communion; and a number of letters on both sides were published in the Glasgow Chronicle, in the summer of 1818. These constitute the first part of Volume First;* and what follows is a series of Essays published weekly, for four years, embracing the principal points of controversy between the Church of Rome, on the one hand, and the different communions known by the name of Protestant, on the other. The Author made comparatively little account of the differences of opinion and practice which exist among the latter, not because he thought them unimportant, but because he wished to keep by the one point of exposing the errors, impositions, and idolatry of the Papal Church, which make it not only lawful, but the duty of all Christians to separate from her communion; and thus to vindicate the Protestant Churches, in the matter of their separation, whatever mistakes any of them may have fallen into in other respects. His success in this undertaking may be inferred from the high approbation of Protestants of distinguished rank and learning, in each of the three kingdoms; perhaps still more from the approbation of thousands, whose learning consists of little more than their knowledge of the word of God; and perhaps most of all from the almost unparalleled abuse heaped upon him by those whose principles and practices he exposed.

When his labours commenced, it was the opinion of many Protestants that such a work was altogether uncalled for. It was alleged by some, that Popery was greatly ameliorated; and by others, that, in the present enlightened state of society, it would soon die away of itself; that, at least, it was impossible it should ever increase, or gain such a footing in Britain, as to occasion any uneasiness or alarm. "THE PROTESTANT" contributed not a little to remove these mistakes; and recent events have confirmed what he maintained from the beginning, —that Popery is the same that ever it was,— that it is on the increase,—and that Papists are making strenuous efforts, especially in Ireland, to recover the ascendancy which they formerly possessed, and which they employed for the extirpation of all who presumed to differ from the Church of Rome, and to believe and worship according to the word of God. Not content with the re-establishment of the inquisition, and the restoration of the order of Jesuits, they have within the last twelve months, made pretensions of a supernatural kind, in order to impose on the world as they did for ages before the Reformation. They pretend that a saint has arisen among them, possessing miraculous powers, equal to those of any apostle or prophet. This is a German prince of the name of Hohenlohe. It is given out that he has great interest in heaven, particularly with the Virgin Mary and some other saints, so that he can cure the diseases of persons whom he never saw, in any part of the world. To Protestants this appears extremely absurd; they laugh at the folly, and think no more about it—believing it impossible that the world can *now* be deceived by such nonsense. But the fact is, a great part of the world is already deceived by it. These miracles are believed as firmly as any recorded in the Bible. In all the Newspapers in the Popish interest, and these are not few, they are puffed off as undoubted facts. They are copied into others as matters of curiosity; and people soon begin to believe what is incessantly repeated with unhesitating confidence. Learned doctors, including the Popish Bishop of Kildare, are not only not ashamed of them, but they glory in them as incontestible evidence of the truth of their religion, and the holiness of their church. These tricks are performed with such art and imposing solemnity, that the ignorant and credulous of all sects are in danger of being deceived: and the very fact that Papists can now with such unblushing impudence practise these impositions, shows that they find what is

* The work was originally published in four volumes.

called Christendom ready to submit again to the bondage of the dark ages, and to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Pope of Rome.

One object which the Author kept constantly in view, was to show that Popery has its origin and its seat in the corrupt principles of our depraved nature. The essence of it is alienation from God in his revealed character; and it operates like all other idolatry, in the way of loving and serving the creature in preference to the Creator. This, it is presumed, will be found demonstrated in the pages of "THE PROTESTANT;" and the consideration of this ought to remove the surprise of those who are surprised by the increase of Popery in this age of light. It is only a heartless assent to an established creed, which is the same thing as indifference to all religion, that constitutes the Protestantism of a vast proportion of our population. These are all no better than Papists at heart. They are under the influence of the same false views of the character of God, and of their own state and character. While they remain indifferent, they may be sufficiently good Protestants according to law; but should their consciences begin to accuse them, and the recollection of their sins make them to feel the dread of a hereafter, they will be in great danger of embracing that religion that affords relief at the easiest rate,—that gives a hope of escaping the wrath to come without such a change of heart and character as would make them hate and forsake their sins. Popery gives relief in this way; and all are prepared to embrace it who wish to "make their peace with God," without being reconciled to him by faith in Christ, and renewed to holiness of life. In an enlightened country many are prevented from embracing it by its ridiculous fooleries; but even these, by becoming familiar, soon become tolerable; and the plausible representations of an artful priesthood seldom fail of success, when brought to bear upon the perverted minds of such nominal Protestants.

The only effectual antidote is the gospel of the grace of God. This exhibits salvation absolutely free to sinners of the human race; and those who are saved must accept the boon as the gift of divine mercy to them as sinners deserving condemnation. Such persons are taught to submit to the righteousness and the will of God as revealed in the Scriptures; to reject all other authority in matters of religion; and thus, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, they are preserved from the errors of Popery and every other fatal delusion. To this subject "THE PROTESTANT" has given a prominent place in his pages; and he is not ashamed to acknowledge, that he sometimes went a little out of his way, that he might have the happiness of preaching the gospel to his readers.

From his numerous mercantile and other avocations, he could not find leisure to bestow more care in the composition of his papers than is usually bestowed on mere letters of business. The reader, therefore, must not expect the graces of style in any of them. He studied nothing higher in his composition than to be intelligible; and he is aware that many verbal improvements might be made on a revisal; but the pages being stereotyped, do not admit of alteration. By the use of the original plates, however, the present publishers are enabled to issue a new edition much cheaper than if they had to set up the whole anew.

NOTE TO THE REVISED EDITION.

THE preceding preface was written on issuing a new and entire edition of the Protestant by the present publishers, four years ago. The demand for the work still continuing and extending, I have been induced to read it carefully over, and make such improvements as seemed necessary, though at the expense to the publishers of casting many of the plates anew. These corrections are almost entirely of a verbal nature, as I scarcely found a sentiment which I wished to alter or exchange. The increasing demand for the work is gratifying to its Author on many accounts, chiefly as indicating an increasing interest in the subjects of it; and it is not the least gratifying circumstance, that it has not only yielded an ample return to the publishers, but also enabled them fully to compensate the loss sustained by the Jury Trial referred to at the end of the fourth volume, which they have done of their own accord, for I had no claim upon them.

W. M'GAVIN.

GLASGOW,
20TH SEPT., 1827.

THE

PROTESTANT.

INTRODUCTORY CORRESPONDENCE.

THE publication of the PROTESTANT has excited so much interest, and has been so favourably received by the public, that I have been induced to reprint my Letters which were published in the Glasgow Chronicle; and, that I may do my opponents all justice, I shall also reprint theirs, in the order in which they originally appeared before the world. I shall begin, by giving the subjects which were performed at the *Oratorio*, with a translation of them into English; and also the paragraph which occasioned this controversy. "Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth."

ORATORIO.

The Oratorio to consist of the following Selection:—

PART FIRST.

Grand Symphony, composed for the occasion, by Mr De Monti, sen., (Organ by Mr C. J. A. De Monti, accompanied by the Military Band.)
Credo in unum Deum—I believe in one God. . . *Chorus.*
Genitum non factum—begotten, not made . . . *Contr' Alto Solo.*
Et incarnatus est—and hath become flesh . . . *Quartett.*
Et resurrexit tertia die—and rose on the third day *Chorus.*
Confiteor unum baptisma—I confess one baptism . *Basso Solo.*
Lucis Creator optime—best Creator of light . . *Chorus.*
Adeste Fideles, (or Portuguese Hymn)—be present ye faithful . . . . . *Chorus.*
Deum de Deo—God from God—variation 1st to the preceding . . . . . *Soprano Solo.*
Chorus da Capo.
Cantet nunc Io, 2d var.—let him sing now Io . . *Contr' Alto Solo.*
Chorus da Capo.
Ergo qui natus, 3d var.—therefore who hath been born . . . . . *Tenore Solo.*
Chorus da Capo.

PART SECOND.

Gloria in excelsis Deo—Glory to God among the lofty ones . . . . . *Chorus Concertante.*
Laudamus te—We praise thee . . . . . *Duett 2 Soprani.*
Domine Deus—O Lord God . . . . . *Tenore Solo.*
Qui tollis peccata mundi—who takest away the sins of the world . . . . . *Chorus.*
Quoniam tu solus sanctus—since thou alone art holy *Trio.*
Cum Sancto Spiritu—with the Holy Spirit . . . *Chorus.*
Te Deum laudamus—We praise thee God . . . *Chorus.*
Te Gloriosus Apostolorum Chorus—thee the glorious choir of the Apostles . . . . . *Duett 2 Soprani*
Te ad Liberandum—thee for delivering . . . . *Chorus.*
Te ergo quæsumus—we beseech thee therefore . *Tenore Solo.*
Per singulos Dies—every day . . . . . *Quartett.*
Dignare Domine—vouchsafe, O Lord . . . . . *Contr' Alto Solo.*
Miserere nostri Domine—have mercy on us, O Lord *Soprano Solo.*
Fiat misericordia tua—let thy mercy be done . . *Quartett.*
In te Domine speravi—upon thee, Lord, I have placed my hope . . . . . *Chorus.*
Et ne nos inducas in tentationem—and lead us not into temptation—(from the Pater Noster) . *Chorus.*
Sed libera nos a malo—but deliver us from evil—(from the Pater Noster) . . . . . *Chorus.*
Domine salvum fac Regem—God save the King—(or Prayer for the King) . . . . . *Chorus.*
To conclude with an extempore Voluntary on the Organ, by Mr De Monti, sen.

"We feel pleasure in noticing the numerous and respectable auditory which was assembled at the Oratorio on Thursday last. The zeal and activity of the directors, the alacrity and pleasure with which their solicitations, in behalf of a charitable and philanthropic institution, were complied with, the great respect paid alike to the subject and the place, form a pleasing and characteristic feature of the age, and must afford an inexhaustible fund of pleasing reflection to the contemplative Christian. May we not hope that these reasons, and the general satisfaction afforded by the performance, will induce Bishop Cameron to grant his permission for another Oratorio at a future period. We cannot close the subject, without offering our mead of praise to Mr De Monti for his extraordinary exertions, which the shortness of the notice required."—*Glasgow Chron.*, May 23d, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—There are two or three words in your paper of last Saturday, on which I beg leave to animadvert a little. They are in the paragraph relating to the Oratorio in the Catholic Chapel:—"The great respect paid *alike to the subject and the place.*" I hope that the highly respectable company which assembled in the Catholic Chapel, last Thursday, paid great respect to the subject that was said or sung there that day. I can conceive no subject so important and interesting to a devout mind. It embraces nothing less than the salvation of the world by the incarnation and death of the Son of God. I think it impossible that any Christian should make this a subject of amusement; and it was right to regard it with all possible respect and devotion. But it appears to me somewhat strange, that they should have paid the like respect to the *place.* Does the writer of the paragraph really believe that the building is as much to be respected, or to be regarded with the same kind of respect, as the most solemn passages of the word of God? Does he in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic Chapel are more holy than the materials of its neighbour the Town's Hospital; or of its other neighbour the Glass Bottle Manufactory? I know there is a Church every stone of which is holy; but this is neither the High Church of Glasgow, nor St. George's, nor the Tabernacle, nor yet the Catholic Chapel in Clyde Street.

The Society for educating Roman Catholics is founded upon the best principles, and is entitled to the liberal support of Protestants. In teaching poor Catholics to read, we do not profess to make them Protestants; and it is not fair to represent us as having become Catholics, because we patronize such an institution. But if it be true that we paid respect alike to the subject and the place where the Oratorio was performed, we have embraced one of the worst tenets of Popery—we are putting the work of a man on a footing with the work of God.

The writer of the paragraph expresses a hope that Bishop Cameron will grant permission to have another such exhibition. And is it come to this, that the Protestants in Glasgow must have the permission of a Roman Catholic Bishop to sing the praise of their Maker; that they must use only such words as he shall prescribe; and that these words must be, to the most of those who use them, in an unknown tongue? If it be possible that any person should consider it as a matter of amusement, then the permission of the Bishop is nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin.—I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—Having perceived in your paper of Thursday, a Letter from "A PROTESTANT," I beg leave to remark, in very few words, on the matter which it contains. Nor let it be understood that it is the spirit of recrimination which makes me trespass on the public, but a desire of exposing the weakness and futility of censorious bigotry;

> "Curst be the verse, how well soe'er it flow,
> That tends to make one worthy man my foe!"

I saw the paragraph which your correspondent alludes to, and am certainly astonished at the handle which he has made of it: paying respect to the house of God seems to have given him very great offence, and drawn from him a question as ridiculous as it is shameful:—"Does he (the writer of the paragraph) in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic Chapel are more holy than the materials of its neighbour the Town's Hospital; or of its other neighbour the Glass Bottle Manufactory?" According to the same principle, I suppose your correspondent would assert, that the ground whereon Moses stood, when he beheld the burning bush, was not more holy than the Green of Glasgow; or that the Temple of Jerusalem, which I believe was partly composed of "stones and timber," was not more sacred than the theatre: yet we are informed, in the sacred Scriptures, that our Saviour was so offended at the disrespect paid to his house, that he not only reproached the buyers and sellers therein, but even personally chastised them.

Were we to analyze all things that have been called holy, we would find them to consist in substance of mere matter; but the union or combination of matter, its application to pious purposes, and its consecration to Almighty God, certainly is not unworthy of being "called holy," and consequently deserving of a more sacred regard than the property of a glass-blower, or even a town's hospital.

From the remark of your correspondent respecting Popish indulgences, I was led to examine the Douay Catechism, from which I learn that the meaning of an indulgence is entirely different from what he would insinuate; indeed, if it were the case that Popish Bishops could have granted indulgences to commit sin, Henry the Eighth would never have professed himself a Protestant.

Thank Heaven! "the phantoms raised by bigotry and by prejudice have fled before the light of reason;" the darkness which for a time overspread our horizon, is dissipating into the more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy: and the institution for the education of Roman Catholics, if it still meet with the encouragement which already has marked its

progress, will be a lasting monument to future ages of the charity of its supporters and conductors.—I am, Sir, Yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—If I were to choose the name of an opponent in controversy, I would not fix on one more to my mind than AMICUS VERITATIS. I see, in your paper of Thursday, a Letter under this signature, containing some remarks on my Letter which appeared in your paper of the Thursday preceding; and, presuming your correspondent to be what he calls himself, I shall proceed to reply, without the least apprehension of "making one honest man my foe."

If I had been sure that the writer of the paragraph relating to the Oratorio was a Catholic, I should perhaps have expressed myself in a manner somewhat different. I should not have put it as a question whether the writer regarded the stones and timber of his Chapel more holy than the materials of its two conspicuous neighbours; I should have taken it for granted that he did. But this would have made no difference in the nature of my remarks. The writer was speaking of a congregation, the bulk of whom were Protestants, and he stated that they paid great respect alike to the place and to the subject. This I thought could be true only on one or other of two suppositions; either that they had abandoned their Protestantism, and become Papists; or that they considered the subject as a mere matter of amusement, and then they might respect the place as much as the subject. I did not suppose that Christians could make so solemn a subject the matter of amusement; I could not allow myself to believe that so many of my friends and neighbours had all at once become Papists and therefore I concluded that the reporter, whoever he was, had given an unfair statement.

AMICUS VERITATIS comes forward to vindicate the statement, and the sentiments implied in it, with regard to the holiness of the place; and he does so candidly and plainly, so as to make it evident that he is a Catholic. He, of course, believes the Chapel to be as holy as a Bishop can make it; I believe so too; and yet I believe it is not more holy than the Bottle-Work or the Town's Hospital. Persons who believe that a priest can create his own Creator; or that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; may very easily believe that a Bishop can turn an ordinary building into a holy place; but Protestants, I mean enlightened and consistent Protestants, believe neither the one nor the other: and what I originally found fault with was, the statement which represented a Protestant assembly as regarding the place with the like respect as they regarded the most solemn passages of the word of God.

AMICUS VERITATIS is perfectly right when he says, "According to the same principle, I suppose your Correspondent would assert, that the ground whereon Moses stood, when he beheld the burning bush, was not more holy than the Green of Glasgow." I frankly confess that I regard the one as no more holy than the other, but for the *divine Presence* which was manifested on the former. Wherever the Almighty makes himself known, by visible or sensible tokens of his presence, that I should regard as a holy place; but I have never heard of him doing so in the Catholic Chapel, and therefore I must be excused from putting it upon a footing with the place where Moses stood in the wilderness, or with the temple in Jerusalem, where, in a mysterious, but sensible manner, the Almighty communed with his people from between the cherubims, and from above the mercy-seat.

Your Correspondent forgets that these things belonged to a dispensation which has long since passed away, and given place to a better one. In the hour of our Saviour's crucifixion the vail of the temple was rent from top to bottom. The holy place was then laid open to all the world, and it was a holy place no longer. From that moment there was no house in the world more holy than another; and the words of Christ began to be fulfilled, "Neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father: but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship him in spirit and in truth." I most earnestly recommend the consideration of this subject to AMICUS VERITATIS; and if he be indeed what his name imports, I hope he will soon see and acknowledge the absurdity of considering any thing holy which is made by human hands.

It is an assembly of Christians, not the place in which they meet, that is the house, or a house of God, and such a house I believe to be holy, because Christ is present with them, though they be but two or three in number; and because they are holy persons, saved by his grace, and sanctified by his Spirit. This house is not the work of man, it is a "building of God."

A word or two on the subject of indulgences. My remarks, it seems, led AMICUS VERITATIS to look into the Douay Catechism to see what an indulgence is. I wish he had indulged me with a quotation, to assist my understanding with regard to the *modern* meaning of the word; for I am not so rich as to possess a Douay Catechism. But I do not need any modern writing to inform me that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the

law of God, and granting permission to commit sin: for instance, he professed to relieve individuals, and whole nations, from the obligation of an oath. He claimed farther the power of granting to individuals and families a full remission of all their sins, past and future, which probably would operate as an encouragement to commit sin, seeing the persons knew beforehand that they had got a full pardon. I am assured by a Reverend Gentleman of this city, that he has seen a bull of the Pope, granted as a special mark of his favour to the head of the ancient family of Kilravack. It is signed by the then Pope's own hand, and grants the most pleasing remission of *all* their sins, to *all the branches* of that family, from the time of granting the bull to a period of which there are about sixty years yet to run.

I am not at present disposed to turn over books of history, else, I doubt not, I could easily show, that it was no unwillingness on the part of the Pope to grant indulgence to commit sin, which prevented him from indulging Henry the Eighth in his wicked project. It is not fair to call that man a Protestant who did little more than transfer the headship of the Church from the Pope to himself.

It is gratifying to be informed that the Catholic Schools are flourishing: but it ought not to be forgotten, that they originated with, and are chiefly supported by, Protestants. While the Catholics were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the House of God, (while a plain building might have served their purpose,) they were suffering their poor to grow up, and to perish in ignorance; and it might have been so still but for Protestant benevolence.

It is amusing to hear a Catholic charging his Protestant neighbour with bigotry; and thanking Heaven that "the darkness which *for a time* overspread our horizon is dissipating into the more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy." I suppose the time here referred to, is that which has elapsed since the Reformation; and, of course, the light which is now about to arise is that of the *dark ages!* I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—It was not my intention to have noticed your Correspondent's letter, signed "A PROTESTANT," containing remarks on a paragraph which appeared immediately after the Oratorio; and I am sorry that AMICUS VERITATIS has done so, because it has brought forth from him a second letter, in your Paper of Saturday last, which I am compelled to answer. I will quarrel with no man for his religious opinions, whatever they may be; and I respect his feelings too much to turn them into ridicule. My purpose is not to enter into a controversy with your Correspondent on the subject between him and AMICUS VERITATIS; but to repel principles falsely attributed to others, and endeavour to make him feel, if possible, the injustice of his uncharitable remark at the conclusion of his letter. Your Correspondent seems to assume the privilege of determining what another body of Christians understand by the word indulgence, and that the Catholic must abide by his definition; and brings forth the report of a Rev. Gentleman, who assures him he has seen a bull of the Pope, granting the pleasing remission of all the sins of the ancient house of Kilravack, for sixty years yet unexpired. Really, Mr. Editor, it is a very unpleasant task to convict any man of committing a mistake, and still more galling to see a whole body of people charged unjustly with professing principles as repugnant to their feelings as to common sense. Your Correspondent may have been informed of this; the Rev. Gentleman may have seen some old Latin scrip, or even a bull; yet I will defy him or any one to produce it, or prove its existence, with the contents ascribed to it,—or that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sins. It is at best a gross misinterpretation. Bulls and indulgences are so mingled by your Correspondent, that he pretends not to know the meaning of either, nor will he be troubled to turn over the leaves of history to ascertain it; but receives the interpretations of these words from the enemies of the Catholic religion, and thus grounds his charge.

A spirit of irony so prevails throughout your Correspondent's letters, that I conceive him to be solely actuated by prejudice, or else why those epithets of Papists, Popish, Wafer, &c.? which originated in derision, and were fostered by bigotry. A quarto edition of a Dictionary, lying before me, says, "Papist, an odious term made use of by Protestants when they speak of Catholics." The Catholics do not admit of these appellations; our houses of Parliament do not make use of them: why then, if he wishes not "to make one honest man his foe," does he use derision to insult them.

Your Correspondent's observations on the Catholic Schools ought never to have been penned, when penned never to have been printed. They breathe a spirit in direct opposition to the principles of its supporters, who act from motives of pure charity and philanthropy, and, by their generosity and candour, win the grateful hearts of their fellow-creatures. He, by reproaches, tries to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug. A little while and it shall be found rooted to the hilt.

Your Correspondent may trouble the public with a reply as I have done: but were he to

write till the indulgence granted to the house of Kilravack is expired, on religious opinions, to provoke a controversy, I would be silent; but you shall ever find me ready to crush prejudice by stating the truth. PAX.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—I HAVE perceived in your Paper of Saturday, a second attack upon the writer of the paragraph relative to the Oratorio, together with some animadversions on my letter of Thursday.

Your Correspondent very ingeniously endeavours to refute what I said regarding that respect which *ought* to be paid to places appropriated for the celebration of the praise of our Creator, and so far does he proceed upon the principle he has laid down, as to assert, that all "enlightened and consistent Protestants," regard a church with as little respect as they would pay to a place of common amusement. I must necessarily suppose, when your Correspondent made this assertion he was not aware that many "enlightened and consistent Protestants" do not agree with him; among the rest the celebrated Mr Hervey, whose authority gives a zest to all I have advanced on this subject. This "enlightened" Protestant Divine writes thus in the commencement of his "Meditations among the Tombs:" he is walking to a church in the county of Cornwall, when he describes "the doors, like the heaven to which they lead, were wide open, and readily admitted an unworthy stranger. Pleased with the opportunity, I resolved to spend a few minutes under the *sacred* roof." He is even more explicit; he calls places of worship "our Creator's courts," and "the place where his honour dwelleth."

Here, then, is an authority which your Correspondent will not surely call in question, breathing the very same sentiments which were the spirit of what I formerly advanced on the subject. I presume when Mr Hervey termed places of worship "*sacred*," it was far from his intention to suppose the materials of which they were composed were holy, but only in relation to that Almighty Being to whose service they were dedicated; indeed there is an innate principle in man, which, when his soul is elevated by piety and devotion, instinctively prompts him to regard with veneration, "the place where his honour dwelleth."

Were we to erect a house for the glory of our Creator, why should it not, as much as possible, resemble the majesty of that God to whose service it is to be dedicated? "The treasures of nature and of art are ransacked to adorn the palaces of earthly kings, and shall we not employ them to build a house to the King of kings and Lord of lords?" "It must grieve," says Mr Hervey, "an ingenuous mind, and be a reproach to any people, to have their own houses wainscotted with cedar, and painted with vermillion, while the temple of the Lord of hosts is destitute of every decent ornament." I think your Correspondent might have been more sparing in his *reproaches* against the Catholics of Glasgow, for the manifestation of their piety and public spirit; and for raising a building which, for ages to come, will adorn and ornament our city.

With respect to indulgences, I beg leave to inform your Correspondent that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin; and whatever he may say with regard to the *ancient* or *modern* meaning of the word, I say, without danger of contradiction, she ever has maintained the utmost abhorrence against all such abominable transactions. As he mentions a Pope having granted an indulgence (which in all likelihood is a forgery), to "the ancient family of Kilravack," I hope he will have the goodness to accept in return one or two Protestant indulgences. The first was published by the pious Luther, and contains a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances. That it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I will decline giving the quotation, but refer your Correspondent to 119 and 123 pages Fifth Volume of the Works of Luther, edited at Wirtemberg. The second was an indulgence granted by Luther and seven other Divines to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at the same time. For the edification of the public, I shall extract a few passages translated into English. The Bull itself may be seen in the original Latin in Bossuet's Variations, L. vi. In his declaration to Luther and Melancthon, the Landgrave had informed them that he had never loved his wife, that he had not been faithful to her more than three weeks; and that he could not abandon the dissolute state of life in which he lived. For these reasons, he begs a dispensation to have two wives. In their answer, after some preliminary observations, they proceed thus:—"But if your Highness do not abstain from an impure life, because you say it is impossible for you to do so, we should wish that your Highness were in a better state before God.—But if your Highness be fully resolved to take another wife, we judge that it ought to be done secretly as we have said above with respect to the dispensation; that is to say, that none but the lady herself, and a few trusty persons obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession, know any thing of the matter. Hence it will not be attended with any important contradiction or scandal. For it is not unusual for princes to keep mistresses; and though the vulgar should be scandalized, the more prudent would under-

stand this moderate method of life, and prefer it to adultery, or other brutal and foul actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all go right with conscience..... Your Highness hath, therefore, not only the approbation of us all, in a case of necessity, but also the considerations which we have made thereupon..... We are most ready to serve your Highness. Dated at Wirtemberg, the Wednesday after the feast of St. Nicholas, 1538.—Signed Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Anthony Corvan, Adam John Liningue, Justus Wintforte, Dionysius Melanther."

I have often considered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of the human mind, that, in Great Britain, Catholics are not allowed the faculty of understanding their own belief. Of the myriads of declaimers against Popery, with which this kingdom abounds, from the unlettered female who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nursery, to the Right Reverend Divine who instructs his brethren the Clergy of the Diocese, there is not one who does not appear to claim a more accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine than the very Catholics themselves. Their decisions are more infallible than those of the Roman Pontiff. It is in vain that Catholics disclaim the odious tenets which are imputed to them; in vain that they appeal to their professions of faith, and the canons of their councils: their complaints are disregarded, and their protestations treated with contempt: the obstinacy of their adversaries will neither yield to argument nor authority. Objections which have been a thousand times refuted, are confidently brought forward as demonstrations of their folly and impiety; and the misrepresentations of prejudice are eagerly received with the veneration due to simple unvarnished truth.

Your Correspondent may reply; but as I do not perceive any good which can be produced to the institution, by maintaining a controversy, I hope I shall be excused if I decline troubling you with any more of my remarks. I am, Sir, Yours, &c. AMICUS VERITATIS.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—I observe two letters in your Paper of yesterday, in reply to mine in that of Saturday last, the one signed PAX, the other by my former opponent, AMICUS VERITATIS. It is a sad thing for me, Sir, to have both Peace and Truth against me; but as I am not conscious of having provoked either of them, and as I am sure neither of them can hurt me, I can cheerfully meet them with open face. Both of them write in a temperate style. The former, indeed, seems a little angry; but the latter appears to be in very good humour: and so far as I can judge of my own temper, I think there is nothing inconsistent with a state of good humour in any thing that I have yet written on this subject. It is my wish to preserve the same state of mind, in replying to the formidable host which is now mustered against me.

PAX says, he was compelled to answer my last letter; and I shall not be sorry if he feels himself also compelled to answer this one, if it should be at the period when the bull in behalf of the Kilravack family has expired; until which period he declares he will not answer me, for, by that time, he will be a pretty old man, although he should be only a stripling now: and surely he cannot say I wish him ill, because I wish he may live to a great age.

He accuses me of writing in "a spirit of irony;" and this is a part of his letter which I do not controvert. There are some things so extremely absurd, as to defy all serious argument; on which, "to be grave, exceeds all power of face;" and the solemn parade about the holiness of the Popish Chapel, appeared to me to be one of these things! The claim seemed to me so extremely ludicrous, that it was difficult to treat it in a serious manner. Yet believing the pages of your Paper, notwithstanding the nonsense that sometimes appears in them, to be as holy as the said Chapel, I did introduce some very serious matters, which I recommended to the serious consideration of AMICUS VERITATIS; and I am sorry to say, I see no evidence of his having considered them.

I say now the Popish, not the Catholic Chapel, because I see PAX attaches great importance to the distinction, and feels offended by my use of the former word. I must maintain that his offence on this account is very unreasonable; and that it is unreasonable to expect that Protestants should give up the question which they have been contesting with Papists for three hundred years, which they must do, if they yield to them the exclusive property of the word Catholic. Every Christian is a Catholic, in the legitimate sense of the word. We profess to believe in the "Holy Catholic Church," that is, in the existence of a holy and spiritual assembly, separated from the world which lieth in wickedness. This assembly consists of all the saints in heaven, and all on earth who are saved by the grace, and sanctified by the Spirit of God. This, however, is a very different Church from the Church of Rome, though I do not doubt that members of the Church of Rome belong to it. Now, to grant to the Papist the exclusive property of the word Catholic, is to concede to him what indeed he arrogantly claims, but to which he has no just right—the exclusive title to be a member of the true Church.

On what other ground does PAX consider the word Papist a term of reproach? or on what other ground does he insist upon us calling

him and his brethren Catholics, but that we may concede to them the point that they only are Christians, and that all we are heretics? But I will not yield that point to him, or any body else. Papist is the distinctive name of those who believe in the sovereign and supreme authority of the Pope in religious matters. Those who hold certain points of doctrine are called Calvinists, though they never professed to believe in Calvin, or to embrace all his dogmas; and why should those who do profess to believe in the divine authority and infallibility of the Pope, think it a reproach to be called after his name? Let every sect be called after the name of its god, and Papists will be found the proper name of PAX and his brethren.

That the word Catholic, and not Papist, is used in both Houses of Parliament, is a proof of the courtesy and good nature of noblemen and gentlemen, who do not much trouble themselves about religious distinctions; but it is one among many evidences of a growing indifference to the great questions at issue between Protestants and Papists. While the two words are used indifferently, it is, perhaps, of little importance; but whenever the exclusive right to the word Catholic shall be generally conceded to the Church of Rome and its members, Protestants will have gone far to shake hands with the Pope, if not to kiss his great toe.

This gentleman accuses me of using another term of reproach, to wit, Wafer. This appears to me a very soft and harmless word. I did not know that there was any evil in it. But the fact is, there is no such word in my letter. I used the common words bread and wine: and I did mean it to be understood, that a Papist believes that his priest can, by the use of certain words, turn these into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; that is, that he can create his own Creator! and, as neither of my opponents controvert this part of my letter, it must be understood that they acquiesce in it.

I am next blamed for so mingling bulls and indulgences, as not to pretend to know the meaning of either. The word bull occurs only twice in my long letter; and the word indulgence stands at such a respectful distance, that it does not appear how they are mingled: but it is of more importance to attend to the subject than the mingling of words; and here I have to remark, before I proceed, that your compositor mistook a word in my manuscript, which was written without much care. You printed "pleasing remission," instead of "plenary remission." PAX quotes the erroneous reading, and then he triumphantly defies me, "or any one to produce it, (*i. e.* the bull,) or prove its existence, with the contents ascribed to it; or that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sin." Now, I dare say it could not be produced with that word in it; but of its existence and authenticity I have not a doubt. It is esteemed such a precious relic by the head of the family that possesses it, (merely, however, I believe, as a piece of curiosity and antiquity), that he refused to let it out of his possession, when urgently requested to permit its publication. For farther information on this point, I shall refer to the Rev. Gentleman who actually saw it, who is, I am told, at present from home; but who will, I doubt not, on his return answer for himself.

It seems, Mr. Editor, you are, art and part, guilty in one of my transgressions. My "observations on the Catholic Schools ought never to have been penned, and when penned ought never to have been printed." My only observations with regard to these Schools were, —it was gratifying to be informed that they were flourishing; and that they originated with, and were chiefly supported by, Protestants. Where is the great evil of these observations? The latter is notoriously true; and the former I believe to be true on the testimony of AMICUS VERITATIS. I believe it is an observation of mine which immediately follows, that has offended PAX, and makes him feel so sore. "While he and his friends were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the House of God, they were suffering their poor to grow up and perish in ignorance." Now, this is a fact which deserves to be printed every day, and it should be sounded in the ears of Papists, till they be convinced of their sin, and make confession. When this is done, I shall gladly let the subject drop for ever.

The subject of indulgences shall have a prominent place in my next letter; and, in those which follow, I intend to go over and answer every objectionable sentiment advanced by your two Correspondents. It is by no means a difficult task which I have undertaken. To use an expression of one of your late Correspondents, on another subject,—there is so much "tempting matter," that it is difficult to let it alone. I must request you to indulge me with a little space in your Paper for a few days, when you have nothing more important to fill it up.—Meantime, I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

GLASGOW, 12TH JUNE, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—IN my first letter on this controversy, I said that, if the subjects of the late Oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the Bishop was nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin. AMICUS VERITATIS says that the Douay Catechism gives a different meaning to the word indulgence than that which I insinuate. I have

called upon him to give the modern meaning of the term, according to the Catechism, but this he has not done, nor yet his coadjutor PAX. Both of them tell me it is not what I suppose it to be; but neither of them will tell me what it is. Now, what is the meaning of this concealment, this mystery about the meaning of a word? Is it because, modified as it may be by modern refinement, it is still too bad to bear the light of a Protestant hemisphere?

My first assertion did not go into the niceties of its ancient or modern meaning. The truth of what I said seems self-evident. If it be a sin to make the word of God a subject of amusement, then the Bishop's permission to do so is a Popish indulgence to commit sin, else Bishop Cameron is not a Popish Bishop. My strongest assertion on this subject was, that "the Pope claimed and exercised the power of granting permission to commit sin; for instance, he professed to relieve individuals, and whole nations, from the obligation of an oath." This is not denied by either of my opponents; and I maintain, whatever the ecclesiastical meaning of the word may be, that this is nothing less, in the plain sense of the English words, than an indulgence, or permission, to commit sin. This, indeed, they may call a dispensation, not an indulgence; but it does not alter the nature of the thing.

I did not expect that your Correspondents would have committed themselves so far as to have asserted, "that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sins;" or, that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin." It will be recollected, by some of your readers, that a Reverend Gentleman of that communion, a few years ago, publicly maintained, that it never was a principle of his Church to withhold the Scriptures from the common people; and that, when the authority of the Council of Trent was quoted against him, he was then indeed PAX! that is, hush! not a word more! Papists have, of late, received so much countenance, and even flattery, from Protestants, that perhaps they are bolder, now they think the ball is at their foot; and they expect to get Britain back to the communion of the Holy See. I do not therefore expect that they will acquiesce so quietly in the statements which I am now about to make, and the authorities which I am going to quote.

The following is a translation of the bull, or, if it be more agreeable to my opponents, the indulgence, or absolution, which was preached and circulated by Tetzel, under the authority of the Pope; and which was so instrumental in helping forward the Reformation. "May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by his most holy passion; and I, by his authority, and that of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy Pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; and, then, from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be: even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the Holy See; and as far as the keys of the holy Church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in Purgatory on their account, and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism; so that, when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the Paradise of delight shall be opened; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This was enforced by the preaching of Tetzel, who declared, that if any man purchased letters of indulgence, his soul might rest secure with respect to salvation. Will PAX, or his brother, after reading this, assert, that "by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sins?"

I have before me an English version of another letter of indulgence, which was granted by the present Pope to the good people of Cork. "Pius VII. by divine Providence, Pope, grants unto each, and every one of the faithful in Christ, who, after assisting, at least eight times, at the holy exercise of the mission (in the new Cathedral of Cork), shall confess his or her sins, with true contrition, and approach unto the holy communion, shall devoutly visit the said Cathedral Chapel, and then offer up to God, for some space of time, pious and fervent prayers, for the propagation of the Catholic faith, and to the intention of our holy father, a plenary indulgence applicable to the souls in purgatory, by way of suffrage, and this in form of a jubilee." Now, let any man figure to himself the good zealous Papists of Cork, after having washed away all their own sins, by assisting at least eight times at the holy exercise of the mission, by true contrition, by pious and fervent prayers offered up to God for some space of time, receiving a plenary indulgence in the form of a jubilee; let any one witness this jubilee, and reflect that it is granted by the special favour of the Pope, and let him say, if it be not true that the Pope does, even to this day, grant indulgence to commit sin.

I shall indulge your readers with another bull of the Pope relating to Ireland. It was produced in the Court of King's Bench on the trial of Connor, Lord Macquire, Feb. 10th, 1644.—*State Trials*, vol. i. p. 464:—

Ad futuram Rei Memoriam Urbanus Octavus, &c. It recites, "that having taken into his serious consideration the great zeal of the Irish towards the propagating of the Catholic faith; which kingdom (for their singular

fervency in the true worship of God) was of old called the Land of Saints: And having certain notice, that, in imitation of their godly and worthy ancestors, they endeavoured by force of arms to deliver their thralled nation from the oppressions of the heretics, and to extirpate those workers of iniquity, who had infected the mass of Catholic purity with the pestiferous leaven of their heretical contagion, by virtue of his power of binding and loosing, which God hath conferred upon him; to all and every the aforesaid Christians in the kingdom of Ireland, so long as they should militate against the said heretics and other enemies of the Catholic faith, he did grant a full and plenary indulgence, and absolute remission of all their sins, desiring all of them to be partakers of this precious treasure; dated from the Vatican, or St. Peter's Palace in Rome, May 25th, 1643, and in the twentieth year of his pontificate." Under this plenary indulgence, the Papists of Ireland murdered many thousands of their Protestant neighbours. After reading this, will your Correspondents assert, that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sin, or that it never was the practice of the Pope to grant permission to commit sin? If they will still assert this, then they must admit that it is no sin to murder Protestants.

I have not been able to procure a Douay Catechism: and, as AMICUS VERITATIS will not inform me what meaning is given by it to the word Indulgence, I must find it out from another quarter. I have before me "A Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire, to which are prefixed the Pope's Bull, and the Archbishop's Mandamus. Translated from the original, with an Introduction and Notes, by David Bogue." For the edification of your readers, I shall transcribe Lesson xxi. It has all the authority and infallibility that the Pope can give it, as I suppose the Douay Catechism also has: it cannot therefore be materially different, for it is impossible that two things on the same doctrine, materially different, can procced from an infallible source.

"Of INDULGENCES. Q. What does faith teach us concerning indulgences? A. That the church has received from Jesus Christ the power of granting them, and that the use of them is very salutary to Christians.—Q. Why are indulgences so salutary? A. Because they are established to moderate the rigours of the temporal pains due to sin.—Q. Is it necessary to know precisely how this rigour is moderated? A. No: it is sufficient to believe that a good mother, like the church, gives nothing to her children, but what really serves to relieve them in this world and in the next.—Q. Is it the intention of the church to free us by indulgences from the obligation of God? A. No: the mind of the church is, on the contrary, to grant indulgences, only to those who attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.—Q. Of what use are indulgences? A. They are of much use to us in every way, since we have always reason to believe that we are very far from having satisfied according to our obligations.—Q. What follows from hence? A. That we should be our own enemies, if we had not recourse to the graces and indulgences of the church.—Q. What then, in a word, is the intention of the church, in the dispensation of indulgences? A. It is to assist well-meaning Christians to clear themselves in regard to God, and make up their infirmity.—Q. What does she intend by that? A. To excite more and more in the heart, piety and love to God, conformably to the word of our Lord,—he to whom much is given, ought also to love much. —Q. What is the best disposition to obtain indulgences? A. Doing, in the best manner we can, what is prescribed to obtain them, and wait the effect of them from the mercy of God, who alone knows the secrets of the heart.—Q. On what are indulgences founded? A. On the satisfaction of Jesus Christ and of the saints.—Q. Why do you add the satisfaction of the saints to that of Jesus Christ? A. Because of the goodness of God, who is willing, on the behalf of his most pious servants, to forgive the others.—Q. Why besides? A. Because the satisfaction of the saints are united to that of Jesus Christ, whence they derive all their value.—Q. Who has a right to give indulgences? A. The Pope in the whole church, and the bishops in their dioceses, with the limitations appointed by the church."

Such is the precious doctrine of the infallible Church respecting indulgences. I would appeal to your types, if they were capable of receiving an appeal, whether they were ever employed in putting together such a jumble of impiety and nonsense? From this document I am enabled to take higher ground. I maintain now, not only that the Pope, and the Church of which he is the head, grant indulgence to commit sin, but that they actually command it. They make it the duty of a Papist to commit sin. I rest this very heavy charge on the answer to the fourth question above quoted:— "The mind of the Church is, to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the *duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.*" Perhaps some of your Protestant readers will not, at first sight, perceive the enormous wickedness of this; but I appeal to every serious and enlightened Christian, whether he can imagine greater wickedness than an attempt to do what God has declared that it is impossible that a creature can do; and what he declares to be already perfectly accomplished, not by a mere creature, but by his own Son? The revelation of divine mercy by Jesus Christ, and the command to believe in him, is virtually a command to cease from every attempt to satisfy divine justice for ourselves, or to make our peace with God; but the Church of Rome sets

its miserable votaries to a work which it is not only impossible for them to do, but the very attempt to do which is an act of rebellion against God. To satisfy divine justice! The man who attempts to do this, or who thinks he can do it, must have as low ideas of the divine Being, as the man who sees and worships his God in a stock or a stone, or any other work of his own hands. Hence the connection of this doctrine of indulgences with the worship of saints and images, and the uniting the merit of the saints with that of the Saviour, which shows that the poor Papist looks upon God as such a one as himself. Christ has satisfied divine justice by the sacrifice of himself once for all; and every man that believes in him becomes interested in that sacrifice; the justice of God is satisfied with regard to him; the anger of God is turned away from him; he needs no other sacrifice or satisfaction; and instead of attempting to satisfy divine justice by his own penances, or the divine law by his own doings, he is taught, from a principle of love and gratitude, as a saved sinner, to live a life of humility and obedience to his heavenly Father. This is the true Catholic; this is a member of the church universal, which unites the earth to heaven.

But the Papist is taught by his church to satisfy divine justice for himself; and, if he cannot make it entirely out, he gets the grace and indulgences of the church, and the merits of the saints, to help him; and, if all should be too little, he has a *corps de reserve* in the merits of Christ, to which, however, he will not likely apply if he can do better. This subject is too serious for ridicule; it is delusion and imposition all over, and the effect of it is to ruin the souls of men. He that rejects the sacrifice of Christ, or who places any confidence whatever in his own merits, or the merits of any creature, refuses the only remedy which divine mercy has provided for the salvation of our fallen race; and by disbelieving the divine testimony concerning the Saviour, he is guilty of the dreadful wickedness of calling the God of truth a liar. Many Protestants, I am afraid, are guilty of the same thing; but it is of the nature of Popery to make men do so; and the Romish Church authoritatively not only indulges, but commands the commission of sin.

In my next letter I shall discuss this subject a little further, and then advert to the indulgences granted by Luther and the other Reformers. I am, &c. A PROTESTANT.

GLASGOW, 15TH JUNE, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—WHEN I concluded my last letter, and declined answering your Correspondent, I did so with the conviction that no additional provocation would emanate from his pen, until he had settled the previous question; but, as Addison observes, "it is indeed impossible to kill the weed the soil has a natural inclination to produce." I feel myself forcibly called upon to notice his letter of Saturday last, which, if I had no other, is a convincing proof of the truth of my remarks. He argues, as yet, on mere supposition, unsupported by a single fact, and is silent on those truths opposed to his fallacious assertions.

I will strictly adhere to my first principle of avoiding a controversy on the differences of religious opinions. My object is not to throw my gauntlet in the face of every man who does not think as I do; but to crush prejudices by opposing truth to error, and the olive branch to the spirit of persecution. Who can blame me, in this enlightened country, where men are allowed the full freedom of conscience, and where, I hope, these sparks of prejudice are only emitting the faint light of an expiring fire?

Every impartial observer must have been struck with the very feeble resistance made by your Correspondent in his last letter, whereby he occupies twenty-four lines of your columns in comparing his own temper with that of his opponent, and calculating how old I shall be when the Kilravack Bull expires. This is not to the purpose: I defied him to produce the Bull, *with the meaning he ascribes to it*, even allowing the benefit of the errata he claims; and it may not be irrelevant here to observe, that it is rather unfortunate for your Correspondent, that the proprietors (perhaps the manufacturers) of the Bull will not allow the publication of it, which might be effected easily without dispossessing themselves of it, and that the Rev. Gentleman who is reported to have seen it should be out of town. I also defied him to prove, that by an indulgence was meant the remission of sins, (for a person in sin cannot derive the benefit of an indulgence,) to which he replies, by a long letter, remarkable only for its cobweb texture, and a deficiency of that courtesy and good nature he blames in the members of our constitution.

Is there not apparent, in your Correspondent's writing, a spark of that spirit which Protestants themselves blame in the first Reformers? Luther enacted many things, according to his own assertion, solely to spite the Church of Rome; hence, I suppose, the reiterated use of those epithets he knows are only used in derision and contempt; hence, he assures us, the repetition of that part of a former letter which he finds gave offence: and let me here observe, the Catholics of Glasgow never withheld the acknowledgment and thanks to their brethren Protestants, for having suggested, and with them framed, an institution which has drawn forth the admiration of a sister kingdom, and the patronage of one of our Monarch's

sons. No, Sir, it was the concluding part that should never have been penned or printed, and which truth itself could not palliate. He denies Catholics even the appellation of Catholic; because, he says, the name is arrogantly assumed. I again refer to our House of Parliament, where some enlightened Protestants, in a debate connected with the Catholic question, objected to the word Catholic being used exclusively to denote the Church of Rome; they did not substitute Papist or Papists, they knew it was an odious expression, and that mockery blunts the edge of serious reasoning; they used the term Roman Catholic.

The principles of the Catholic Church do not emanate from a Pope, but from the great Founder of the Christian faith, and if a Pope were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed, and the followers of the Ex-Pope would then, and only then, be called Papists. Before I conclude, let me beg of those who are not tainted with the venom of prejudice, not to receive as truths those allegations ungenerously charged on Catholics, because they remain unanswered. There are, in every Christian, some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms, that to encourage a discussion on them, with those whose boast it is to treat every sentiment and opinion not their own with contempt, would to me appear a sinful provocation.

Had your Correspondent taxed the Catholics with any one principle which they profess, I would gladly have acknowledged it; but he proceeds in the same unheeded course, and deals out misrepresentations with an unsparing hand. He asserts the Catholics believe the Pope to be infallible. They believe him to be the head of the church; but they know him to be a man, and not their God, as he contemptuously asserts. But, if by such absurd sophistry he means to prove his first assertion, I must acknowledge they are fit pillars to support the unholy edifice he has raised with his own hand, at the expense of his neighbour's nicest feelings, his own integrity as a writer, and his charity as a Christian.

My pursuits and my absence will prevent me troubling you for some time; and, as I hope your Correspondent will be silent when I return, I hope I shall not be tempted to take up my pen again, which, if it were to raise one angry frown from me, would be my greatest regret. Yours, &c. PAX.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—I KNOW that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or at most from the pains of purgatory; but this is disproved by the Catechism, of which I quoted so largely in my last letter. We are there told, that the Church, as a good mother, when she grants indulgences, "gives nothing to her children but what serves to relieve them in this world, and in the next." Indulgences, therefore, serve to relieve Papists from the punishment which their sins deserve in the world to come. To this, let me add the declaration of the divine, angelic, and seraphic doctor, St. Thomas, a pillar of the Popish Church. "There actually exists," says he, "an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints have performed, beyond what is necessary for their own salvation, and which are therefore applicable to the benefit of others; the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure is the Roman Pontiff, and, of consequence, he is empowered to assign to such as he thinks proper, a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes." Here then is a plenary remission of all their crimes, and of all the punishment which they deserve, whether in this world or the next. It is not said to those who can afford to pay for it; but the practice of the Romish Church showed that they knew how to supply the ellipsis. The merits of Christ are out of the question here. Nothing is necessary but the merits of fellow-creatures, who it seems had done more good works than were necessary for their own salvation, while the man who takes his religion from the Bible knows, that though all the good works of all the men in the world, since the fall of Adam, were put into one common stock, they would not be sufficient to merit one breath of air.

It was the practice of the Romish Church to enjoin certain penances for certain transgressions. By and by they began to relax in the severity of their discipline. Dupin, a Popish historian, writing of the 12th century, says, "The practice of public penance for public sins was not yet entirely abolished, but it was become very rare, because the remission of sins was to be obtained by other ways, and chiefly by the crusade and pilgrimages. They began to reserve the remission of certain sins to the Pope and the Bishops." So far as appears, nobody then doubted that it was in the power of the Church, and of the Pope as her head, to allow certain sins to be committed, without subjecting the individual to the usual penances; and, when the permission was signified in writing, the document alone, or the fact and the document taken together, constitute what, in the primary sense of the term, was called an indulgence. But the matter did not remain long in this situation. An additional import was given to the word; the practice was

extended; and the remission of penances prepared the way for the remission of sins. If the individual was freed from all penitentiary inflictions in the former case, in the latter he was freed from all punishment whatever; and if the indulgence was plenary, he might transgress with impunity every statute of the decalogue, and every ordinance of the Church. To this favoured individual, purgatory, and even hell itself, were divested of their terrors; in the prospect of the last judgment, he was already acquitted. *Edin. Ency. Vol. VIII.* p. 316.

On this subject, Dupin speaks with great tenderness. He had mentioned the origin of indulgences in the 12th century; and, when writing of the 15th century, he informs us, in few words, that "indulgences granted by the Popes were more common than ever: they had become a kind of traffic." This is as much as could be expected from a Papist; but it shows that the wickedness of the holy Church had by this time risen to a great height. It will amuse your readers to see the nature of this traffic, and the prices which were paid for indulgence to commit certain sins. A book was published at Rome, entitled, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," in which the price of absolution for every vice that the Pope professed to pardon, was fixed. I will not pollute your pages by many extracts, but mention two or three things, to show your readers in what estimation Papists held the privilege of committing certain crimes, and how the crimes themselves were estimated:—For a layman murdering a layman, a sum equal to about 7*s.* 6*d.*; for him that killeth his father or mother, wife or sister, 10*s.* 6*d.*; for laying violent hands on a clergyman, so it be not to the effusion of blood, 10*s.* 6*d.* Thus, it seems, to strike a clergyman, though it did not break his skin, was as great a crime as killing one's own parents. For a priest to marry, was a crime for which no sum could atone, at least I find nothing for this in the list; but for a priest to keep a concubine, was only 10*s.* 6*d.* For licence to eat flesh in Lent, 10*s.* 6*d.*; for a queen to adopt a child, £300. This book has been often printed, both in Popish and Protestant countries; and the Protestant princes inserted it among the causes of their rejecting the Council of Trent. When Papists saw what use the Protestants made of it, they put it into the list of prohibited books, upon the pretence of its having been corrupted by the Protestants; but the many editions of it which have been published in Popish countries, and which the Papists themselves could not, and did not disown, (though perhaps they will disown it now,) were more than sufficient to justify the reproaches of Protestants, and to cover Rome with confusion, if she were capable of it. It was printed at Rome, 1514; at Cologne, 1515; at Paris, 1520, 1545, and 1625. See *Free Thoughts on the Toleration of Popery, by Calvinus Minor,* (the late Rev. Archd. Bruce of Whitburn,) a book which contains a great mass of information on the subject of Popery, with the most ample authorities. See also the *Morning Exercise against Popery,* with the authorities cited, quarto, page 489.

But the following authority alone, I should think enough; Claude D'Espence, a Parisian Divine of great note in the Romish Church in the 16th century, bears the following testimony to this dreadful abuse:—"Provided money can be extorted, every thing prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for money; so that, as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime that a person can commit is to be poor. Shameful to relate! they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And, in some places, they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying, that they may keep a concubine if they please. There is a printed book which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, The Taxes of the Apostolical Chancery, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of the Summists. And of these crimes there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." *Claudius Espenceus Comment. ad cap.* I. *Epist. ad Titum, degress.* II.

For the existence of the famous Kilravack Bull, and that it is such a one as I represented, I am authorised to refer your Correspondents to the head of that house, Col. Rose of Kilravack, near Nairn, to the Rev. Mr. Cormack of Stow, near Edinburgh, and to Dr. Brewster of Edinburgh; but why should modern Papists doubt of such a thing? It is a mere trifle to some that might be mentioned. In the treasure of indulgence published by the Franciscans at Roan, 1614, were the following words:—"For every day until the nativity of our Lady, there are 862,000 years and 100 days of pardon and remission of the third part of sins granted." See *Free Thoughts,* &c. Some, however, went a great deal farther than this, and gave a full pardon of all sins, and a third part of sins besides. *(Ibid.)* I think the reverend author ought to have acquitted the Pope of this Bull: for it bears internal evidence of having been made in Ireland.

As Dupin informs us, it was only against the abuse of indulgences that Luther began to preach;—"he did not yet directly attack the indulgences, nor the power of the Church, but maintained that the Pope could only forgive the penalties he imposed himself; that, therefore, indulgences were only a relaxation of canonical punishments; that they only regarded

the living; that those in purgatory could receive no benefit by them; that at most they could only be useful by way of suffrages," &c. Such was the erroneous opinion of Luther, when he had only begun to see the errors of Popery; and he was answered by the Pope himself as Dupin relates:—"When these things were doing in Germany, Pope Leo X. thinking by his decision to put a stop to the disputes that might arise against indulgences, set forth a Brief, on the 9th of Nov. 1515, by which he declared that the Successor of St. Peter, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, had power to forgive, by virtue of the keys, the guilt and punishment of actual sins, viz. the guilt by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishment by the indulgences which he could grant to believers for just reasons, as well to those who were alive as to those who were in purgatory; and that those indulgences were founded upon the superabundance of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints, of whose treasure the Pope is the dispenser, and this as well by form of absolution as by suffrage; that the dead and the living who truly obtain indulgences, are so far delivered from the punishment due to their actual sins, according to divine justice, as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth." *Dupin, vol. IV. p.* 17. I allow that the language of this Brief is extremely equivocal; and I cannot help thinking it was made so of purpose, that it might mean any thing, or nothing, just as the Church or her clergy should please, in all time coming. One thing is, however, plainly asserted in it, that the Pope, by virtue of the keys, has power to forgive the guilt of actual sin by the sacrament of penance. Now, when the guilt is removed, what right has he to hold the punishment in his own hands; and to remit that only so far as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth; that is, I suppose, according to what has been paid for it?

After all the evidence that I have produced from the writings of Papists themselves, will PAX still maintain that by an indulgence is not meant the remission of sin? I expect he will; and he will get out by a quibble:—an indulgence is not the remission of sin,—it is merely the Letter or Bull that contains it! I do not see how AMICUS VERITATIS can get out so easily. He said, "with respect to indulgences, I beg leave to inform your Correspondent, that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin; and whatever he may say with regard to the ancient or modern meaning of the word, I say, without danger of contradiction, she ever has maintained the utmost abhorrence against all such abominable transactions." There is one part of this statement which he will certainly confess to be erroneous,—he has been "contradicted." It has been proved that this Church, or her head, granted permission to commit the grossest sins for half-a-guinea; and when was it known, that her constitutional organs, whether Popes or Councils, expressed any abhorrence about the matter, or took any steps to put a stop to the evil?

With regard to Luther and the other Reformers, admitting it to be all true that A. V. asserts, I am not answerable for it. If I profess to believe in Luther; if I maintained that he was infallible in doctrine and practice, then, no doubt, I should reckon myself bound to defend all his doctrines and all his doings. But I know Luther was a fallible man like myself; and his authority goes no farther with me than that of the Pope. I respect, indeed, the truths which he was honoured to maintain against the Church of Rome; and I respect the memory of the man who, with so much intrepidity, maintained them: but I respect them not as his truths, but as the truths of the Bible.

A man who had just emerged from the thick darkness of Popery, was like one brought out of a dungeon into the light of day. He could not for a time see objects distinctly. This was precisely the case of Luther. Accordingly, as might have been expected, he made many mistakes. His consubstantiation, for instance, was little better than the Pope's transubstantiation. He had been so long accustomed to the quibbling casuistry of the schoolmen, that his perceptions of right and wrong, with regard to some points, may have been very indistinct. A good deal of the filth of Rome, no doubt, adhered to him after he came out of it; as would probably have been the case with any other man in similar circumstances.

With regard to the indulgence said to have been granted by him and his brethren, allowing the Landgrave of Hesse to have two wives at one time, the fact has been denied on grounds which appeared satisfactory to some credible historians; and Papists of the 17th century were as capable of forging a Bull as any person about Kilravack. It was at one time confidently affirmed, and circulated as a fact through great part of Christendom, that the devil had run away with Luther, soul and body. This would probably have been believed by all good Papists to this day, had not Luther, *in propria persona*, contradicted the fact. The most monstrous calumnies were circulated against Luther throughout all Europe, just as against John Knox in Scotland; and Bossuet, being an enemy of the German Reformer, would gladly catch at any thing that would go down with his readers; and put it into his book, with all its aggravations. Let A. V. bring from Protestant writers as much that is disgraceful to Luther and the Reformation, as I have brought from Popish writers, and Popish Bulls, to the disgrace of Popery, and he will have done something.

But suppose I admit (which I am rather inclined to do) that the whole is true as Bossuet

had stated, and A. V. has quoted it, what then? Why, it goes to prove what I have maintained in this and my last Letter. The Landgrave of Hesse would not have applied for an indulgence or dispensation to keep two wives, unless he had known that the Church was in the practice of granting such indulgence. Such princes as he is represented to be, looked upon the Reformation as an opposition shop set up for spiritual traffic. They had long dealt with Rome, but her wares had become rather too common and unfashionable for princes, since she had begun to sell indulgences so low as two-pence a piece, as was done by Tetzel. The Landgrave, therefore, wished to deal with this new comer; and when he applied for this indulgence, it is likely he would inform Luther and his friends, that if they did not grant what he wanted, he knew where to get it; and the Reformers, fearful of losing such a protector, while surrounded by powerful enemies, yielded to the temptation, and did what was unworthy of their cause. More of this in my next.

I am glad to see by your Paper of yesterday, that PAX has taken his word, and written something in reply to my Letter of the 12th instant. I am glad of this, not because I have pleasure in tormenting him; but because he has divulged some more of the errors of his system, which I will attempt to expose when I am at leisure. In the mean time, I shall proceed right forward in the route I have prescribed to myself, in answering his former Letter, and that of AMICUS VERITATIS. I am, &c. A PROTESTANT.

JUNE 19TH, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—WHEN I first addressed you, it was far from my intention to enter upon religious controversy, but only a desire of putting bigotry to the blush, and of advocating the cause of truth. With the same intention I again address you, and endeavour to reply to your Correspondent, "A PROTESTANT."

Before I proceed, I may recall to your recollection the remark of Demosthenes, the orator, "such is the natural disposition of mankind, that invective and accusation are heard with pleasure, while they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience;" from which I would infer, that during our controversy, your Correspondent has greatly the advantage, and more particularly so, as he assumed a signature that will very generally insure him of being received with approbation.

In the commencement of his last Letter, your Correspondent says, "if the subjects of the late Oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the Bishop was nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin." Now, Sir, I am really astonished to see him trifling thus. Does he not know that the Catholic Chapel was asked for a charitable purpose? Does he not know that charity is the essence of religion? Consequently the Chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement.

As your Correspondent has taken up the subject of indulgences, I shall endeavour to follow him through the most of his course, and to make good my former assertion, "that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin;" but if, in replying to your Correspondent, I should unknowingly touch the feelings of any of my Protestant brethren, I hope they will not attribute it to the spirit of recrimination, but to my necessity of disclosing the truth. I hope they will also recollect who was the cause of this dispute: and that

> "The blood will follow where the knife is driven—
> The flesh will quiver where the pincers tear."

Before I proceed to quote the authority of the Douay Catechism, respecting the word Indulgence, I shall just remark that this is a work which is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church; and which is put into the hands of every child that is learning its Christian doctrine. In the 71st page of the said Catechism is asked, "Question, What is an indulgence? Answer, Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the Church; but only a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance." Now, Sir, I would ask any honest impartial man, possessed of Christian candour, could he infer from this answer that an indulgence is a "permission to commit sin?" No, Sir, the idea is absurd, and I am astonished that your Correspondent, who gives his writing publicly to the world, should so far forget himself as to draw inferences so unchristian and unreasonable as he has done. But, Sir, I will not content myself with barely stating the approved doctrine of the Catholic Church. I will go farther. I shall recall to your recollection that Catholics abjure as antichristian those principles imputed to them by your Correspondent, especially with regard to a liberty of committing sin, or that the Pope is infallible. That I may be found correct, I shall refer to Act 33. Geo. III. cap. 44. This is a document which is approved by the Pope and all the Catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms; it is also received and accredited by the British Government, as containing the principles of Catholics. Here, then, I take my stand; and now again boldly repeat, "that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic Church that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin." With what a face of effrontery

can your Correspondent come forward and declare to the public that such are the principles of a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue; and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them?

I shall next ask your Correspondent, Did not the Protestant Church exercise the power of granting indulgences? If he would deny this, I would recall to his recollection the notorious *Cutty Stool*, whereon, if a person was condemned to stand for a certain great crime, he might, and often was exempted from undergoing that punishment, by paying a certain sum of money. Is not this an indulgence? Is not this a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin?

In your Correspondent's last letter I noticed an allusion to a Rev. Gentleman which was certainly characteristic of the author. Every minister of the *Gospel* should be a minister of *Peace;* and it was unfair to suppose, that because the Rev. Gentleman here alluded to, did not reply, it was either from a conviction of the validity or correctness of what might have been advanced against him. I myself am confident, and I do not *commit myself* when I say so, that your Correspondent cannot produce any decree of the Council of Trent, absolutely forbidding the reading of the Scriptures. The Council of Trent, and the Church, merely command her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures but that which is approved by the Church; and, consequently, cannot be said to forbid the reading of the Scriptures, any more than the Bible Society, who will not permit the circulation of any edition of the Scriptures but their approved version, although many other different editions exist.

It would be almost endless, Mr Editor, to answer all the charges which your Correspondent may bring against Catholics, as the fertility of his genius appears to be very little inferior to the original declaimers against Popery. I shall, however, in my next, animadvert a little upon any thing worthy of notice, especially those proofs which he has brought forward to substantiate his former assertions. I suppose your Correspondent was not aware that the doctrines of Tetzel were condemned by the Pope's Nuncio. Meantime, I am, Sir, yours, &c. AMICUS VERITATIS.

20TH JUNE, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—I FIND that some of my late Letters were too long to admit of immediate insertion in your Papers; and I have been told they were too long to command the attention of superficial and coffee-room readers. Henceforth, therefore, I shall deal out what I have to say in smaller portions.

In my last, I said I was inclined to admit the truth of the statement of AMICUS VERITATIS respecting the indulgence granted by Luther and his colleagues to the Landgrave of Hesse. Instead of justifying, I am as ready to condemn their conduct in this matter as he can be. But it is worthy of remark, that this is only a single and solitary instance, set in opposition to thousands which might be shown to have been granted by the Pope and Popish Bishops. The very eagerness with which such an instance is seized, the triumph with which it is brought forward by the advocates of the Papacy, and the surprise which it excites in the breasts of Protestants, who have not previously known of it, is perhaps the best answer to any objection to the Reformation which might be made on this ground. It shows, that in the opinion of both foes and friends, such facts are rare exceptions to the manner in which the cause of the Reformation was carried on, and altogether unlike the conduct of the Reformers. What Luther and his colleagues did on this occasion, was only to express their opinion or judgment as to the lawfulness of a particular proposed measure. Highly improper and condemnable as this opinion was, there is a wide difference between it and a power claimed and arrogated by an individual, or class, to set men free from what they allowed to be sinful, and contrary to the law of God—a claim which had been set up and exerted in innumerable instances, to gratify the ambition and avarice of priests, at the expense of all moral obligations. You will observe I am not defending the Reformers, for I think in this matter their conduct was quite indefensible; but, for the information of your readers, I shall cite a high example, which, if the Reformers had yet any regard for the authority of the Pope, which some of them had after they had declared for the Reformation, was calculated to lead them astray. Pope Clement VIII. had, only a few years before the affair of the Landgrave of Hesse happened, offered to grant permission to Henry VIII. of England to have two wives, although he was restrained by fear of the Emperor from divorcing his sister. This is stated in a letter, dated 18th Sept. 1530, from Gregory Cassalis, Henry's agent at the Court of Rome; which letter is published from the original by Lord Herbert, in his History of the Life and Reign of Henry VIII. p. 330. The following is an extract and translation:—"Superioribus diebus, Pontifex, secreto, veluti rem quam magni faceret, mihi proposuit conditionem hujusmodi, concedi posse vestræ Majestati ut duas uxores habeas;" that is, "His Holiness, a few days ago, secretly (because he considered the affair to be one of very high importance) submitted to me the following accommodation, viz. that an indulgence may be granted to your Majesty to have two

wives." Here is the Pope not only claiming the power of granting indulgence to commit sin, but actually suggesting a wicked project to the king of England, who needed no prompter to acts of wickedness. In his first Letter, AMICUS VERITATIS asserted,—"If it were the case that Popish Bishops could have granted indulgence to commit sin, Henry VIII. would never have professed himself a Protestant. I now appeal to A. V. himself, whether such a proposal made by the most holy Head of the infallible Church, was not enough to make every honest man forsake Rome, whether he became Protestant or not?

With respect to the first indulgence which A. V. ascribes to Luther, viz. "a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances," I am not disposed to admit the truth of it without farther evidence. He says, "that it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I will decline giving the quotation, but refer your Correspondent to 119 and 123 pages, 5th vol. of the Works of Luther, edited at Wirtemberg." Now, I ask A. V. whether he has actually seen and read any thing in the works of Luther, that, by fair construction, can bear the above meaning? I ask this because I am sceptical on that point. In plain English, I do not believe that Luther gave it as his deliberate opinion that it was lawful to commit the sin mentioned in certain circumstances, or that he gave a perpetual indulgence to any one for that purpose. I have no access to the book referred to; but if A. V. has it, I call upon him to leave it with you, for an hour or two, that I may consult the passage: or if he does not choose to do this, let him send me, through you, an extract authenticated by his own signature. I will not be satisfied with his translation, nor by any quotation, or extract, or translation from any other book. I must have the *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication; and if I do find that it contains what A. V. ascribes to it, I will publish the fact, and confess that Luther held more errors than I was aware of. I suggest the mode of sending me this extract through you that he may not have to plead his determination not to answer my Letters; but if he chooses to give the extract to the public in a Letter from himself, so much the better.

Dreadfully corrupt as the Church of Rome was about the time of the Reformation and long before it, there were some honest men in her communion, who saw and deplored her corruptions; and did not, like modern Papists, gloss them over, and by sheer impudence deny their existence. Such was Claude D'Espence, whom I quoted in my last. Such was also Wesselus, a man highly esteemed in the Church of Rome. He argues like a Protestant against indulgences; but his arguing proves clearly what I have been maintaining all along, that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of granting them. "No Pope," says he, "can grant indulgences even for an hour; and it is ridiculous to imagine that, for doing the same thing, an indulgence should be granted, sometimes for seven years, sometimes for 700 or 7000, and sometimes for ever, by a plenary indulgence. There is not the least foundation in Scripture for the distinction of remitting the fault and the punishment, upon which the doctrine of indulgence is grounded. Covetousness was the cause of their introduction at first; and though the Pope once swore to the French ambassador that he did not know the corruption of the sellers of indulgences, yet, when he knew, he permitted them, and they became more extensive." See *M'Culloch's Popery Condemned, p.* 182.

In my next, I shall take up the subject of Hervey and holy places. I am, &c.

A PROTESTANT.

SIR,—IN my Letter which appeared in your Paper of the 6th instant, I said, "Persons who believe that a priest can create his own Creator, —that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, may very easily believe that a bishop can turn an ordinary building into a holy place; but Protestants, I mean consistent and enlightened Protestants, believe neither the one nor the other." AMICUS VERITATIS replies, that I must not have been aware that many enlightened and consistent Protestants do not agree with me; and then he cites Mr Hervey, author of the Meditations, whose authority, he says, gives a zest to all he has advanced on this subject.

It is true, Hervey does speak of parish churches in language sufficiently high and bombastic; but Hervey is no higher authority with me than A. V. himself. In his youth he was far from being an enlightened, and, so long as he spoke of material buildings as sacred places, he was not a consistent, Protestant. "The Bible—the Bible alone—is the religion of Protestants." Whatever, therefore, a man may be in other respects, if there be any thing in his religion which is not derived from the Bible, he is not a consistent Protestant. Now, I maintain, that we have no authority from the Bible to regard one house or building more holy than another. It is needless to refer me to the tabernacle and the temple among the Jews; because these things had no relation to the New Testament state of the church, but as types or shadows of spiritual things which were afterwards to be enjoyed; and it was ordained that the shadows should pass away when the substance should have come, which took place when Christ had fulfilled all that was typified of him in the law of Moses by the sacrifice of

himself. If, therefore, we take the tabernacle and the temple as examples for calling our places of worship holy, we must have all the furniture and all the services of the temple. We mut have the symbols of the Divine Presence —we must have the altar of burnt-offering, and the altar of incense, and a high priest, and a numerous retinue of priests, killing cattle and offering sacrifices every day. Some of these things, indeed, the Church of Rome does exhibit, which is a proof, among many others that might be mentioned, that she sets her authority against that of God; for it is not more true that these things were divinely appointed for a time, than that they were divinely appointed to cease when Christ came to accomplish what was signified by them. Christ regarded the temple as a holy place, and he chastised those who profaned it; because it was not till his death that the system of Jewish worship was abolished. It is from his apostles, and from the churches which they gathered, that we take our example.

Now, they do not appear to have regarded one place more holy than another, with the exception of some Jewish converts, perhaps, who could not all at once divest themselves of the veneration with which they had been accustomed to regard the place where their fathers worshipped. The apostles preached in the temple, because it was the place of public resort, just as they preached any where else, when they could get people to hear them. We find them meeting in private houses, in a school-room, by the seaside, and, what would be reckoned very indecorous now-a-days, preaching in the open street; but no hint of their regarding one place more holy than another. Be he who he will, therefore, who ascribes holiness to buildings, inherently or relatively, he is not a consistent Protestant.

But Hervey, especially towards the end of his days was an enlightened Protestant. I am glad that A. V. has been reading his works; but let him not stop at the productions of his youth—let him peruse and study the works of his mature age, especially his Theron and Aspasio, and his defence of that work against the exceptions of John Wesley. There he will find the Papist doctrine of human merit cut up by the roots. Let him study these works, and recommend them to all his brethren.

Amicus Veritatis says, "your Correspondent might have been more sparing in his reproaches against the Catholics of Glasgow, for the manifestation of their piety and public spirit; and for raising a building which for ages to come will adorn and ornament our city." I have no objection that our city be ornamented with stately buildings by those who can afford to do it; but I would rather that all the houses in Glasgow were as plain as they were a hundred years ago, than that our poor population should be deprived of one necessary of life, in order to build palaces. I acquit myself of having reproached the Papists on this subject. I stated a plain fact, that while they were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the house of God, they were suffering their poor to grow up and perish in ignorance. If they feel themselves reproached by this, it is the fact that does it, not I.

Idolatry in every form is cruel. That Popery is idolatry, is clearly proved by Mr Cunningham of Lainshaw, in a late publication, which I strongly recommend to such of your readers as wish to know what that system really is. A. V. has discovered the spirit of idolatry in the Letter which I am at present answering. He says, "Were we to erect a house for the glory of our Creator, why should it not, as much as possible, resemble the majesty of that God to whose service it was to be dedicated?" Now, what must that God be, to whose majesty any material building can be a resemblance? Certainly not that God who dwelleth not in temples made with hands, and whose glory fills the universe. It must be an idol of A. V.'s own fancy.

I see from your Paper of yesterday, that A. V. has also taken his word, and carved out more work for

A PROTESTANT.

June 26th, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

Sir,—If frequency of repetition could give to misrepresentation the substance of truth, an indulgence would be of all scandalous things the most scandalous. Your Correspondent seems to have adopted this principle; he conceives he may justly assume the privilege of saying what has been said by hundreds before him; and, therefore, without hesitation, condemns the practice of indulgences, in terms the most pointed and severe. But I am not to be intimidated by a sourness of aspect: the shafts of ridicule will not in the least discompose me, and I can despise the meanness of sophistical reasoning, whilst I pity the prostitution of talent.

In my last I endeavoured to prove "that it never was the doctrine of the Catholic Church that a Pope or Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin;" and I promised that, in my next, I would take some notice of those proofs which your Correspondent had advanced in opposition to this. I shall commence with his Letter of 18th of June. The first in rotation is a bull or indulgence, "which," he says, "was preached and circulated by Tetzel, under the authority of the Pope, and which was so instrumental in helping forward the Reformation." The second was an indulgence, "which was

granted by the present Pope to the good people of Cork." The third was an indulgence granted by Pope Urban the VIII. to the people of Ireland. And, lastly, he very gravely proceeds to quote the authority of a French catechism, which was translated and edited by a Protestant, a known enemy of the Catholic Church.

In the first place, Mr Editor, I shall merely remark, that the doctrines or theses of Tetzel were publicly condemned by the Pope's nuncio, Miltitz, and consequently cannot be Catholic doctrine. Your Correspondent should have known this, and he really should make himself better acquainted with history, that he may not so palpably commit himself. An error of this nature is very inexcusable in a writer who addresses the public, especially when brought forward with an air of triumph, to affect the interest of those he imputes it to. He will find me correct respecting the condemnation of Tetzel's doctrines, by consulting Mosheim by Maclaine, Fleury's Continuation, Maimbourg, and the historians of the period in general, who represent him to have died of chagrin, in consequence of his treatment. The second of his proofs requires hardly to be noticed. Indeed I do not recollect of ever seeing any thing so palpably misapplied; there is not a single word in it applicable to the subject in question, and yet, he asserts that it is an "indulgence to commit sin!" Really, Mr Editor, it is amusing to see the puny efforts of bigotry and credulity; when a person is determined to withstand the truth, they evince themselves on almost every occasion. "Truth is one: it is the centre of the circle: recede from it, and you may wander to any point of the circumference." Respecting the bull of Pope Urban VIII. the style and language in which it is couched assure me that it must be a forgery. Its very date increases my suspicion. A period when the sword of persecution was unsheathed from its scabbard —when the flames of intolerance raged with destructive violence—when the storms of passion, like a hurricane upon the deep, overwhelmed the miserable victims of their fury—when the demon of falsehood spread her malignant influence over the hearts and sensibilities of men, and prompted them to invent the most wicked calumnies for the destruction of their Catholic brethren. Who would take a review, from the year 1577 to the year 1684, that would not shudder at the horrific scenes that were the consequences of accumulated forgeries? It was this detestable habit of fabrication and lies, in your chief reformers, which drew from the pen of the Rev. Mr Whitaker, a Protestant divine, the following remarkable confession:—"Forgery," says he, "appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism; originally coming forth as a kind of leprosy upon the brow of Presbyterianism in Scotland, it was conveyed, by the intercourses of vice, to the profligate head of the Church of England."—*Whitaker*, vol. iii. p. 49. I am not astonished that Bogue's Catechism was the one which your Correspondent has selected for his purposes. This is a work which was translated from the original French, by a Protestant, merely for the purpose of exercising his talent of ridicule, and it was natural to suppose that your Correspondent would apply to such a valuable source of misrepresentation. But it is rather unfortunate for him, however, that, of the 41 lines he has quoted, there is not a single passage which says that an indulgence "is a permission to commit sin." Not one; yet he proceeds, and asserts that from this document he is enabled to maintain, "not only that the Pope, and the Church of which he is the head, grant indulgence to commit sin; but that they actually command it." Judge, O Public! on what this defamer of his neighbour's character grounds his very heavy charge. On the answer to the fourth question quoted, "the mind of the Church is to grant indulgences only to those who attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice." Is there any sensible person who could draw such an inference from the answer I have above quoted? None, I expect. Yet your Correspondent, by a manner of reasoning almost peculiar to himself, endeavours to establish his charge. Like Luther before him, with one dash of his pen, he magnanimously abolishes the obligation of good works, and opens the gates of heaven to every man who can only boast the gift of an all-saving faith. This Solidifian tenet, it must be acknowledged, with the Church of England, in her articles, is "a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." The restraints of religion are too unpleasant to the passions of men:

> "'Tis prudence to reform her into ease,
> And put her in undress, to make her please:
> A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,
> And leave the luggage of *good works* behind."

"On this head," says a writer of the present day, "we have undoubtedly great obligations to Luther. Our blessed Redeemer died for us, and still left the way to happiness straight and rugged; the new apostle rushed to the arms of his faithful Catherine, and made it spacious and commodious. After Christ it was still so uninviting, that, as he declared, few would choose to walk in it: after Luther, it was cleared of the thorns of virtue, and might with ease be trodden by thousands. His disciples, however, have gradually learned to blush at the extravagance of their master: in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned, on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of the Scripture and common sense. But the unnatural portrait which their great patriarch had drawn of the Catholic doctrine, they still cherish with filial respect, and consider as an invaluable legacy."

In my next, I shall take up your Correspondent's Letter of 23d inst. I shall produce my quotations from Luther in their proper place. Meantime, I am, Sir, yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

GLASGOW, 25TH JUNE, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—PAX undertook to make me feel, if possible, the injustice of my uncharitable remark at the conclusion of my Letter, which appeared in your Paper of the 6th of June. I was replying to that part of A. V.'s Letter, which spoke of the darkness passing away, and giving place to the chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy; and my remark was, that I supposed the time of this darkness was that which had elapsed since the Reformation; and that the light which was now about to arise was that of the dark ages. Now, where is the injustice and uncharitableness of this? Is it not the opinion of all good Papists that the Reformation was the darkest and most melancholy dispensation the Church ever experienced? Is it not the custom of preachers in Popish churches, especially in that in Glasgow, to declaim against the Reformation, and against Luther, and all others who had a hand in that great schism? Is it not the desire and prayer of every member of the Romish Church, that things were restored to the state in which they were before Luther was born? Is it not most desirable that the Pope and his army of priests had, as formerly, the key of every man's heart and conscience throughout almost all Europe? Would it not be a happy thing if the Church had still the power of settling all controversies, and silencing all objectors to her infallibility, by sending them to the stake or the gibbet? I ask Mr PAX, if he would not rejoice if all these things were to happen? In short, if he would not rejoice if our light were that of the dark ages? And well he might: he would then be a luminary of the first magnitude, for a little light goes a great way in the dark.

To show that these surmises are not uncharitable, I refer PAX to an enlightened historian of his own communion. Dupin speaks with great complacency of the state of things in the tenth century, which, for its darkness and the sottish ignorance of both priests and people, has been called the age of lead. "In this century," says he, "there was no controversy relating to the doctrine of faith, or points of divinity, because there were no heretics, or persons who refined upon matters of religion, and dived into our mysteries. However, there were some clergymen in England, who would needs maintain that the bread and wine upon the altar continued in the same nature after the consecration, and that they were only the figure of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. This error was refuted by a miracle wrought by Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, who made the body of Jesus Christ appear visibly in the celebration of the holy mysteries, and made some drops of blood flow out of the consecrated bread when it was broken. St. Dunstan likewise refuted that error very strenuously in his discourses.—In fine, there was no council held in this century that disputed any point of doctrine or discipline; which shows us that there was no error of faith that was of any consequence, or made any noise in the Church."—*Dupin, cent.* X. Happy state of the Church, when her Bishops could refute error by a miracle! and when nobody was troubled with common sense, but some clergymen in that perverse country, England.

PAX accuses me of trying, by reproaches, "to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug." And he prophesies, that in "a little it will be found rotted to the hilt." What sword does he mean? If it be the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, I hope it will never be sheathed, that it will never rot, and that it will never cease to be wielded by the friends of truth, so long as error exists in the world. If he mean the sword of persecution, and that I try to unsheath it, he slanders his neighbour, and lays himself open to more severe reproof than I choose to administer. I have no hostility against him; I pity him as the unhappy victim of error and imposition; and the worst thing I wish him is, that he would be convinced of his errors, and renounce them. But I declare the most determined hostility against the whole system of Popery; not against Papists, but against their errors, which are their own greatest enemies. Like Mr Cunningham of Lainshaw, to whose work on this subject I referred in my last, I believe it is not in the power of the devil to invent such another system of delusion, and wickedness, and opposition to the religion of Christ. This was the mightiest effort of the wicked one to deprive the world of the benefit of Christ's incarnation and death, and to keep the human race in bondage to himself. He has been deplorably successful; and the ruin of millions of souls, has been the consequence. It is because I wish well to the persons of Papists—it is because I wish nothing less than their present and everlasting happiness, that I wish them delivered from the bondage of error, and the dominion of their priests—and that the priests themselves were delivered from the slavery of the prince of darkness.

But persecution is not the way to accomplish this. If there be one thing in Popery which I abhor more than another, it is its persecuting spirit. It has always persecuted when it had the power. It made it a meritorious act to

extirpate heretics. Most of the reformed churches brought a portion of this spirit from Rome with them; and it is one of the last rags of Popery which some of them are inclined to throw away. I consider every species of civil disability and disqualification, on a religious account, persecution; and I am sorry that, in this otherwise free and happy country, so many are subjected to it, and Papists among the rest. * Persecution is disgraceful to those who inflict, but honourable to those who suffer it. It throws around them the charm and glory of a relationship to apostles and prophets, and men of whom the world was not worthy. Popery is not worthy of such honour. I would never persecute Papists.

Nobody can hinder them from continuing Papists if they please, and, even in this case, I wish to do them good. I wish to see them all well educated, and respectable members of society. I have, therefore, been a subscriber to their schools, and intend to remain so. Whatever creed they shall profess, it is better to have a reading, well-informed, than an ignorant population. A PROTESTANT.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—IN "A PROTESTANT'S" Letter of the 23d June, he exultingly exclaims, "I do not see how AMICUS VERITATIS can get out so easily." He then quotes my assertion, which I dwelt upon in my Letter of 25th, and continues, "there is one part of this statement which he will certainly confess to be erroneous: he has been contradicted." It does not however follow, Mr Editor, that because a man has been contradicted, he must necessarily be in error. The apostle Paul was often contradicted, but that was no proof he was in error; and, notwithstanding all the precaution and penetration of my opponent, strange to relate, he has himself opened the door to me, and proved that I was not in error. In the commencement of his Letter, he says, "I know that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or, at most, from the pains of purgatory." Now, surely, Sir, what Catholics maintain constitutes their tenets; and it does not require an uncommon degree of reasoning to understand, that if it be the belief of Catholics that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from temporal punishment, they cannot mean, at the same time, a permission or liberty to commit sin. Here the candid reader will acknowledge that your Correspondent has only contradicted himself, and not convicted me of error. But he says, that this is disproved by the Catechism, of which he quoted so largely: however, he should have been candid enough to have explained that a Protestant, a professed enemy of the Catholic Church, was the editor of that Catechism. Then every unprejudiced person would have acknowledged that the information which he imparted was devoid of one essential means of real information, viz., impartiality and fidelity of translation. I must acknowledge, however, that David Bogue is much more candid than your Correspondent, for he defines in the publication from which your Correspondent quotes so largely, (and on which he reasons so justly as to condemn the laws of every church and of every civil government on earth), that the virtue of indulgences in the Catholic Church "only consists in mitigating the rigour of the temporal punishment due to sin." This is not surely a liberty to commit sin, any more than it is a liberty to commit sin to commute the punishment of the Cutty Stool for a fine of a few shillings or a few pounds.

Even allowing the quotation from St Thomas to be correct (which I deny), there is not one word in it which so much as hints at a liberty to commit sin, which is what your Correspondent endeavours to establish. Even he himself acknowledges that it would mean only "a plenary remission of all their crimes, and of all the punishment which they deserve." Now, surely, your Correspondent would not be impious enough to assert, that when the Almighty, in the sacred Scriptures, promises to give to the truly penitent a plenary remission of his sins, and of all the punishment which they deserve, he means at the same time to grant him permission or an indulgence to commit sin. The quotations from Dupin are of the same stamp: not one word is said of a liberty to commit sin: they are entirely confined to public penances.

Your Correspondent proceeds to quote the Edinburgh Encyclopedia: as well might he quote to me his own authority. The quotations from the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, as well as that which he produces in his next paragraph, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," are downright forgeries. I do not, however, assert that the individuals to whom he refers were the forgers; I only mean to say that they copied the forgeries from other books, in which they might have been circulated as real facts. Your Correspondent himself acknowledges that the publication to which he alludes is among the number of prohibited books; and as no book is prohibited, but such as contain doctrine con-

* I think it right to let this remain as originally written, and printed in all the former editions, though I found it my duty, in a subsequent part of my work, to qualify the opinion here expressed. I am now convinced that the exclusion of papists from political power in our protestant state is not persecution, but a necessary measure of self-defence; not, however, on account of the errors of their faith, but because of their subjection to the Pope of Rome, —a power hostile to every protestant government.

trary to the tenets of the Catholic faith, he thereby acknowledges that what he wishes his readers to believe Catholic doctrine, is, on the contrary, condemned by all the authority of the Catholic Church. To such gross and palpable forgeries, a denial is all that can be expected; and though he asserts that the book entitled "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery," was printed at Rome, 1518, at Paris, 1520, &c., it is quite a mistake. Every person knows that it was very easy to date a book at Rome, though printed at Wirtemberg, Amsterdam, or London. If opportunity will permit, however, I intend to enter more fully upon this subject hereafter. When he refers to "Free Thoughts," &c., he refers to antiquated calumnies, to enemies of the Catholic Church, as a proof of her tenets; and it would be just as candid to refer to the French Moniteur, when under the thraldom of Bonaparte, for the character of the British government.

In treating of Protestant indulgences, which he is unable to justify, your Correspondent seems to think that Catholics were as capable of forging calumnies on their Protestant brethren, as some Protestants were ready enough to forge against them. He surely will not refuse to submit to the decision of a very learned Protestant writer, I mean the Rev. Mr Whitaker. "Forgery," says he, "I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it, seems to have been peculiar to the reformed. I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery."—*Whitaker*, vol. iii. p. 2.

In his Letter of the 25th ult. your Correspondent appears "sceptical" with regard to the existence of an indulgence which I formerly said was to be found in Luther's Works. He requests me to give him the quotations. But before I do this, I may express my surprise, that a man who would pretend to discuss the religious opinions of others, should not only be unacquainted with them, but ignorant of the great father of his own. That Luther did preach the doctrines in question, is certain. He tells us, that whilst he continued a Catholic monk, he "observed chastity, obedience, and poverty, and that being free from worldly cares, he gave himself up to fasting, watching, and prayer; whereas, after he became reformer, he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence: to satisfy which, he broke through his solemn vow of continency, in direct opposition to his former doctrine, by marrying a religious woman, who was under the same obligation. He then proceeded to teach the shameful lessons we have seen above; and others still more licentious, such as the permission, in certain cases, of concubinage and polygamy. *Milner's Letters, pp.* 158, 159. The *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication are:—"Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut fœmina non sis, sic nec in te est, ut absque viro degas——Tertia ratio divortii est, ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit—hic opportunium est, ut maritus dicat: Si tu nolueris, altera volet: Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla." *Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt. tom.* V. *fol.* 119, 120. The Works of Luther are preserved in the Library of the University of Glasgow, where your Correspondent may examine if my quotations are correct, and I expect that he will be as good as his word.

Your Correspondent says that those indulgences of Luther which I adduced were solitary cases, I now ask him in short words:—Did not Luther issue more bulls than one, to absolve the Germans from their obedience to Charles V.? Did not Calvin aud Beza require the Huguenots to rebel against their sovereigns? Did not Knox, and the Presbyterian Clergy of Scotland in general, with thundering anathemas impel their followers to shake off the dominion of the Queen Regent, and afterwards that of the unfortunate Mary? What else were the sermons and writings of Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Poynet, and other fathers of the new religion at home, in the reign of Queen Mary, but so many decrees in favour of rebellion, and so many absolutions from the duty of allegiance? Did not a new set of Protestant doctors, proceeding, however, upon the fundamental principle of the former, that of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and in all matters of religion, preach up, on the alleged authority of God's word, the justice and necessity of deposing and murdering their king, the gallant Charles I., and subverting the constitution? Did not the same doctors, on the same pretended sacred authority, absolve the prisoners of war who were released to them at Brentford, from the oaths they had severally taken of not serving again in the republican army? Did not the most famous prelates and divines of the establishment, a few years before, pretend to absolve the king himself from his sworn duty to his subjects, and the very law of nature, by deciding that he was at liberty to send his favourite minister, Strafford, to the scaffold, notwithstanding he himself was conscientiously persuaded of the Earl's innocence? He will not now have to complain that I depend upon one or two solitary cases: let him answer these, and I can furnish him with more.

Now, Sir, after all which has been disproved, will your Correspondent again come forward and endeavour to inforce his odious calumnies? Will he again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and bigotry? O how shameful and obstinate a thing is bigotry! "To what end," says Mr Phillips, "is argument with the bigot? No philosopher can contrive—no humanity can melt—no miracles can convert—no religion can reclaim him. In his hands the

gospel is a murderer, and God a demon. He has no pity, for he cannot feel; he has no piety, for he cannot forgive; his prayers are curses—his communion death—his vengeance is eternity. Red with the fires of hell—reeking with massacres of earth—and righteous with the blasphemies of heaven, he erects his cannibal divinity upon a throne of skulls: and true to the primeval archetype, feeds even with a brother's blood the impious flame of his rejected altar."

When your Correspondent remains silent, I intend, if time and opportunity will permit, to reply to the challenge which he made in his Letter of 23d ult. but, in the mean time, shall proceed to take notice of his Letter, dated 24th June, &c. I am Sir, Yours, &c.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

GLASGOW, 3D JULY, 1818.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

SIR,—AMICUS VERITATIS has "often considered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of the human mind, that in Great Britain, Catholics are not allowed the faculty of understanding their own belief." If ever they possessed this faculty, I should like to know who has deprived them of it. I believe, however, few of them ever possessed it; and I question if A. V. himself does so. Does he understand transubstantiation, or does he not believe in it? Does he understand how the real body of Christ can be in a thousand places at the same time, and eaten whole by thousands of individuals, perhaps a thousand times in their lives? If he does possess the faculty of understanding this, he is a greater man than I took him for.

But I suppose he means that we do not allow Papists to know what their belief is. "Of the myriads of declaimers against Popery," says he, "with which this country abounds, from the unlettered female who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nursery, to the right reverend divine who instructs his brethren the clergy of his diocese, there is not one who does not appear to claim more accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine than the very Catholics themselves." Now there appears to me nothing wonderful in this. If the Papists, like other sects, professed to think for themselves, and to believe what was the result of their own investigation and reflection, it would be unjust to charge them with any thing but what they professed at the time. If any man, or any class of men, tell us plainly what their faith is, we ought to give them credit for what they profess, and no more. But if any man tell me that he belongs to a church whose authorized standard of faith is before the world, and whose practice is well known to the world; that he adheres to that standard, and approves that practice, then I am not bound to take his word for the faith or practice of his church. I judge from her standard and general practice; and if his private judgment be different, I tell him he is a dissenter, he has forsaken the faith of his church. The faith of the church of Scotland, for instance, is as well defined in her standards as perhaps any thing of the kind can be; her practice also is known to the world; and it is very possible that an Episcopalian, or an Independent, may know what is the faith and practice of Scottish Presbyterians, better than many of the very Presbyterians do themselves.

Papists do not profess to exercise their own judgment in matters of faith, or to believe any thing different from what their Church believes; and as this Church is infallible either in her body, or arms, or head, it is not certain which; as she believes now what she always did, and ever will believe, I am not obliged to take the report of her faith from any modern Papist, who may feel himself ashamed of some of the frailties of his old mother, and wish to conceal or deny them. I go to their authentic records. I appeal to their own historians, their own divines, whom they hold in great veneration, their own Popes, who are generally by Papists believed infallible. From these sources, and from the allowed practices of the Church, any man is capable of acquiring as "accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine as the very Catholics themselves." Nay, I could bring young females from the nursery, not "unlettered" ones, indeed, who really have more accurate knowledge of this subject, than perhaps nine-tenths of the Papists in Glasgow. I do not say they know more than A. V.; for I believe he knows more than he chooses to make known.

Let the Papists in Scotland, in the present day, come honestly forward, and tell us what is their own belief, without respect to any other authority. Let them confess that the Church of Rome had become very corrupt both in doctrine and practice, as is perfectly evident from all authentic history; but that they are not answerable for such corruption; that they renounce all that is really corrupt in the system, and are determined to think and act for themselves according to what they find in the Bible;—let them do this, and then we will not judge of them by what we find clearly established against the Church of Rome, but according to their own professions, and their own practice. Then we will not call them Papists, or even Roman Catholics; but give them any name which they may choose for themselves as dissenters from the Church of Rome. If, however, they will cling to Rome as their dear and only mother; if they will maintain that this is the only true Church; that she never was, and never can be wrong:—then we are entitled to draw the veil from the bloated face of the mother of harlots, to

show her to the world as she is; and those who maintain that she is innocent, and holy, and infallible, have no right to complain, if we accuse them of consenting to all her abominations.

Every word of this applies to A. V., and PAX, and their fellow Papists. They find themselves in a situation in which it is impossible to maintain and practise Popery in all the grossness of it. The atmosphere in which they move is too bright for their works of darkness. They cannot prescribe to their penitents a certain number of stripes on the bare back as an atonement for their sins. They cannot set their fine ladies, or even their poor old women, to walk nine times a day round the Chapel in Clyde Street, over the hard stones upon their bare knees, in order to procure the release of some soul from purgatory. They cannot send their secret agents in the dead hour of night to snatch away from his family some person whom they suspect of heresy, to be cast into a dungeon, never to be heard of more;—though some lines quoted by A. V. in his letter of the 25th June, about the knife driving, the blood flowing, the pincers tearing, and the flesh quivering, make me more than suspect that he was thinking of the Inquisition, and wishing that he had me in it. I say they cannot do these things in Scotland. They are obliged therefore to assume the appearance of humanity, and moderation, and common sense; but while they maintain that they are of the Church of Rome, and that this Church is the same that ever it was, we do them no injustice when we say that they would be what Papists formerly were, if they had the power.

Some people have an idea that the Popery of the present age is not so bad as the Popery of a former age; and this is reckoned a charitable and liberal view of the matter; but Papists themselves do not receive this as a concession in their favour, or thank those who make it. They will not admit that their religion has changed in any point whatever. They would gladly have us believe that it was always as harmless as it now appears in Glasgow; and for this purpose they deny that ever it was what all history represents it to have been. They deny facts as clearly established, even by their own historians, as any fact of history can be; and with the most unblushing effrontery affect to wonder that we will not take their word in opposition to all other evidence. Besides the history of past ages, we know from the present state of Popery in those countries where it reigns in all its glory, that the human mind is enslaved as much by it as ever. The Pope is still looked up to as their God upon earth. His authority is supreme in matters of religion and morality. As if the law of God were not sufficiently strict; as if men were not wicked enough by the violation of its precepts, he can actually create sins and then forgive them; he makes that sinful which was not so, and then he can grant pardon for money. He can grant indulgence, for instance, to marry within the forbidden degrees; and it is difficult to say what he cannot do. He has prohibited the formation of societies for circulating the Bible. He has restored the Inquisition, and the order of Jesuits; and has, in short, done every thing in his power to bring Europe again under subjection to his dark dominion. I ask AMICUS VERITATIS, if his religion be not the very same that prevails in Spain, Portugal, and Italy? If any person in any of these countries were to write or speak as freely against Popery as he does against Luther and the Reformation, would it not be at the risk of his life? His is the same religion that opposes heresy by force: he must approve of this, because such is the will of the holy church which cannot err, and though he cannot oppose error here by torture and the Inquisition, it is not unfair to presume that he would do so if he could. His system at least leads to this: and if his own humanity would not suffer him to do such a thing, it must be because he is not so bad as his religion.

A. V. says further, that "objections which have been a thousand times refuted, are confidently brought forward," &c. I challenge him to show that any one of the objections which I have brought forward has ever been once refuted. It certainly "is in vain that Catholics disclaim the odious tenets which have been imputed to them; in vain that they appeal to their professions of faith, and the canons of their councils." All this certainly is in vain, while they avowedly adhere to a system, the iniquity of which is known to all the world.

I hope PAX is come home by this time, as I intend a little more plain dealing with him; after which I shall attend to A. V. who, in two letters, has laid himself open to such an exposure as he will not like. I am glad, however, that he is writing; because it leads him to divulge what his own sentiments are on the subjects of religion. He has plainly avowed some of the grossest errors of Popery: and it makes the work much easier to me, when I get this directly from himself, than to be obliged to seek for it in the Bulls of Popes, and the Canons of Councils. I am, &c. A PROTESTANT.

JULY 2D, 1818.

TO

THE READERS OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

As the controversy between me and the advocates of Popery is likely to take a more extensive range than was at first contemplated: and as it is not likely that the Editor of a public Newspaper will be able to afford room for all that will be written on the subject, consistently with due attention to other matter, I have

resolved to give my sentiments to the public in another form. While I express my thanks to the Editor, for his ready admission of free discussion on this, as on every other subject, which would not likely have been done by any other in the city, I have often had occasion to regret that he could not print fast enough, and that my Letters sometimes lay in his hands a whole week before they were given to the public.

I had a Letter prepared for the Chronicle of this day, containing a variety of matter on the subject of indulgences, with extracts and animadversions on the Douay Catechism, which some unknown friend was so kind as to send me through the Chronicle Office: but as the Editor must delay printing it, and as, from the pressure of other matter, I can never be certain when I shall come before the public in a newspaper, which must be open to all the world as well as to me, I have resolved to publish what I have to say farther upon the subject, in the form of weekly numbers, under the title of "THE PROTESTANT."

I have also to express my thanks to some unknown Correspondents, who have written me very friendly and complimentary Letters. One of them, who subscribes himself *Pillsem*, offers to substantiate a fact, with regard to indulgences granted in Scotland in the present day; but, before I can make public use of his communication, it is necessary that he favour me with his name and address, with liberty to refer to him in case the fact be contradicted.

The first Number of THE PROTESTANT, containing the Letter intended for the Glasgow Chronicle of this day, will be published on Saturday first, and may be had of all the Booksellers. The price will not be more than to cover the expense; and it is particularly recommended to the attention of Papists.

A PROTESTANT.

JULY 14TH, 1818.

Advertisement which appeared in the Glasgow Chronicle.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

IF answers have not appeared to all the Letters published in the GLASGOW CHRONICLE, under the signature of "A PROTESTANT," it is not because AMICUS VERITATIS was silenced by the absurd reasoning and the calumnious imputations against the most numerous and most respectable body of Christians in the world; (absurd, indeed, when Pope Clement VIII. was represented to have granted a dispensation to Henry VIII. six years before he was born, and sixty-one years before he was Pope,) but because the Letters of A. V. have been refused insertion in the GLASGOW CHRONICLE, under pretence that the other party had withdrawn. AMICUS VERITATIS, therefore, leaves the public to judge how far it was consistent with impartiality to give insertion to aspersions against Catholics, and to refuse insertion to the refutation of those aspersions.

GLASGOW, 16TH JULY, 1818.

THE

PROTESTANT.

No. I.

SATURDAY, JULY 18TH, 1818.

MY controversy with the Papists originated in a paragraph, supposed to be written by one of them, in the Glasgow Chronicle, relating to an Oratorio, which had been performed in their Chapel, for the benefit of the Catholic Schools. A few remarks made on that paragraph brought forth a reply from AMICUS VERITATIS; and another Letter from me produced a second from a person, under the same signature, and one by another Papist, under the signature of PAX. The controversy was continued in the Glasgow Chronicle, till it began to assume a shape, and take an extent of range, such as to render it impossible that the Editor of a public journal could give place to the discussion with any degree of regularity. I have, therefore, determined to publish a Paper every Saturday, under the above title; and if I am favoured by the countenance of the public, I may continue to do so for some considerable time.

I intend to follow my opponents through all their windings—to refute what they assert, and confirm what they deny; for their letters hitherto consist of little more than bare assertion, and bare denial, with a good deal of abuse, in which it has been my study not to imitate them; for though I have written, and may still write, with great severity, against the system of Popery, and the wickedness of its abettors in general, I have abstained from attacking individuals by name, whether ancient or modern, while they (at least one of them) have poured a torrent of abuse against the persons of men, to whom the world is indebted for all that it enjoys this day of civil and religious liberty.

The present Paper is published in the form in which it was intended for the Glasgow Chronicle of last Tuesday.

SIR,—I NOW sit down to answer the Letter of your Correspondent, PAX, which appeared in your Paper of June 18th. He has a quotation from Addison, which I do not profess to understand, in its connection with other matter. He talks of my fallacious assertions—my prejudices—venom of prejudice—my spirit of persecution—my absurd sophistry—the unholy edifice which I have reared with my own hands, at the expense of my neighbours' nicest feelings—of my own integrity as a writer, and my charity as a Christian. I do not profess to answer this. I never studied at Billingsgate college; and have little skill in the art of calling names. I am quite deaf to the cry of bigotry which is reiterated in every Letter of my opponents. The continued outcry by Papists against bigotry, reminds me of the thief who was the first and the loudest to cry "Catch thief!" that he might remove suspicion from himself, and escape in the crowd.

He accuses me of arguing upon mere suspicion, without the support of a single fact; and being silent upon those truths which are opposed to my fallacious assertions. PAX was here cutting before the point. The Letter which he was answering, was professedly an introduction to a series of Letters, in which I promised to go over, and answer, all the objectionable matter contained in his Letter, and that of his friend, A. V. It was rather too much to expect that the introduction should contain all that the work was meant to contain:

yet such seems to have been the expectation of Mr PAX. I hope he will read over all the Letters which I have since written on the subject, and if he does not confess, I think he ought to confess, that I have given of facts *quantum sufficit.*

He seems to enjoy his triumph very heartily; and far should I be from depriving him of any enjoyment which he may have in this controversy. It seems "every impartial observer must have been struck with the very feeble resistance" which I had made in my former Letter. He defied me to produce the Kilravack Bull, with the meaning I had ascribed to it. This would have been very fair, if I had said the Bull was in my possession, or in the possession of any person to whom I had immediate access. All that I asserted was, that a Rev. Gentleman had assured me he had seen it, and that such were its contents. This gentleman is willing to meet with PAX any day, and maintain his assertion, and to bring other witnesses to vouch for the fact. In short, the document has been seen by hundreds; and PAX may see it himself, if he shall please to make a pilgrimage to Kilravack. I venture to assure him, he will find it as good for his soul as a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Loretta, and far less expensive.

He makes some insinuations here, which ought not to be passed over slightly. He speaks as if he took me for a Jesuit, who could shuffle, and quibble, and say the thing which is not; in short, he means it to be understood that I had asserted what I could not make good concerning this Bull; and that I had recourse to the mean subterfuge of slurring over the matter with an apology on account of the absence of my witness. I think PAX would not, on such slight grounds, have made this uncandid insinuation, if he had not been habituated to the quibbling, shuffling arts to which Papists always have recourse, in the defence of their system. It is not easy for an honest man to suspect his neighbour of dishonesty; but a rogue suspects all who are about him. If PAX be an honest man, he will confess that he has wronged his neighbour, and I shall not insist on his doing penance: at least, he shall not, if I can help it, be obliged to walk round his chapel on his bare knees, as some of his brethren and sisters in Ireland do, till the blood flow from the flesh stuck full of small stones.

He also defied me to prove, that by an indulgence is meant the remission of sin. Without quibbling about the Popish meaning of the word indulgence, I have proved from a variety of documents, to which I refer him, that the Pope and his Bishops claimed and exercised the power of granting the remission of sins to those who paid them for it. I have proved that an indulgence, or permission to commit the grossest sins, might have been procured for half-a-guinea. I have proved, in the words of a celebrated Divine of the Romish Church (see your Paper of June 23d,) that of the greatest crimes, there were some that persons might have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they had been committed, might be bought. This fact, and the existence of the book which contained the price of pardon for certain sins, are asserted by Claude D'Espence; and A. V. slurs this over without any remark, while he is calling all my other documents forgeries. If PAX be able to look a heretic in the face, I invite him to call on me, and I will show him such a list of pardons proclaimed, and of course granted, to all who would purchase them, as perhaps he never saw in his life. For instance, "Pope Sextus hath given and granted to every brother and sister that shall visit the said altar (that is, the great altar of St. Hilary) upon the 2d day of June, and the 16th day of July, every year, for every of the said days, a plenary remission of all their sins."—"Pope Innocent hath granted to the said brothers and sisters, upon Easter-day, and eight days following, four thousand years of quarantains, and remission of the third part of all their sins. *Item,* He hath granted to Twelfth-day, and the octaves thereof, five thousand years: to the day of the nativity of our Lady, and the octaves of it, thirty thousand years of true pardon."—"Pope Sextus IV. hath granted to the said brothers and sisters that shall visit the said altar in the church of St. Hilary, on which the blessed sacrament of the altar standeth, upon any of the festivals of our Lady, from the first vespers to the second, plenary pardon of all their sins. *Imprimis,* The first day of Lent, three thousand years of true pardon, and plenary remission of his sins, over and above. Thursday, ten thousand years. Friday, ten thousand years. The first Sunday in Lent, eighteen thousand years of pardon, and remission of all his sins to boot. Monday, ten thousand years, and a plenary indulgence. Tuesday, twenty-eight thousand years, and as many quarantains (or periods of forty days,) and the remission of the third part of their sins, and the delivery of one soul out of purgatory," &c. &c. &c. See *Eccles. Hist. France,* 4to. p. 222—224. There are several quarto pages of such matter: the above is extracted merely as a sample.

Who would not imagine from this, that the Pope possessed an infinite fulness of grace and mercy? This, indeed, is what he wished to be understood. He placed himself in the seat of God, showing himself as God—able to open and shut the gates of heaven at his pleasure. But when any poor sinner came to claim the benefit of that grace which the Pope possessed in such abundance, he found there was no grace for him, unless he could pay for it, which made it in fact no grace at all.—Christ invites the chief of sinners to come to him, and receive all

the blessings of salvation, without money and without price; but the Pope in this, as in every other part of his system, is Antichrist, that is, opposed to Christ,—there is no pardon, no blessing of any kind, to be obtained from him, except in some rare instances, without money. Such is the cruelty of the system—such is the hard-heartedness of the whole priesthood, that, though they profess to have the power of releasing souls from the pains of purgatory, they will not do it without payment. Not to speak of Christian principle, no man of ordinary humanity would suffer his neighbour to remain one hour under the pain of the tooth-ache, if he could afford relief; but thousands of souls may lie wallowing in the fiery lake for thousands of years; and though the priests have the power, not one will move a finger to release them, till he be paid for it. There is no need of colouring here; the monstrous deformity of the system appears on its very front.

The only apology that can be made for the priests is, that they do not themselves believe in purgatory. If this apology be sustained, then they are guilty of robbing the poor people who confide in them, by means of lies and imposition. If they do believe in purgatory, and that the souls in it suffer greater misery than any creature can suffer in this world; and if, believing this, they will not grant the relief which they can grant, till some poor relative has parted with his last shilling as a price for it, then the priests stand convicted of a cruelty of disposition, which will scarcely find a parallel among the most barbarous savages.

In the above quotations, there are so many thousand years of true pardon granted to those who shall visit the altar; but it is well known, that the visiting of the altar was nothing but for the gift that was left at the altar. The expression *true* pardon, too, which is often repeated, seems to intimate that there was such a thing as *false* pardon, or pardon falsely granted, which is perhaps the only true thing which the poor people were taught to believe.

PAX, in a parenthesis, gives us a piece of very important information:—"A person in sin cannot derive the benefit of an indulgence." It is well known that indulgences have been given to thousands. Is it then to be understood, that all the persons to whom they were granted, were in a state of sinless purity? Certainly; otherwise, according to PAX'S own showing, the indulgence was of no use; and those who bought such favours were swindled out of their money. From this plain avowal of the Popish doctrine, we are led to the conclusion, that every person to whom an indulgence is granted, is, in the esteem of the church, a sinless person. He was brought into this state by means of the sacrament of penance, and the absolution of the priest: he is taught to believe that the priest really can grant such absolution; and that there is a virtue in the sacrament of penance fully adequate to cancel all his guilt. Now, suppose it possible that persons so absolved and purified are still sinners, notwithstanding the mysterious process which they have undergone—a supposition by no means irrelevant; and supposing they should die in this state, they are undone for ever: and the church has swindled them not only out of their money, but out of their everlasting happiness. It was foretold of this church, that her traffic would be in "the souls of men;" and who can tell how many millions of souls she has sold to perdition!

To direct a sinner to any thing but the merits of Christ for the pardon of sin, is to deceive him; and if he be so simple as to believe what he is told, he is utterly undone. The Church of Rome stands convicted of thus deceiving and ruining those that confide in her. Some unknown friend has sent me, through the Chronicle Office, a Douay Catechism, from which I abstract the following, on the subject of penance. "Q. What is penance? A. A sacrament, by which the sins we fall into, after baptism, are forgiven us. Q. When did Christ ordain this sacrament? A. After his rising from the dead, when he breathed on his disciples, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained, John xx. 23. Q. What is the matter of this sacrament? A. The sins of the penitent, accompanied by contrition and satisfaction. Q. What is the form of it? A. I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Q. What are the effects of it? A. It reconciles us to God, and either restores or increases grace. Q. How many parts has it, as it concerns the penitent? A. Three; contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Q. What is contrition? A. A hearty sorrow for, and detestation of, our sins, by which we have offended so good a God; with a firm purpose of amendment. Q. What is confession? A. A full and sincere declaring of all our sins to our ghostly father. Q. What is satisfaction? A. A faithful performance of the prayers or good works enjoined us by the priest, to whom we confess. Q. What is required to a good confession? A. 1. That we seriously examine our consciences; 2. Be heartily sorry for all our sins, with a firm purpose to amend, taking care and time to make an act of contrition; and, 3. Confess them faithfully to the priest. Q. What is a firm purpose of amendment? A. It is a resolution, by the grace of God, not only to avoid sin, but also the occasion of it. Q. What if a man knowingly leave out one mortal sin? A. He commits a great sacrilege, by lying to the Holy Ghost, and makes his whole confession nothing worth. Q. What is an indulgence? A. Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the church; but only a

releasing of temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us, by the sacrament of penance."

Such are the principles of the Douay Catechism, on the subject of penance and indulgence. Your readers will see they are not very different from those of the French Catechism, which I quoted in a former Letter; except that, instead of giving indulgence the honour of a section by itself, they attach it to the end of the section on penance. The Catechism before me, indeed, is only an abstract, and does not go so much into detail as the French one; but the ground-work and leading principles, so far as I have compared them, are substantially the same.

Let any intelligent person consider the extract which I have made from the acknowledged standard of the Church of Rome, as it exists in Britain, and say, if it be not a mass of error and corruption throughout. Here the priest is every thing, and Christ is little or nothing. In fact Christ is nothing at all in the Popish system, after he had delegated his authority to the priests. Most absurdly they apply to themselves what Christ said to his inspired apostles; and then they take the whole work of Christ into their own hands, as if he had left the entire charge of his church to them. The priest administers the sacrament of penance; this takes away all the sins committed after baptism (the sins befcre baptism were taken away by that rite:) the priest absolves from all sin; this sacrament reconciles the sinner to God: there is no occasion to confess sin to God; it is enough that the sinner confess to his ghostly father: there is no need of the atonement of Christ; a faithful performance of the prayers and good works enjoined by the priest is sufficient satisfaction: and if the sinner, in confessing to the priest, should knowingly omit one mortal sin, it is the same as lying to the Holy Ghost, so that the authority of the Holy Ghost and of the priest are the same. In short, the principle of the system is, that poor perishing sinners must commit themselves implicitly to the care of their ghostly fathers; and, instead of trusting in God, in whom alone salvation is to be found, incur the curse of trusting in man, in whom there is no help.

I should not much object to the definition of the word contrition, as above quoted from the Catechism, if it stood connected with the animating principle which alone can produce genuine repentance or contrition. It has, however, no such connection, though it seems to relate to an act of the sinner's own, which he must take "care and time to make;" that is, an "*act of contrition*," which stands in the front of the Catechism, as follows:—"O Sovereign Lord, because I love thee above all things, I am heartily sorry that ever I offended thee; I hate and detest all my sins, because they are displeasing to thee, my good God; and I firmly purpose and resolve, through thy grace, never more to offend thee. Amen." Such is the act which all Papists are taught by their Church to make; and with regard to most of them, I am afraid, it commences by telling their Maker a lie to his face. How few are there who can truly say they love the Lord above all things!

It is not my intention to reply to A. V.'s late Letters, till I have done with some previous matter; but I cannot deny myself the pleasure of informing him, that, in his Letter in your Paper of the 11th instant, he has given his system a wound, which he will not soon be able to cure. Speaking of the book which contained the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, which was put in the list of prohibited books by the Council of Trent, he says, "No book is prohibited, but such as contains doctrine contrary to the tenets of the Catholic faith." Now it is a fact, that the same Council of Trent put the Bible, as well as the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, in the list of prohibited books. The Bible, therefore, by A. V.'s own acknowledgment, contains doctrine contrary to the Catholic faith, and is of course condemned by the authority of the Church. But perhaps he will call the Bible forgery, like almost every thing else that contains a word against his infallible Church.

In a future Letter, I shall quote the authority of the Council of Trent at length on this subject. In the meantime, your readers may rest assured of the fact, that the Bible is under the fourth rule concerning prohibited books, and not to be read in the vulgar tongue, without special permission of a priest, granted in writing, under the heaviest penalty known to a Papist—that of not receiving the pardon of his sins; and the rule proceeds upon this very certain ground, that if the Holy Bible be permitted to be read every where without difference, in the vulgar tongue, it does more harm than good, through the rashness of men.—I am &c.

A PROTESTANT.

JULY 13TH, 1818.

No. II.

SATURDAY, JULY 25TH, 1818.

AT the conclusion of my last, I convicted AMICUS VERITATIS of admitting that the Bible contained "doctrines contrary to the tenets of the Catholic faith." I believe I might very honourably terminate the controversy here; for persons who make the above admission, and still adhere to the Church of Rome, are not to be reasoned with as Christians. For the sake of society, however, if not for their own sakes, it is necessary to continue the controversy, in

order to expose the impositions which such men practise upon the public; that, if they cannot be put to silence by fair argument, the world may be convinced that their testimony is not to be believed.

I shall deviate a little farther from my plan, in order to remove as soon as possible the impression that may have been made on the mind of some readers, by A. V.'s assertions with regard to the character and doctrine of Luther. That I may do A. V. no injustice, I shall begin by quoting the whole passage. He asserted that a certain passage in Luther's works "contains a perpetual indulgence to commit adultery in certain circumstances." He now repeats, "that Luther did preach the doctrine in question is certain. He tells us, that whilst he continued a Catholic monk, he observed chastity, obedience, and poverty, and that being free from worldly cares, he gave himself up to fasting, watching, and prayer; whereas, after he became a Reformer, he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence; to satisfy which, he broke through his solemn vow of continency, in direct opposition to his former doctrine, by marrying a religious woman who was under the same obligation. He then proceeded to teach the shameful lessons we have seen above, and others still more licentious, such as the permission, in certain cases, of concubinage and polygamy. *Milner's Letters*, pp. 158, 159. The *ipsissima verba* of Luther's acknowledged publication are,—'Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei iuris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut fœmina non sis, sic nec in te est, ut absque viro degas.—Tertia ratio divortii est ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit. Hic opportunum est, ut maritus dicat: Si tu nolueris, altera volit: Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla.' *Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt.* Tom. V. fol. 119, 123. The Works of Luther are preserved in the Library of the University of Glasgow, where your Correspondent may examine if my quotations are correct, and I expect he will be as good as his word."

My word was, that if I found, upon examining Luther's own words, he really held and taught the doctrines imputed to him by A. V., I should publish the fact, and confess that Luther held more errors than I was aware of. Certainly I should do so, if I found the fact to be as A. V. states it; for I have no interest in defending the errors of Luther or of any other man; but the fact is, Luther taught no such errors; and A. V.'s pretended extract from his Works is a piece of as barefaced imposition as ever was palmed upon the public.

I have to thank the Librarian of the University here, who, at the expense of some inconvenience to himself, the Library being shut at this season, gave me an opportunity of inspecting Luther's Works, which consist of seven immense folio volumes. The words are correctly given by A. V. as far as the word *ancella*, which ought to be *ancilla;* this, however, is of little consequence, as it may be a mistake of the Printer. After *ancilla*, Luther has a comma, and then he proceeds to explain the necessary steps to be taken before a man can lawfully put away his wife, and take another. I shall give the whole sentence as it stands in Luther, that the reader may see how much he has been abused by modern Papists. "Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla, ita tamen ut antea iterum et tertium uxorem admoneat maritus, et coram aliis ejus etiam pertinaciam detegat, ut publice et ante conspectum Ecclesiæ duritia ejus et agnoscatur et reprehendatur." This is a part of Luther's third reason of divorce. He is maintaining that in certain circumstances it is lawful for a man to put away his wife and take another,—"yet so that before this, the husband admonish his wife, not once only, but a second, and a third time, and also expose her obstinacy before others, that publicly, and in presence of the church, her obstinacy may be known and reprehended." But A. V. stops at the word *ancilla:* for a comma he substitutes a period, and omits all the rest of the sentence, which makes Luther appear to teach, that, without ceremony, a man may take his handmaid instead of his wife. In this way, A. V. will prove the Psalmist to be an atheist. His very words, in the fourteenth Psalm, are, "There is no God."

If not quite hardened, A. V. must blush when he sees his wickedness thus exposed. This is the man who makes such an outcry against the Protestants for forgery, and who maintains, on the authority of Whitaker, that no such practice was to be found among Papists. I wish Whitaker were alive; I should tell him of a Papist who commits forgery; for, to garble a man's words, and make him say what he does not mean to say, is as really forgery as to put a man's name to a document which he never saw. I advise A. V. to beware of such tricks, lest some worse thing befall him than the lash of a Protestant.

Some of my friends accused me of want of charity, when I said, in one of my Letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, "I believe A. V. knows more than he chooses to make known." I feel myself quite justified in making the assertion. He must know very well that the passage in Luther, when fairly quoted, gives not the least countenance to the abominable charge which he unblushingly brought against the Reformer; but he did not choose to make this known. The doctrine of Luther is substantially the same that is taught by the soundest casuists, and which is laid down from the Apostolic writings, in the Westminster Confession, Chap. XXIV. § 6. Luther, indeed, does not speak

with so much delicacy on a delicate subject, as a modern divine would do; but that fault was common to him, with most writers of his time, and for two hundred years afterwards. Our own Queen Mary, one of the idols of Papists, did not always write in such language as would become a young lady in the present day.

The extract given by A. V. with the necessary addition which I have made to it from Luther's works, consists of two unconnected passages, of which I need not give a literal translation, as I confess the expression is somewhat coarse. But I appeal to better scholars than myself, whether the following be not the meaning which a liberal translator would give it, expressing the same ideas in modern language. Luther is speaking of man and woman, and of their being made for one another. Speaking in name of the former, he says, it was not of himself that he was made so; then, as addressing the latter, he says the same of her; and the inference which he draws with regard to both is, that the one ought not to be without the other. Is not this perfectly consistent with the declaration of the Creator concerning Adam, while in a state of innocency,—"It is not good that man should be alone." The third reason of divorce is, when one party withdraws from the other, and will not perform due benevolence, or refuses to dwell with the other: in this case, a husband may tell his wife that he will take another, but not privately, or on his own authority; but repeated admonition must be given to her before the church, as Luther's words are literally translated at the bottom of the second page: that is, she must be divorced before the husband is warranted to put her away,—or, in other words, that a regular process of divorce must be led, before he can marry another. I see nothing in this contrary to the word of God; and I believe it is perfectly consistent with the law, both in England and Scotland.

The Papists were never able to fix the smallest charge of any thing bordering upon unchastity upon Luther, except that he married a wife. It is utterly false that "he describes himself as raging with the most violent concupiscence," &c. Whatever such men as A. V. or Milner may say, regardless of their character, or confident of escaping detection, the advocates of Popery, in former days, were too well informed of the truth, and too conscious that they would be exposed, to hazard any such assertion. All that the bishop of Meaux, when speaking of the strong language which Luther used on the necessity of marriage as a remedy against unchastity, says, is, "I cannot think how he will be able to reconcile this with the life which, according to his own account, he led in the most spotless manner, during all the time of his celibacy, and till he was forty-five years of age." *Hist. de Variations*, lib. 3., num. 49. All the world know that Luther was apt to use strong, and even unguarded language; but nothing but ignorant or malevolent effrontery could induce any one to accuse him of such actions and sentiments as A. V. lays to his charge. So far from making the confession alleged, in a letter to his friend Amsdorff, written at the time of his marriage, he says: "Ego enim nec amo, nec æstuo, sed diligo uxorem;" and he assigns as the principal reason for his marrying, that he might, by his own example, trample upon an iniquitous law, which was the source of so much immorality and flagitiousness. *Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheranismi*, lib. 2., pp. 16, 19. In fact, Luther speaks with great indifference of marriage, so far as regarded himself, but, knowing the monstrous wickedness which the celibacy of the priests occasioned, he strongly recommended marriage to others, and in doing so he was supported by the authority of the word of God.

A. V. expresses his "surprise, that a man who would pretend to discuss the religious opinions of others, should not only be unacquainted with, but ignorant of the opinions of the great father of his own." Luther is not the father of my religion. It would be a sad thing for Protestants, if their religion were derived from a book which is to be seen, perhaps, no where in the kingdom, but within the walls of the Glasgow University. Though I claim no relation to Luther more than to any other Christian, I am happy that I have it in my power to vindicate his character from the aspersions of an anonymous libeller, who abuses the liberty which he enjoys in a free country, for the vilest purposes of defamation. I never thought highly of the morality of Papists; but A. V. has made me think more meanly of it than ever. He abuses other venerable names besides that of Luther: but as his charges against them are not of so gross a nature, nor supported by such *apparent* evidence, I shall not take up their cause at present, but proceed in my reply to PAX, from which I have been diverted, by a desire of making a speedy exposure of A. V.'s falsehood and impudence.

PAX seems very much offended by my continued use of the word Papist; and because I do not use the term Roman Catholic, like some of our senators, who were enlightened enough to see that it was improper to use the word Catholic exclusively to denote the Church of Rome. I confess, I am not so easily satisfied on this point as these worthy senators must have been. I do not call the members of the Church of Rome, Papists, because it is a term of reproach, but because they have not furnished me with another term which does not imply, on my part, the concession of some important principle. I have already given my reasons for not calling them Catholics; and for nearly the same reasons, I cannot call them Roman Catholics. The word Catholic signifies

universal. In the nature of the thing, there cannot be more than one universal Church; that is, the whole body of believers in Christ throughout the world, together with those who have gone to heaven. This is very different from any visible organized church; and certainly it is not the Church of Rome. To use the term of Roman Catholic, is to admit that the Church of Rome is in some sense universal, which it never was; or that it is the only true Church, for there cannot be two universal churches. I say the Church of Rome never was catholic, or universal. It never prevailed over the whole world. It was never universal, even in what is called Christendom; for, not to speak of the Greek Church, which remains to this day a separate communion, it never prevailed universally in the West of Europe. The Culdees in our own country, for instance, maintained a long and a noble struggle against the errors and the encroachments of Rome; and they continued to do so, till the Waldenses had thrown off her galling yoke. The melody of a simple and spiritual worship did not cease to ascend from the glens and mountains of Scotland, till it began to be heard in the valleys of Piedmont; and till the inhabitants of the rocky Alps had learned to sing the praises of their Redeemer.

The true Church of Christ was driven into the wilderness; but it was not in the power of Rome to destroy her altogether. The Culdees were not finally overcome till the twelfth century; and, in that same century, the Waldenses had become a great eye-sore to Rome. "In Scotland," says the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, "the Culdean doctrine had taken deeper root; and, although equally offensive to the votaries of Rome, it kept its ground for several centuries. The Popish writers themselves celebrate the piety, the purity, and the humility, and even the learning, of the Culdees: but while they were displeased with the simplicity, of what they deemed the barbarism, of their worship, they charged them with various deviations from the faith of the Catholic Church. It was not the least of these that they did not observe Easter at the proper time. They did not acknowledge auricular confession; they rejected penance and authoritative absolution; they made no use of chrism* in baptism; confirmation was unknown; they opposed the doctrine of the real presence; they withstood the idolatrous worship of saints and angels, dedicating all their churches to the Holy Trinity; they denied the doctrine of works of supererogation; they were enemies to the celibacy of the clergy, themselves living in the married state. One sweeping charge brought against them is, that they preferred their own opinions to the statutes of the holy fathers. The Scots, having received the Christian faith by the labours of the Culdees, long withstood the errors and usurpations of Rome."

This information respecting our ancestors will, I hope, be interesting to my readers; and it may lead some to conclude, that the effect of the simple mode of worship practised by the Culdees, in all their churches, is visible in Scotland to this day.

Rome having succeeded at last in extinguishing the light in Scotland, it broke out with greater brightness on the Continent. "Of all the sects that arose in this century," says Mosheim, "none was more distinguished by the reputation it acquired, by the multitude of its votaries, and the testimony which its bitterest enemies bore to the probity and innocence of its members, than that of the Waldenses, so called from their parent and founder, Peter Waldus." "They complained that the Roman Church had degenerated, under Constantine the Great, from its primitive purity and sanctity. They denied the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. They maintained that the power of delivering sinners from the guilt and punishment of their offences, belonged to God alone: and that *indulgences*, of consequence, were the criminal inventions of sordid avarice. They looked upon the prayers, and other ceremonies that were instituted in behalf of the dead, as vain, useless, and absurd; and denied the existence of departed souls in an intermediate state of purification, affirming that they were immediately, upon their separation from the body, received into heaven, or thrust down to hell."

In short, the same doctrines which were taught by Luther and the other Reformers were maintained by greater or smaller numbers of Christians, in different parts of the world, even in the darkest ages. The translator of Mosheim says very properly "When the Papists ask us, Where our religion was before Luther? we generally answer, In the Bible; and we answer well. But to gratify their taste for tradition and human authority, we may add to this answer,—and in the valleys of Piedmont;"†

* A mixture of oil and balsam, consecrated by a Popish bishop, to be used in baptism, confirmation, &c.

† Perhaps no body of Christians, since the days of the Roman emperors, suffered more severe persecution than the Waldenses did, at the instigation of the Roman Pontiff. As a specimen of the Popish method of converting heretics, I shall give a few extracts from a bull of Pope INNOCENT VIII. in which he requires the Archdeacon of Cremona to extirpate that simple and harmless people. This was thirty years before the Reformation. "We have heard," says the Pope, "and it has come to our knowledge, not without much displeasure, that certain sons of iniquity, followers of that abominable and pernicious sect of malignant men, called the poor of Lyons, or Waldenses, who have long endeavoured, in Piedmont and other places, to ensnare the sheep belonging to God, to the perdition of their souls, having damnably risen up, under a feigned pretence of holiness—being given up to a reprobate sense, and made to err greatly from the way of truth—committing things contrary to the orthodox faith, offensive to the eyes of the divine Majesty, and which occasion a great hazard

to which I may add,—and on the mountains of Scotland.

The Church of Rome, therefore, never was universal, or catholic; and I cannot consistently call her members Roman Catholics; but I have no objection to call them Romists, if that shall please them better than Papists. Under one or other of these terms they must be content to be called after their head, like other sects, and with more propriety than most other sects, for they own the Pope to be the head of their Church, whereas, few other Christian sects acknowledge any head upon earth.

I see, in the Glasgow Chronicle of Saturday last, an advertisement by A. V. in which I am apprized of a small mistake with regard to the Pope, who offered to indulge Henry VIII. with two wives. It seems I had given the Pope an *I* too much, and had written Clement VIII. instead of Clement VII. This trifling error occasions great triumph to A. V. who makes out from it that all my arguments are absurd indeed. From this I infer, that, in the esteem of A. V. himself, this is the greatest matter he could find against me, as he blazons it forth in the middle of his short advertisement. Now this error is actually nothing at all with regard to my argument. The fact is, that the Pope of the day made the above proposal to the King of England. The thing was done—it matters not what was the number of the name of the beast that did it.

No. III.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 1ST, 1818.

PAX tells us, that "the principles of the Catholic Church do not emanate from a Pope, but from the great Founder of the Christian faith." This is true of the really Catholic, or universal Church, but not true of the Romish Church. Some of the fundamental principles of Christianity, such as the Trinity, and the divinity of Christ, are indeed admitted in the Popish system; but they are so blended with human errors, as to be in a great measure neutralized, and rendered inefficient for the purpose of saving sinners. From the divinity of Christ, we infer the sufficiency and the virtue of his atonement, and his supreme and exclusive authority in matters of faith and Christian practice. But the benefit of this is lost in the Church of Rome, by setting up her own authority and that of her priests, as sufficient in matters of faith; and by directing sinners to satisfy divine justice for themselves. Hear the Douay Catechism, which A. V. says is approved by the whole Church, and put into the hands of all their children for their religious instruction. "Q. Is any great honour due to priests and ghostly (i. e. spiritual) fathers? A. Yes: for they are God's anointed, represent the person of Christ, and are the fathers and feeders of our souls. Q. In what are we bound to believe and obey them? A. In all things belonging to faith and the government of our souls." This is, in language sufficiently plain, setting aside the authority of Christ altogether. Papists are taught implicitly to believe all things belonging to faith, which a priest may tell them—that is, all things believable; and though it may seem strange to persons who think and reason upon principles of common sense, Papists are taught by their priests to believe a great deal more than what is believable.

Now, who are these priests in whom the poor people are commanded to put such confidence? They are merely men like themselves. They were never taken into the council of the Almighty, that they should know more of his will than other men. They were never favoured with a revelation from heaven in their private ear. No heavenly messenger was ever sent to them, to teach them what others could not know. They may, indeed, pretend to converse with angels, and to have communications from heaven; but I defy the whole priesthood to exhibit one evidence of this. Grant, then, for a moment, that all the priests of the Romish Church, in all ages, were as decent and sober as those in Scotland are, in the present day, not one of them, nor all of them together, could be worthy of being obeyed in any one article of faith, or of being implicitly believed in any one matter of religion.

How much more, when the prevailing character of the priests was the opposite of what I have supposed? Is it possible, that, while living in all sorts of wickedness, the Almighty should speak to men by their mouth? The truth which God has revealed for the salvation of sinners has a purifying influence, and its moral

---

of souls." He then declares that he has constituted Albert his Nuncio, commissioner, "to the end that you should induce the followers of the most wicked sect of the Waldenses, and all others polluted with heretical pravity, to abjure their errors. And, calling to your assistance all archbishops and bishops seated in the said duchy (of Savoy) whom the Most High hath called to share with us in our cares, with the inquisitor, the ordinaries of the place, their vicars, &c., you proceed to the execution thereof against the foresaid Waldenses, and all other heretics whatever, to rise up in arms against them, and, by joint communication of processes, *to tread them under foot as venomous adders;* diligently providing that the people committed to their charge do persevere in the profession of the *true faith*—bending all your endeavours, and bestowing all your care, towards *so holy and so necessary an extermination of the same heretics.*" "Thou, therefore, my beloved son, taking upon thee, with a devout mind, the burden of so meritorious a work, show thyself, in the execution thereof, so careful in word and deed, and so diligent and studious, that the much wished-for fruits may, through the grace of God, redound unto thee from thy labours, and that thou mayest not only obtain the crown of glory, which is bestowed as a reward to those that prosecute pious causes, but that thou mayest also ensure the approbation of us, and of the Apostolic See. Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, 27th Ap. 1487, and 3d of our Popedom."—*Jones' Hist. Wald.* 1st ed. pp. 466—468.

effects are invariably seen in those who believe it. It is certain, the greater part of the priests themselves did not believe it, else they would not have lived such profligate lives. Were they then to be implicitly believed in a matter in which they did not believe themselves? If they taught what they did believe, it must have been error and falsehood, and those who trusted in them, must have been deceived and ruined. Upon the supposition, that the priests are not now such grossly wicked men, as they once were, (and it cannot be denied, that the Reformation has had a happy influence even upon the Popish priesthood, especially in Protestant countries;) upon the supposition, that they are even good men, they are liable to err like all others, and ought not to be believed in any matter of faith whatever, unless they can produce divine authority for what they say; and then it is not the priest that is believed, but God himself. Whatever may be the character of the individual trusted in, the Bible declares the misery of the man that trusteth in man.

With regard to the atonement of Christ, on which alone the hopes of a sinner can safely rest for pardon and peace, the Church of Rome makes it of no value, by virtually denying its sufficiency; which they do, by teaching men to add the merits of saints, and their own merits to it. Nothing can be more dishonourable to Christ than this. It is, in fact, reducing him to the rank of a mere creature, who died for sin in vain, if the sinner must yet make atonement, in whole or in part, for himself, or if he must have recourse to the merits of other creatures to help him. Christ said upon the cross, "It is finished;" and how impious and presumptuous is it to attempt to add to his FINISHED work! As well might a worm add to the magnitude and brightness of the sun.

The doctrine of indulgences certainly did not emanate from the great Founder of the Christian faith. A good deal has been said on this subject already. I leave it to the reader to judge whether I have not proved all that I asserted of it; and I have abundance of materials in reserve, to prove the unparalleled wickedness of the Church of Rome, in this single branch of her traffic. But at present I shall not have recourse to any other document, than that to which A. V. refers me. The Douay Catechism, he tells me, is approved by the whole Church. I confess Popery appears in it considerably softened down, and divested of much of its grossness. I have no evidence, however, of this Catechism being approved by the whole Church of Rome; for that Church has not met in general council for nearly three hundred years; and this Catechism does not profess to have been approved by the council of Trent, or any other council. It is not authenticated by any authority whatever; there is no name to vouch for it, but that of the printer; whereas the French Catechism is sanctioned by the authority of the Pope, and the Archbishop of Paris. Unauthenticated as the Douay Catechism is, it may be either admitted or denied by Papists to contain the faith of their Church. AMICUS VERITATIS, however, cannot have this advantage; for I find the Catechism before me contains the very words which he quoted from it in one of his letters, on the doctrine of indulgence. It is therefore sufficiently authentic for every purpose of my controversy with him.

Now, I intend to show that, modified as it is, the doctrine of indulgence is not one that emanates from the great Founder of Christianity; but that it is directly opposed to Christianity. I shall give the precise words of the Catechism. "What is an indulgence?" "Not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the Church, but only a releasing of temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance."

Here it seems the Church of Rome teaches, that sin may be forgiven, and yet the person who committed it be liable to punishment. This is inconsistent with the whole tenor of Scripture. When God pardons the sins of his people, he is said to remember them no more. Not that the knowledge of them can escape out of his mind; but he does not remember them so as to exact the penalty, or punishment of them. He exacted the whole penalty of his own Son, when he stood in the place of the guilty: it was exacted of him, and he answered; he paid the whole debt; he made complete atonement, when he gave himself up to God a sacrifice for sin. He that believes in Christ, is justified from all things, from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses. He is justified from the guilt, and released from the punishment, which his sins deserved. There is a necessary connection between guilt and punishment; when the former is taken away, the latter cannot, with justice, be inflicted.

I know that Popish writers distinguish between the *culpa* and the *pœna*, that is, the *guilt* and the *punishment*, and certainly they are different and distinguishable things: but it is quite contrary to Scripture, to say, that the one can be taken away, and the other remain. It is of no consequence that it is only temporal punishment that is said to be released by an indulgence. I could easily show, from Popish writers, that the church affected to release sinners from both the *culpa* and the *pœna*, not for time only, but for ever. But I am arguing at present from the Douay Catechism, which ascribes to an indulgence the power of releasing from temporal punishment only. But if it be admitted that punishment of any kind is due, then the guilt cannot have been taken away. Punishment, in this world, is as really an expression of divine wrath against sin, as punishment in the next world. But when God pardons a sinner, his wrath is turned away from

him: he accepts the satisfaction made by Christ in his death, as sufficient punishment for all the sins of all his people; but to suppose punishment, either temporal or eternal, still due to a believer, is to set aside the atonement of Christ.

Papists, and perhaps some Protestants, will reply to this, that believers, real Christians, suffer much in this world in consequence of their sins; and that it must be very desirable to have an indulgence, or to be exempted from such sufferings. It is true, believers do often suffer much in consequence of their sins. Though we maintain that they are perfectly justified before God, on account of Christ's righteousness, we do not consider them to be personally without sin, as Papists consider those who have had their sins forgiven by the sacrament of penance. Consistent Protestants know nothing of sinless perfection in this world. They do not pretend to it, and the less they do the better. While in the world, therefore, they must suffer affliction, because sin, the cause of all suffering, adheres to them. But the afflictions of Christians do not partake of the nature of punishment,—they are not penal, but salutary; they are the necessary and merciful discipline of our heavenly Father, who, when he does chasten his people, it is for their profit, that they may be partakers of his holiness. If they have the Spirit of Christ, who dwells in all Christians, they would not wish exemption from this, much less would they purchase exemption in the form of an indulgence. They are taught to believe, that though no affliction for the present be joyous but grievous, yet afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness in them that are exercised thereby.

But Papists profess to grant exemption from the temporal punishment due on account of sins which have been forgiven. If such punishment be due, then the atonement of Christ is set aside as unavailing. If it be granted that the work of Christ is sufficient, and fully available, for the justification of the ungodly; but that the Church grants indulgence, or exemption from the afflictions with which God is pleased to visit his people, for the purpose of their sanctification, then the Church sets herself up to counteract and oppose the work of Christ in his people, by professing to exempt them from what He declares to be good for them, and which they must not be without. Take either part of the dilemma, and there is no avoiding both, and the Church of Rome is proved to oppose herself, both to the authority of Christ, and the grace of the Holy Spirit.

Thus, then, it is not true, that the principles of the Romish Church emanate from the great Founder of Christianity, as PAX asserts. They emanate from human ignorance and error; and even when Papists profess to hold, in words, some of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, they make them void by their own traditions. To add any thing to the authority, or to the atonement of Christ, is as bad as to renounce both. On this ground the Church of Rome stands convicted of being the Antichrist spoken of by the apostle Paul, as the "man of sin and son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

It is, indeed, of little use to argue with Papists from the Bible. This is an authority to which they pay little regard, unless it happen to be backed by the authority of their priests; and some of the priests themselves know little of what it contains. I could direct the reader to an individual of this holy order, —one who "is to be believed and obeyed in all things belonging to faith and the government of our souls,"—not one in some dark country like Spain, but one in our own enlightened country, who, when he was referred to the prophecy of Jeremiah in support of an argument, and the Bible put into his hand, that he might read the passage, really did not know where to find the book of Jeremiah! If the blind lead the blind, we know what shall be the consequence; and there is no blindness so fatal as that of having the eyes shut against the light of God's word. Papists shut their eyes against this light upon principle; and prefer the darkness which emanates from their priests and ghostly fathers. One of the orators in the Council of Trent maintained, that "the Scriptures had become useless, since the schoolmen had established the truth of all doctrines; and that they ought not to be made a study, because the Lutherans only gained those that read them." This was not the opinion of a mere individual, but of the Council, with the Pope at its head, whose decrees were professedly given under the authority of the Holy Ghost, as is evident by their canon upon the subject. I did not say, that the principles of Popery emanated from the Pope; the Pope himself emanated from the spirit of error and ambition, which began to work in the churches at a very early period, and which has continued to this day.

"If a Pope," says PAX, "were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed." I believe a Pope is seldom guilty of preaching any thing; and it may be true, in one sense, that he does not teach any thing contrary to the Testament; that is, contrary to what the New Testament says he would teach. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared as with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to

abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth." "That wicked one, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."

My opponents do not profess to know much about the Bible, or what PAX calls the Testament. They seem better acquainted with profane poetry, and the ridiculous bombast of Counsellor Phillips; but I shall suppose them sitting down to make a commentary on the above extract from the New Testament. They would likely find, in the *first* place, that the latter times meant the period of the Reformation; and, *secondly*, That those who gave heed to seducing spirits were Luther and his colleagues. But how could they find Luther forbidding to marry, when one of the greatest crimes of which they accuse him is, that he did marry? How could they find the Reformers commanding to abstain from meats, when they accuse them (at least Luther) of ceasing to give himself up to *fasting*, watching, and prayer?

The truth is, and it is vain to deny it, the above extract from the New Testament, dictated by the Spirit of prophecy, points out with historical accuracy, the character and practice of the Church of Rome. She departed from the faith when she let go the sole and exclusive authority of Christ in matters of faith, and took for her rule the traditions and authority of men. She gave heed to seducing spirits, when she received for infallible truth the absurd reveries of wild and senseless children, under the name of Fathers and Saints. She gave heed to doctrines of devils, that is, concerning demons or departed spirits, when she taught the worship of saints, as the heathens worshipped their departed heroes. She forbade her priests to marry, but gave them permission to live in all manner of lewdness. In this article alone the wickedness of the Church of Rome appears great beyond expression. She makes that unlawful which God has declared to be lawful and honourable; and she gives permission to her priests, who ought to be examples to the people, of sobriety and purity, to live in open violation of one of the precepts of the decalogue. The same remark applies to her commanding to abstain from meats. God has provided suitable food for all his creatures, and he gives men permission to eat of whatever is fit to be eaten; but Papists, affecting to be more holy than is required of them, and pretending to imitate Christ's fast of forty days, abstain from eating flesh in Lent. They imitate Christ in nothing that is imitable; and they profess to imitate him in that which is inimitable.

Speaking lies in hypocrisy, with signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, are prominent features of that system which practised all the arts of jugglery to deceive the people, and keep them in subjection to their ghostly fathers. I shall conclude this paper with a specimen of their lying wonders; and let the reader judge if it be possible that a system, supported by means of such absurdity and impiety, can be any thing but the very opposite of Christianity.

"The Sovereign Queen of Heaven," says one of their books of devotion, "not only cherishes affectionately her servants; ennobles them with singular prerogatives; succours them in their necessities, and espouses their causes; but she also saves them by her prayers from deserved punishment, and introduces them into the kingdom of heaven. Of all these prerogatives, this last appears to be the most singular and worthy of admiration; for it is a thing very strange that, according to the common opinion of doctors, none of those who live and die her servants can, by any means whatever, be damned. Yea, even many of them who are wicked and abandoned, as daily experience shows, have miraculously obtained mercy and eternal life."

I can easily believe, that many of the devoted servants of the Virgin Mary might be found, by daily experience, to be wicked and abandoned; but it does not appear so clearly, how daily experience could show, that many of these had, by her means, obtained mercy and eternal life. It is not likely that such cases as the following occurred every day:—

"St. Anselm records, that a famous robber entered one morning into the cottage of a poor widow with an intention of robbing her: but, judging her unworthy of his rapine, he began to accost her in a familiar and merry strain:—And have you breakfasted yet, my good woman? I breakfast, Sir! said she; God forbid that I should so violate the vow I have made to fast every Saturday of the year. Every Saturday! and why that? replied he. Because, answered the widow, I have heard from a preacher, very famous in doctrine, and still more so from the sanctity of his life, that whoever fasts on Saturday, in honour of our Lady, cannot die without confession. The robber, at these words, felt compunction, fell down on his knees, and promised and swore to the Queen of Angels to fast every Saturday too; which promise he kept inviolably ever after. But, as he still continued his robberies, he was one day surprised by some travellers, who, by a stroke of a sword, separated his head from his body. His executioners, thinking they had done his business sufficiently, withdrew from him a few steps: when lo! the head of him that was killed fell a crying, Confession, masters, I beg that at least I may have confession. After they had a little recovered from the astonishment and panic, which such a prodigy caused, they ran to the next village to advertise the curate, who immediately came, accompanied by a great

number of his parishioners, desirous of beholding the miracle; and, having joined the head of the robber to his body, gave him confession as he desired. That being done, the penitent having thanked him for his good office, said to him, with a voice so distinct and high as to be easily heard by all present, Masters, I never did any good thing in all my lifetime, except my having fasted every Saturday, in honour of the Mother of God. In the very instant I received the deadly blow, a frightful troop of devils surrounded me, for to seize my soul: but the Blessed Virgin coming to my aid, she drove these forthwith far from me by her divine presence, and would not suffer my soul to leave my body till I should be sufficiently contrite, and make confession of my sins. He spoke thus, and having entreated the attendants to pray for him, he passed from this life into one more happy and glorious."—*See Free Thoughts, &c., with the authorities cited.* Such, it seems, is the religion of those who make an outcry against the doctrine of salvation by faith, without good works; that they can save the greatest criminals without either faith or works, if they will only fast on Saturday in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

No. IV.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 8TH, 1818.

"IF," says PAX, "a Pope were to preach tenets contrary to those contained in the Testament, he would be deposed, and a successor appointed, and the followers of the Ex-Pope would then, and only then, be called Papists." In my last number I have shown that the Church of Rome taught many things contrary to what is contained in the New Testament; and supposing the Pope to preach any thing at all, we may suppose he will preach the doctrines of his Church. For instance, the New Testament affirms, that marriage is honourable in *all;* but no, says the Pope, it is not honourable in all,—it is not even lawful in the clergy. We are taught in the New Testament that none can forgive sins but God, agreeably to his own declaration in the Old Testament:—"I, even I, am he that pardoneth thine iniquities for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins any more:" but the Pope teaches that this is not true; he says he can forgive sins himself, and that all his priests can do the same. Why then is he not deposed? If what PAX says were true, there never would have been a Pope; for there never was one who did not teach doctrines contrary to the New Testament. Nay, his very existence as a ruler over the Church is in direct opposition to the New Testament. While he pretends to be the successor of Peter, and to sit in the chair of Peter, his whole administration is opposed to the injunctions of that apostle, who, in the name of his divine Master, charges all the ministers of Christ not to assume authority over their brethren. "Feed the flock of God," says he, "that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being *lords over God's heritage,* but being ensamples to the flock," 1 Pet. v. 2, 3. The Spirit of God foresaw what should happen, and he put in this caveat against it. If there be any thing in the history of human depravity, contrary to the will of God, as revealed in the Scriptures, it is the authority assumed, and the power exercised by the Pope of Rome. Blinded, indeed, must that man be who does not see this; and he must be ignorant indeed who can maintain, that if such were the case the Pope would be deposed.

Will PAX tell me who could depose him? All the authority in the Church of Rome has centred in him for hundreds of years. There is, indeed, no authority in the Church but his. The Pope told King Richard, that "he held the place of God upon earth; and, without distinction of persons, he would punish the men and the nations that presume to oppose his commands." Martin V., in the instructions given to a nuncio sent to Constantinople, assumes to himself the following blasphemous title:—"The most Holy and most Blessed, who is invested with Heavenly power, who is Lord on earth, the successor of Peter, the Christ or anointed of the Lord, the Lord of the Universe, the Father of Kings, the Light of the World, the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Martin." The Pope does not indeed talk in such language now; but his claims are still sufficiently high, and the submission yielded to him is such, that to speak of his being deposed, is as absurd as to speak of the head cutting itself off. He was, at one time, indeed, and very lately, not far from being cut off or deposed; not however, by his own authority, or by the authority of the Church, but by the power of the French Emperor. Then, he who affects to have all power in heaven and earth (as the Popes blasphemously do), was content to hold his station and authority at the will of an Upstart and a Usurper. He was even mean enough to become the tool of that Usurper, and to yield the sanction of his then little authority to his nefarious deeds.

The following is the doctrine which was taught throughout all France by his authority:—"Q. What are the duties of Christians towards the Princes who govern them; and what are our duties towards our Emperor, Napoleon the First? A. Christians owe to the Princes who govern them, and we owe in particular to our Emperor, Napoleon the First, love, respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, the contributions required for the pre-

servation and defence of the Empire and of his throne; we, moreover, owe to him our fervent prayers for his welfare, and for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the State." In answer to another question it is said of this Emperor:—"It is he whom God raised up in difficult circumstances to re-establish the public worship of the religion of our forefathers, and to be its protector. He has restored and preserved public order by his profound and active wisdom; he defends the state by his mighty arm; he has become the *anointed* of the Lord by the consecration which he received from the Sovereign Pontiff, the head of the Universal Church." "Q. What are we to think of those who violate their duty towards our Emperor? A. According to the Apostle Paul, they would resist the order established by God himself, and render themselves worthy of *eternal damnation.*"—*Catechism for the use of the French Church.*

Papists, and AMICUS VERITATIS in particular, rail against the Reformers for disloyalty; but, allowing all they say on that subject to be true, which is by no means the case, it is not to be compared with the conduct of the present Pope towards Bonaparte. Believing, as Papists in general do, the divine indefeisible right of Kings, and particularly of the Bourbons, the Pope was guilty of rebellion against that divine authority, when he crowned the Usurper, and blessed him as his beloved Son. It is needless to tell me that he whipt himself heartily for this afterwards. Such a crime required greater satisfaction than a few stripes inflicted by his own hand.

Papists will plead the necessity of the case; they will say the Holy Father was compelled to do as he did; and it is one of the evils of the Popish system, that it accommodates itself to circumstances, and times, and places: thus Papists in Great Britain submit to many things, and profess many things, which they would not do if they were living in Spain or Italy. They will profess, or deny, or do any thing that will serve the purpose of preserving or promoting the interests of the Holy See. Thus the Pope found it necessary to submit to Bonaparte, and to do as he bade him. The thing was wrong to be sure, but the necessity of the case made it right. If this principle were universally acted upon, there would be no such thing as morality in the world; there would be nothing to oppose that which is evil. Real Christianity teaches a different lesson—that it is not lawful on *any account* to do evil; and it is not in the power of any creature, or of all creatures together, to compel a man to do evil. But Popery in this, as in every thing else, is opposed to Christianity. Real Christians will rather die than commit sin, at least it is the will of God that they should do so; but the head of the Romish Church can not only permit evil to be done, but he sets the example by doing it himself.

PAX affirms, that "there are, in every Christian, some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms, that to encourage a discussion on them, with those whose boast it is to treat every sentiment and opinion not their own with contempt, would appear to me a sinful provocation." The latter part of this sentence does not apply to me, though, I suppose, PAX means it so. It is not,—it never was my practice, much less my boast, to treat every sentiment and opinion not my own with contempt. In matters of religion I profess no opinions that are properly my own; and if PAX, or any body else, shall convict me of sporting my own opinions, or any opinions but what are clearly derived from the Word of God, I shall thank him for his pains, and give him liberty to treat said opinions with as much contempt as he pleases.

That "there are in every Christian some points of faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted in their bosoms," as not to be fit subjects of discussion, is what I cannot admit. PAX is not commissioned to speak in name of every Christian more than I am. It may be true of Papists, that they have such secret and sacred points of faith as must not be told to every body,—as must not be the subject of discussion, or even of defence when they are impugned. But this is not the case with the faith of a Christian. He has nothing so delicately refined, or so sacredly planted in his bosom, that he may not tell it to all the world; nay, he is commanded by the Author and Finisher of his faith to proclaim it, if he have opportunity, upon the house-tops—to make it known to every creature.

The faith of a Christian is, That God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; that we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of his grace. The sum of the whole is, that we are sinners; that Christ came into the world to save sinners; that he gave his life a ransom for many; that he is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God by him; and that he that believeth on him shall be saved. This possesses all the pathos and sublimity of divine truth; but it is not a delicately refined sentiment planted in the human breast, for the purpose of being concealed there. Christians are commanded to be ready to give an answer to every one that asketh a reason of the hope that is in them; and to profess their faith before the world. There must be something wrong—there must be some radical error in that system of faith that is so refined, and so hallowed, and so sacredly planted in

the bosom, as to be locked up in it, and to be unfit for discussion.

I am aware that PAX is referring to the doctrine of transubstantiation. I have oftener than once accused Papists of maintaining the monstrous absurdity, that a priest can create his own Creator; that is, that he can, by the use of certain words, turn a little bread and wine into the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. This is the point of faith so delicately refined, planted in his bosom, that to encourage a discussion of it would be sinful provocation. Accordingly, neither he nor his friend, A. V. has made any reply to the above charge. They have attempted to answer many things of far less importance; but while they do not deny that they maintain this absurd doctrine, they have not the candour to confess that they do maintain it. I must, therefore, have recourse again to the Douay Catechism, which A. V. acknowledges to be of supreme authority, being approved by the whole church.

"Q. What is the blessed Eucharist? A. It is the body and blood of Jesus Christ, true God and true man, under the forms and appearances of bread and wine.—Q. What is there under the form of bread? A. There is not only the body, but also the blood of Christ.—Q. Is the body of Christ also under the form of wine? Yes.—Q. What else? A. There are also under each form the soul and divinity of Christ; so that under the form of bread there are the body and blood, the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, wholly and entirely, and the same under the form of wine.—Q. In what manner is Christ present in the Eucharist? A. By the true and real presence of his divine and human nature, and not in figure only, as heretics would have it.—Q. How prove you that? A. Because when Christ ordained it at his last supper, he took bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, *This is my body;* and he also blessed the cup, saying, *This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins,* Mat. xxvi. 28.—Q. By what means is that which was before bread changed into the body of Christ, and that which was wine changed into the blood of Christ? A. By the divine power, which as easily changes one substance into another, as he made the world out of nothing, and works the miraculous effect which the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation, by the ministry of the priest; in the same manner as when by Moses the rivers were changed into blood, and water into wine by our Saviour Christ.—Q. Is the body of Christ hurt or broken when we divide or break the sacrament? A. No, it is not; for Christ is now immortal and impassible, he cannot die or suffer any more, Rom. vi. 9.—Q. How can the same thing be in many places at once? A. By the omnipotence of God, to whom nothing is impossible; who is in all and every one of his creatures at one and the same time, and daily works such wonders even in nature as surpass our understanding.—Q. What is the matter of this sacrament? A. Wheaten bread, and wine of the grape.—Q. What is the form of it? A. This is my body, this is my blood.—Q. What disposition is required in him that receives the blessed Eucharist? A. That he be in the state of grace, free from all mortal sin: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, 1 Cor. xi. 29.—Q. Is it lawful or profitable to receive under one kind? A. Yes, because under one kind we receive both body and blood.—Q. Did not Christ command all to receive under both kinds? A. No; for at the last supper, when he bid all present then drink of the cup, none were there but the Apostles. And, when in St. John, c. vi. he seems to command the receiving under both kinds, he immediately takes away the difficulty, by promising everlasting life to him that receives under the form of bread alone. He that eats this bread shall live for ever, v. 58.—Q. What are the effects of this sacrament? A. It increases grace, and nourishes our souls in spiritual life. He that eats of this bread shall live for ever, John vi. 58.—Q. Is the Eucharist a sacrament only? A. No; it is also a sacrifice." The Catechism then proceeds to illustrate the doctrine contained in this answer, the sacrifice of the mass, &c. to which I may advert in a future Number.

The doctrine clearly maintained in the above extract is, that bread and wine are, by the power of God, and by the ministry of the priest, changed into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. My readers will probably think the statement here is sufficiently gross: yet the Douay Catechism does not go the full length of absurdity that some others do. I should say my copy; for I have been informed there are different versions of the Douay Catechism, intended for different parts of the world, adapted to the different degrees of knowledge or ignorance that may exist among the people. Other catechisms, therefore, may be still more absurd than my version of the Douay one. I have before me two volumes of a catechism in French, entitled, "*Instructions generales en forme de Catechisme; imprimées par ordre de Messire Charles Joachim Colbert, Évêque de Montpellier,* 1719." This Catechism asserts, that the bread and wine are not bread and wine after the consecration. They retain nothing but the appearance, to wit, the colour, the figure, and the taste. "*Il n'y a plus ni pain ni vin; il n'en reste que les apparences; scavoir, la couleur, la figure, et le goût. La substance du pain est changée en la substance du corps de Jesus Christ, et la substance du vin est changée en la substance du sang de Jesus Christ.*"

With intelligent persons the mere statement of such a doctrine is sufficient confutation; but

as Papists profess to give scripture authority for it, a few observations may be allowed. Their principal argument is derived from the words of Christ, at the institution of the Lord's supper, which they call the Eucharist, or thanksgiving. The words of the Vulgate, which with Papists is of equal authority with the original Greek, are *hoc est corpus meum*, "this is my body." Plain common sense can see in this nothing more than "this represents, or signifies my body;" as when Christ figuratively speaks of himself as "the door," "the true vine," &c. nobody supposes that he was really transformed, or transubstantiated into a door or a vine. But the words of the Vulgate are not the words of Christ, for he did not speak in the Latin language. "Had he spoken in Latin," says Dr Clarke, "following the idiom of the Vulgate, he would have said *panis hic corpus meum significat;* or, *symbolum est corporis mei—hoc poculum sanguinem meum repræsentat;* or, *symbolum est sanguinis mei:* this bread *signifies* my body; this cup *represents* my blood. But let it be observed, that in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses to *mean, signify, denote,* though both the Greek and Latin abound with them: hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say, *it is,* for *it signifies.* So Gen. xli. 26, 27. *The seven kine* ARE (*i. e.* represent) seven years. And, following the Hebrew idiom, though the work was written in Greek, we find in Rev. i. 20, "the seven stars ARE (*represent*) the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks ARE (*represent*) the seven churches."—*Discourse on the Nature, Design, and Institution of the Eucharist,* p. 51. What absurdities one should make the Bible speak, if every passage in which the substantive verb is used were to be understood as Papists affect to understand "this *is* my body!"

The transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, is compared to the miracle of Moses, when he changed the rivers into blood; and that of Christ, when he changed the water into wine. But the cases are by no means parallel. The change produced by these miracles was evident to the senses of those who witnessed them. They did not change the substance, and retain the same appearance as before. After the water was changed into blood in the one case, and into wine in the other, the colour and the taste were not those of water; but the change which is pretended to be made by the ministry of the priest, when he uses certain words, leaves every thing as it was. The acutest sense whether of seeing, handling, tasting, or smelling, can perceive no difference: yet the people are taught to believe that a mysterious change of the whole substance has taken place: that what they know was bread a few seconds before, and what they see to be bread still, is not bread, but the real body of Christ, which they are told at the same time is in heaven. The tendency of this monstrous absurdity is to set aside the evidence of miracles altogether; for the senses of men were always called to judge of a miracle; but transubstantiation completely sets aside the evidence of sense; and if this doctrine were true, we have no certainty of any thing that Christ and his apostles did in order to convince men that the power of God was with them. If the senses of thousands be deceived every time the Eucharist is celebrated, they may have been deceived also with regard to every miracle recorded in Scripture.*

But the wickedness of the doctrine does not terminate here. Along with the body and blood, there is also the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, wholly and entirely under the form of bread, and the same under the form of wine. The priest professes to change a little gross matter into an object of worship—into the *divinity,* as well as into the soul and body of the Saviour; then he falls down and worships the work of his own hands; he holds it up to be adored by the whole congregation; and having worshipped the idol they eat it up! The grossest heathenism is scarcely to be compared with this. This is Popery as it exists and is practised at this day, amidst all the light of science, and all the light which the Word of God has shed upon our Christian population! One should think this a subject too serious for burlesque, and yet Papists themselves can burlesque it. "I had a mind to see," says Bishop Burnet, "a picture that, as I was told, is over one of the Popish altars in Worms, which one would think was invented by the enemies of transubstantiation, to make it appear ridiculous. There is a windmill, and the Virgin throws Christ into the hopper, and he comes out at the eye of the mill all in wafers, which some priests take up to give to the people."—*Letters,* &c. *let. 5th, quoted in Free Thoughts,* &c. p. 387.

Much has been said about the priests withholding the wine from the people, and taking it all to themselves. I think the people would sustain no loss though the bread were also withheld, and though the priests ate and drank the whole idol. The service is a piece of profane mummery—an impious imitation of a holy ordinance; and the less it is made to resemble the divine original the better.

No. V.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 15TH, 1818.

PAX says, if I had taxed the Catholics with any one principle which they profess, he would gladly have acknowledged it. I have taxed them with many things which they profess, if

* See Mr Burns' excellent Letter to Dr Chalmers.

their own words and their own Catechism express their profession; and I hear of no acknowledgment coming from PAX or any of his brethren. I taxed them plainly with transubstantiation. This is certainly a doctrine which Papists profess; yet PAX does not acknowledge it. It is a point of "faith so delicately refined, so hallowed, so sacredly planted" in his bosom, that he must not say any thing about it to provoke discussion.

"He (the PROTESTANT) asserts," says PAX, "the Catholics believe the Pope to be infallible; they believe him to be the head of the Church; but they know him to be a man, and not their God, as he contemptuously asserts." Perhaps PAX means it to be understood, by this sentence, that he does not believe in the Pope's infallibility; but he does not say so. He represents me as asserting that Catholics believe it; and Protestants may understand that he repels this charge; but if any thorough-bred Papist should find fault with him for denying the Pope's infallibility, he can say he did not deny it; he only said that the PROTESTANT asserted that Catholics believed it, which is certainly true.

PAX must know very well that this assertion is strictly correct. Papists do believe the Pope to be infallible. I do not say that *all* Papists believe it; for I know that while the Romish Church has for many centuries maintained the doctrine of infallibility, her members were never agreed with regard to the seat of it. Some held that it was in a general council; some ascribed it to the Pope; and others to the Pope and a general council together; which led Dean Swift to remark, that the church might as well be without an infallible head, as not to know where to find him in a time of necessity.

If there can be any thing rational in absurdity and impiety, I should maintain that the opinion of those who believe the Pope to be infallible, is the most rational of the three. A general council is composed of hundreds of individuals, who are all allowed to be fallible men when taken separately; and it is impossible to conceive that a hundred fallible men can make an infallible body; as well might we suppose that a hundred lies will make one truth. To add the Pope to a general council, and make the two together infallible, is little better; it is still a compound of fallible materials; and amidst the jarring opinions of many fallible individuals, it is scarcely possible to come to any decision, without appealing to *one* as the ultimate judge. In point of fact, this one was the Pope; and whatever persons might maintain as a speculative opinion, with regard to the seat of infallibility, which all believed to be somewhere in the church, for all practical purposes it was generally understood to rest with the Pope.

And if it be true that the Pope is the successor of Peter, and the vicar of Christ; that he has all the authority with which Christ invested Peter as one of his accredited ambassadors; nay more, if it be true that he is the head of the Church (as PAX asserts), which Peter never pretended to be;—then, without all doubt, if he be not infallible, he ought to be so; and he ought to be omniscient too; he ought to be able to search the reins and the heart, that he may give to every man according to his works. In short, it is a very cruel thing to make any man the head of the church, if he be not infallible, for without this he will commit great mistakes, which will issue in the ruin of himself and others.

I shall now proceed to give the opinion of Popish writers on the subject of the Pope's infallibility. It is maintained, in the decretals, that the Pope can be judged by none—that his judgment, whether respecting faith, manners, or discipline, ought to be preferred to all things, (not excepting even the Bible, it seems); "that nothing is true except what he approves, and every thing which he condemns is false." "We can believe nothing," says Lewis Capsensis, "unless we believe, with a divine faith, that the Pope is the successor of St. Peter, and infallible." "It depends upon the Pope," says Baronius, "to ratify decrees, and to alter them when ratified." "The Pope," says Bellarmine, "is absolutely above the Catholic Church, and above a general council; so that he has no judge above him on earth."—See *M'Culloch's Popery Condemned, with the references*, p. 150, 151.

Bellarmine teaches, "that the Pope, when he instructs the whole church in things concerning faith, cannot possibly err; and whether he be heretic himself or not, he can by no means define any thing heretical to be believed by the whole church." Another writer on this subject says, "The very doubt whether a council be greater than the Pope seems to be absurd, because it would involve a contradiction, namely, that the supreme Pontiff is not supreme."—"He cannot err, he cannot be deceived," says another, "it must be conceived concerning him, that he knows all things." "O Rome," exclaims Cornelius Mussus, bishop of Bitonto, "to whom shall we go for divine counsels, unless to those persons to whose trust the dispensation of the divine mysteries has been committed? We are therefore to hear him who is to us instead of God, in things that concern God, as God himself. For my part, I freely confess, in things that belong to the mysteries of faith, I had rather believe one Pope than a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, Gregories, not to speak of Richards, Scotuses, and Williamses: for I believe and *know* that the Pope cannot err in matters of faith, because the authority and right of determining whatever relates to faith resides in the Pope." The Assembly of Cardinals, Prelates, and Clergy of France, 1625, declare, "that his Holiness is

above the reach of calumny, and his faith out of the reach of error." In the theses of the Jesuits, in the College of Claremont, it was maintained, "that Christ hath so committed the government of his church to the Popes, that he hath conferred on them the same infallibility which he had himself, as often as they speak *ex cathedra;* and therefore there is in the Church of Rome an infallible judge of controversies of faith, even without a general council, whether in matters of right or fact." The learned writer of "*Free Thoughts,*" from whose notes these extracts are taken, and who gives a host of authorities, asserts that "the above has been the general doctrine of the Jesuits, though violently opposed by the Jansenists, and a great part of the Gallican Church. Three or four councils have ascribed infallibility to the Pope, particularly that of Florence, under Pope Eugene, in opposition to the decisions of the council of Basil. The last council of Lateran, and that of Trent, may also, with good reason, be reckoned to have acknowledged this. But at the time of the last of these, the Pope declared, that he would rather shed his blood than part with his rights, which had been established upon the doctrine of the Church, and the blood of martyrs; and the legates were charged not to allow the council to make any decision on the point of infallibility, and they accordingly avowed they would rather lose their life than allow a thing so certain to be called in question. The bishop of Grenada maintained before the council, that the Pope was a God on earth, and therefore he was not subject to a council."—*Free Thoughts,* p. 200. PAX will see from this, that I was not mistaken when I called the Pope the god of Papists.

I do not suppose that Ravaillac, the assassin of Henry IV. was a divine of high authority in the Church of Rome; but he possessed the genuine spirit of a bigotted Papist. He believed it lawful for any private person to kill the king, because he was too favourable to the heretics, and because he had been told that he intended to make war on the Pope; "*and to make war against the Pope,*" said Ravaillac to his judges, "*is to make war against God, seeing the Pope is God, and God is the Pope.*" Such language as this was encouraged in the Church of Rome, at least no fault was found with it; the church itself, therefore, is implicated in the crime; for every church ought to be held responsible for the opinions and practices of her members, when they are not publicly disapproved or disavowed.

Bellarmine is allowed by Papists themselves, to be a standard authority in their Church. What gives his testimony double force is, that he was a counsellor of the court of Rome, wrote under the Pope's eye, and taught controversy publicly in his university; and his books were published in Rome itself, and dedicated to the reigning Pope; and instead of meeting with the smallest censure from that court, they were received with the highest approbation, and the dignity of cardinal conferred on him as a reward of his merit. Now, such was the devotion of this Bellarmine to the Church of Rome, and such were his ideas of the infallibility of the Pope, that he taught as follows:—"He thinks not rightly of the Church of Christ, who admits nothing but what he finds to be written, or done, in the ancient church; as if the church in latter times either ceased to be the church, or had not a power of explaining and declaring, appointing, and even commanding whatever relates to faith and manners."—"It may be affirmed, in a good sense," says he, "that Christ gave to Peter the power of making sin to be no sin, and that which is no sin to be sin." And again, "If the Pope should command vice, and prohibit virtue, the Church would be bound to believe vice to be good, and virtue to be evil, unless she should sin against conscience." The canons, with their glossaries, teach that the Pope "hath a heavenly power, *cœleste arbitrium,* and therefore changes the nature of things, applying the essential attributes of the one to the other; that he can make something of nothing; and in those things that he wills, his will is instead of reason; nor is there any one that can say to him, *What dost thou?* for he can dispense with law; he can make justice injustice, by changing and correcting laws; and, in a word, that he hath a plenitude of power."

The Popes have often been accused of putting themselves on a footing with Jesus Christ, as of equal authority with him; but this, impious as it is, comes short of the truth. The Pope actually exalts himself *above* all that is called God. He assumes greater power; and his minions, such as Bellarmine, ascribe to him greater power than ever was ascribed to Jesus Christ. It was never said of the Saviour that he did, or that he could make that which is sin to be no sin, or that he could make that to be no sin which is sin. The law of God, the eternal and immutable law of righteousness, was in his heart. He obeyed every precept of it himself; and he made atonement for every transgression in the room of all his people. But had it been possible for any power in heaven or on earth to make that which is sin to be no sin, there was no occasion for either the obedience or the atonement of Christ. When I speak of what divine power cannot do, I must, of course, be understood as speaking of those things which are contrary to the infinite holiness of God. It derogates nothing from any of the divine perfections, nay, it is the glory of the character of God, that he cannot lie, that he cannot look upon iniquity. He cannot, therefore, make that which is sin to be no sin. But Bellarmine, an approved doctor in the Romish Church, says the Pope can do so. This accounts for the fact of my opponent's pertina-

ciously maintaining that it never was a principle of their Church, that a Pope would grant indulgence or permission to commit sin, for that cannot be sin, be it murder or any thing else, which the Pope grants permission to do.

It was quite usual with Popish writers to address the Pope as a god; and instead of finding fault with any of them for this impiety, he received their adulation as the sweetest incense. Angelus Politianus thus addresses Alexander VI.: "We rejoice to see you raised above all human things, and exalted even to divinity itself, seeing there is nothing, except God, which is not put under you." And Clement VII., with his cardinals of Avignon, writing to King Charles VI. says, "As there is but one God in the heavens, so there cannot, nor ought to be of right but one God on earth." —*Troisard, tom.* 3. *fol.* 147. "It is evident," says the canon law, "that the Pope who was called God by Constantine, can neither be bound nor loosed by any secular power; for it is manifest that a God cannot be judged by men."—See *Free Thoughts, &c. with the references,* p. 32, 33.

One should think it scarcely possible to go farther in impiety and blasphemy; yet, the following seems to exceed any thing of the kind which I have seen: "The devil hath passed so far in this mystery of iniquity, that one disputed in the schools a little before Luther came, and somewhat after, whether the Pope participated not in both natures, the divine and human, with Jesus Christ." *Page* 275, *Du Plessis,* who refers, on the margin, to *Erasmus, in Epist.* 2*d Tim. cap.* 1. The Church of Rome has, perhaps, to thank the Reformation, and the light which accompanied it, for checking this error, so that it went no further than the schools. But for this, it would very likely have found its way into some of the public standards of the Church; and the Pope, frail and mortal as he was, would have accepted the compliment of possessing the divine as well as the human nature.

It is well known that the Pope claimed authority, not only over the Church, but also over all the civil powers in Christendom; nay, he pretended that the property of the whole globe was vested in him, so that he could dispose of islands and continents at his pleasure. It is said, that some of the Papists in Ireland have of late begun to doubt his infallibility, because he gave that kingdom to England; but if he could by any means give England to Ireland, I doubt not he would be, in the esteem of Irish Papists, as infallible as ever. "It is a thing most manifest," says a Popish writer, "that his Holiness hath universal power over all, not only in his own states, and over his own vassals, but also in those of other princes, and in all the world; but as to the laity, the jurisdiction is of two sorts, spiritual and temporal; as to the spiritual, every one grants that he hath supreme power as head. Considering, therefore, those things that are of positive institution *(de jure positivo)*, his Holiness can not only interpret, *and dispense with them,* but he can *revoke* them entirely. It is not quite the same with such as are of *jure divino;* these he cannot revoke, he can only explain." —*Tesoro Politico, con licenza de superiori,* 1602. p. 20. Bellarmine teaches that "the Pope has the chief power of disposing of the temporal affairs of all Christians, in order to their spiritual good."—*Lib.* V. *cap.* 6. "And on account of the wickedness of the times, not only usefully, but even necessarily, some temporal principalities are granted to the Pope and to the other bishops."—*Lib.* V. *cap.* 9. "It would be altogether expedient, if it could be brought to pass without injustice and warlike strife, that all the provinces of the world were ruled, even in political matters, by one chief king."—*Lib.* I. *cap.* 9. "It is not repugnant to the gospel, if in any manner it might be, that the same should be high priest of the whole world, and also emperor of the whole world."—*Lib.* V. *cap.* 10. It would seem as if the Pope had nothing less than this in view, and that he was actually grasping at the empire of the whole world, when his hand was paralyzed by the Reformation.

I could easily show from a work above quoted *(Tesoro Politico)* numerous authentic instances of princes holding their dominions under the Pope, who claimed a right to dispose of them at his pleasure. Indeed, to deny that the Pope had such power, was declared to be heresy. Thus Boniface addresses a letter to Philip le Bel, in these terms, "Boniface, Bishop, and servant of the servants of God, to Philip, king of France: fear God and keep his commandments: we would have you to know that you are subject to us, both in things spiritual and temporal, and we declare all those to be heretics who believe the contrary. Given at our palace of Lateran, the 5th of December, the 7th year of our Pontificate." In another to the same, he says, "God hath established us over kings and kingdoms, to pluck up, to overthrow, to destroy, to scatter, to build, and to plant, in his name, and by his doctrine. Do not allow yourself to be persuaded that you have not a superior, and that you are not subject to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; he that thinks thus is a fool; and he that obstinately maintains it is an infidel, separated from the flock of the good Shepherd."

The Pope thus being acknowledged to have all power on earth, was not yet content. He must have power in heaven too; he professed to open and shut its gates at his pleasure; and he impiously pretended to have the heavenly powers at his command, though only for the purpose of gratifying his own avarice and revenge. The Pope was the proprietor of some alum works; for the holy father, it seems, could

condescend to be a chemist and a manufacturer. One of the workmen made his elopement, came to Britain, and revealed the secrets of the trade. The Pope sent after him the following curses in the form of an excommunication, which my readers may contrast with the doctrines of Jesus Christ. *Bless and curse not.*

"By the authority of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and of the holy canons: and of the immaculate Virgin Mary, the mother and patroness of our Saviour; and of all the celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubims, and seraphims; and of all the holy patriarchs and prophets; and of all the apostles and evangelists; and of the holy innocents, who, in the sight of the Holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song; of the holy martyrs and holy confessors; and of the holy virgins; and of all the saints, together with all the holy elect of God, we excommunicate and anathematize this thief, or this malefactor, N———: and from the thresholds of the holy church of Almighty God, we sequester him, that he may be tormented, disposed, and delivered over, with Dathan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways; and as fire is quenched with water, so let his light be put out for ever, unless he shall repent and make satisfaction. Amen.

"May God the Father, who created man, curse him. May God the Son, who suffered for us, curse him. May the Holy Ghost, who was given to us in baptism, curse him. May the holy cross, which Christ for our salvation triumphantly ascended, curse him. May the holy and eternal Virgin Mary curse him. May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May St. John, the chief forerunner and baptist of Christ, curse him. May St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and all the other apostles of Christ, together with the rest of his disciples, and the four evangelists, curse him. May the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who, by their holy works, are found pleasing to God, curse him. May the holy choir of the holy virgins, who, for the honour of Christ, have despised the things of this world, curse him. May all the saints, who, from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages, are found to be the beloved of God, curse him. May the heaven and the earth, and all things therein remaining, curse him. May he be cursed wherever he may be, whether in the house or in the field, in the highway or in the path, in the wood or in the water, or in the church. May he be cursed in living, in dying, in eating, in drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, in sleeping, in slumbering, in waking, in walking, in standing, in sitting, in lying, in working, in resting,"—[I must omit some words, for the Pope is far more gross than Luther, see No. II.]—"and in blood-letting. May he be cursed in all the powers of his body. May he be cursed within and without. May he be cursed in the hair of his head. May he be cursed in his brain. May he be cursed in the crown of his head, in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his eye-brows, in his cheeks, in his jaw-bones, in his nostrils, in his fore-teeth and grinders, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his wrists, in his arms, in his hands, in his breast, and in all the interior parts of the very stomach, in his reins, in his groin, in his thighs,"————"in his hips, in his knees, in his legs, in his feet, in his joints, and in his nails. May he be cursed in the whole structure of his members. From the crown of his head to the sole of his foot, may there be no soundness in him. May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his majesty, curse him. And may heaven and all the powers that move therein, rise against him to damn him, unless he repent and make full satisfaction. Amen. Amen. Amen." *Ledger Book of the Church of Rochester, and Sir Henry Spelman's Glossary, p.* 206. *Quoted by both Bruce and M'Culloch.*

No. VI.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 22D, 1818.

IT is impossible to enumerate, in one Paper or two, the absurdities involved in this article of the Popish creed,—"We believe the Pope to be the Head of the Church." It is absurd and impious enough for a man to profess to be head of any Christian church, though it be so small as to be actually within the sphere of his personal oversight. It is worse to pretend to be head of the Church in a whole diocese, or nation, to which one man cannot possibly do the duty of a bishop or overseer; but to pretend to be head of the Catholic or Universal Church, is, beyond expression, impious and absurd. Such, however, is the avowed belief of PAX; and he speaks for his brethren as well as himself, for he says, "they believe him (*i. e.* the Pope) to be the head of the Church;" and it is of the Catholic, or Universal Church, that he is speaking.

In my last Number, I gave a sketch of the Pope's claims to infallibility, and universal authority over all things, and all persons, with regard to both spiritual and temporal matters; and if he were really the head of the Christian Church, such authority and power would not be too much for him; he would require it all, in order to conduct the affairs of the Church, and to defend her against her enemies. Nay more, as the greatest enemies of the Church are not fellow-creatures, but principalities, and powers, and the rulers of the darkness of this world, if the Pope were the head of the Church,

he would require to have greater power than these, else the Church would soon be overcome, —the gates of hell would soon prevail against it. The real head of the Church has such power; and because he has it, we rest assured of the safety of the Church throughout all ages. Christ says truly, and he only can say it, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." God "raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all might, and dominion, and principality, and power, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

The head of the Church is represented as sitting upon a throne of glory; thousands of holy angels minister to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before him; he employs them in the service of his Church; they are ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them who are the heirs of salvation; and they acknowledge themselves to be the fellow servants, and the brethren of them who have the testimony of Jesus. Nay, they are a constituent part of the Church of Christ; not that part, indeed, which he purchased with his own blood; but they are a part of that great assembly which surround the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple.

With all this power Jesus Christ is invested; and it is all necessary to his being the head of the Church. But who was ever the Pope that possessed such power, or that could exhibit such glory? The Pope, indeed, pretends to it; but the pretence is as vain and impious as was the pretence of Baal to be the God of Israel; and the priests of the one idol may very justly be compared with those of the other, as zealous supporters of that system of idolatrous worship, which is as much opposed to Christianity, as was the worship of Baal, or of the golden calves, to the worship of the true God.

The Pope affects to be like Jesus Christ. He has also his throne, and his attending worshippers, who fall down before him, and kiss his feet*. He cannot, indeed, make the winds his messengers. He cannot send lightnings that they may go, nor do they say unto him, Here we are. But he has his Bulls, which he sends throughout the world, and his legates, *a latere*, who stand at his elbow, waiting his commands, and who go forth from his presence to do his will throughout all his dominion,—to rule the hearts and consciences of men; to order all their spiritual concerns; to pardon or retain their sins; to save or condemn their souls; or, to use his own language, "to pluck up, to overthrow, to destroy, to scatter, to build, and to plant." All this is pretended by a poor dying worm.—While it is unspeakably impious, it is infinitely more ridiculous than children playing at kings and queens. It is a creature affecting the style, and majesty, and authority, and power, of the Creator.

I shall be told, perhaps, that it is only the Church on earth of which the Pope is the head, and that, as it is composed of mere men and women, there is nothing more unreasonable in one man being constituted the head of such a body, than in one man being constituted the head of a state or nation. The cases are by no means parallel. Human laws and human government are proper and necessary for human creatures; a mere creature, like ourselves, may be constituted the head of a kingdom; and his authority and power may be sufficient for all the purposes of the constitution. But the Church, even in this world, is a congregation of faithful men, that is, believing men, who, as such, are renewed in the spirit of their minds, are united to Jesus Christ in the most intimate relation,† and to the saints in heaven, so as to form, with them, one body, of which Christ is the head. I use the word congregation, not as denoting a visible assembly, for this Church never can come together in this world; but though not visibly, they are really gathered together as one in Christ.

This is a society of spiritual men. They are separated from the world for spiritual purposes. When companies of them come together as a visible organized Church, be they ever so few, or ever so many, it is for the purpose of serving God in the way which he has appointed, in which he has promised to accept their service, —to promote the edification of themselves and one another,—and to propagate the gospel in the world. This society is divine in its origin, in its constitution, in its laws, and these laws are administered under the sanction of divine authority.

No mere creature is capable of being the head of such a body, because he is incapable of taking cognizance of the spiritual concerns of the members, even upon the smallest scale on which we can suppose a church to exist; how much more of all the members throughout the world. The head must know the heart of every member, must be acquainted with all its wanderings, its errors, and its sorrows, that he may know how to correct, to restore, and to comfort. The Pope, indeed, affects to obtain this knowledge of the hearts of his subjects, by means of confession; but supposing such knowledge to be actually obtained by all his

* It is recorded, as an instance of singular humility in one of the Popes, that he had a cross embroidered on his slipper, that it might appear to be the cross, and not his foot, that was worshipped by the prostrate devotee.

† It is not said that every member of a visible Church stands in this gracious relation, because there are many who have intruded themselves into the Church, who have not observed the appointed order of first coming to Christ and believing in him.

priests, not one in a million of the sins so confessed can ever reach the ears of the Pope; and supposing one sin in a million to reach him, and supposing he enjoins the necessary discipline, he must, in many instances, be unable to apply it; the sinner may live at the distance of thousands of miles; he cannot reach him with the rapidity of thought; he must send some corporeal messenger with a Bull in his pocket: but the poor sinner may be in the other world long before the messenger reach the spot. If it be answered, that every priest has the power of granting absolution, as well as of enjoining penance, then the priest is doing what belongs only to the head to do; the Pope is ignorant of the individual case; and, in so far, he is not the head of the Church. The real head of the Church knows every thought of the heart of every member; and this is necessary to his being head of the Church. He walketh in the midst of the golden candlesticks, that is, in the midst of the Churches. His eyes are like a flame of fire, searching the reins and the heart; and he will give to every man according to his works.

Perhaps, some Protestants will not go all the length with me in rejecting human authority in the Church. If so, I cannot help it. It is my decided conviction that there never was, and never will be, any authority lawfully exercised in the Church of God, but the authority of God himself. The Church is the kingdom of heaven,—the kingdom of God,—the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; and why should not he be the sovereign, and lawgiver, and judge, in his own kingdom? He never delegated his sovereign authority to a creature; he never appointed a creature to be the head of his body; the pretensions of the Pope, therefore, are direct treason against the authority of Christ, as really as it would be treason in PAX to give himself out as the King of Great Britain.

I would maintain this principle though there never had been a Pope of an immoral life. I maintain that no creature, not even a holy angel, is capable of being head of the Church, and that God never appointed a creature to fill that station. But many of the Popes were men of the most profligate lives; they were fit successors of the worst of the Cesars: the Vatican, for all manner of wickedness, will bear a comparison with any heathen temple. Can any man suppose it possible that Christ would delegate his authority to such men? that he would constitute such the head of his Church, which is called to be holy, even as he is holy? The head and the body, in all cases, must partake of the same character. Thus the Church of Christ is a holy community. It consists of sinful creatures, indeed; but they are sinners, "washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;"—not personally free from sin while in this world; but their perfectly holy Head is carrying them forward to a state of sinless perfection. That Church, then, of which the Pope is the head, must be of the same character with himself. The head and the members must be, in some measure, like one another; and such, in point of fact, it has always been. While the head was practising all manner of wickedness, the Church was represented as "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

"It is known by every body," says a writer of the 17th century, "that the celibacy of that wretched clergy is among them the source of a universal and loathsome impurity; and that the least crimes committed by those of that order are fornications and adulteries."—"It is also known that the Pope authorizes and protects public stews, in order to draw a considerable revenue from them; but it is not so universally known, that to advance the reputation of that crime, (which, indeed, is not accounted any by the Court of Rome,) the Popes will not suffer any women to prostitute themselves, unless they be Christians; and, therefore, by order of his Holiness, Jewish, Pagan, and Mahometan women, who have a mind to set up that trade at Rome, must first be baptized."—*Philosophical Library for May*, 1818, p. 81. What must Mahometans and Pagans think of that religion, initiation into which is a necessary qualification for the commission of wickedness?

The Church of Rome had gone such a length in wickedness, that her reformation became impossible; the vital principle had long been extinct. Real Christianity was unknown within her pale, except by some solitary individuals here and there, who were of no consideration in the Church. It was, therefore, as impossible for her to reform herself, as for a dead body to raise itself to life. "When, at the era of the reformation," says Mr Cunningham, p. 141, "Pope Adrian the Sixth, a well-meaning pontiff, wished to introduce a reform into the Court of Rome itself, he was dissuaded from it by Cardinal Francis Soderini, Bishop of Preneste, who, among other reasons, used the following:—'That there was no hope of confounding or destroying the Lutherans, by a reformation of the Court of Rome. That, on the contrary, it was the true way to give them more credit; for if the people, who always judge by the event, were to see a reformation begun, they would suppose that since there had been good cause to oppose some abuses, there was room for believing that the other novelties proposed by Luther were well founded.'—'That in reading the history of past ages it may be seen that the heretics who had rebelled against the authority of the Church of Rome, had always founded their arguments upon the corrupt manners of the Papal court. Still, however, the Popes had never thought it would be of any use to introduce a reform, but had

satisfied themselves, after employing exhortations and remonstrances, with engaging princes to protect the Church.'—'That heresies had never been put an end to by reformation, but by crusades, and by exciting sovereigns and nations to extirpate them. That it was by those means that Innocent the Third happily extinguished that of the Albigenses in Languedoc; and his successors had employed no others against the Waldenses, the Picards,' &c.—'That it would be impossible to effect any reform without diminishing considerably the ecclesiastical revenues, which were derived from four sources: the one temporal, viz., the domains of the state; the three others spiritual, namely, indulgences, dispensations, and the collation of benefices; and that none of these could ever be dried up without occasioning to the Holy See a loss of a fourth of its revenues.'" The above is extracted from the work of a *Catholic writer* of great authority.—*Histoire du Concile de Trente. Par Fra. Paoli Sarpi, tome* i. p. 42, 43.

Mr Cunningham then gives an extract from the Tax of the Apostolic Chancery, containing the expense of committing certain sins, which see part first, p. 24, of my Letters republished from the Glasgow Chronicle; and then proceeds:—"Pope Leo X. having, in the year 1517, published a sale of plenary indulgences, made a grant of the revenue to arise therefrom, within the Electorate of Saxony, to his sister Magdalen, married to Cibo, natural son of Pope Innocent VIII. who in consequence of that marriage, had made Leo a cardinal at fourteen years of age. Magdalen, anxious to make her brother's gift as profitable as possible, appointed Aremboldi, then a layman, but subsequently created archbishop of Milan, to manage the business for her, who intrusted the collection of the indulgences to the highest bidders. These collectors, says Fra. Paoli Sarpi, the Catholic historian already quoted, *caused much scandal by their immoral lives and debaucheries, spending in taverns and elsewhere, in gaming, and other things not fit to be mentioned, what the people saved from their necessary expenses to purchase indulgences.*"

These were the *holy* fathers who could sell the plenary remission of sins to whole nations, that their *bastard* children might be endowed with princely revenues. Very fit and proper heads they were of a Church which was confessedly so corrupt as to be beyond the possibility of reformation; for the argument of Cardinal Soderini must remain in full force while the Church of Rome exists. She cannot reform, for that would be to admit that she needed reformation, which would justify the complaints of the heretics, and destroy her own infallibility. She must therefore go on from evil to worse, till she be ripe for destruction, which will overtake her at the time appointed.

It is a pretty generally received opinion that the Church of Rome is not so wicked now as she was in former ages. I confess I am of a different opinion. I believe her wickedness is greater now than ever it was, and that it will continue to increase to the end. It is true, she does not now exhibit, in general, such gross immoralities as we read of in her history. We do not hear, for instance, that the present Pope farms out indulgences, as a provision for his own, or his predecessor's natural children. The knowledge that is now diffused over Europe will not permit things to be done, which were openly practised in the days of darkness. But the existence of this knowledge aggravates the wickedness of those who shut their eyes against it; and what are apparently less enormities committed in the present day, may be greater sins than greater enormities were in former days; for sins committed against knowledge are greater than sins of ignorance. Christ tells the Scribes and Pharisees, that if he had not spoken to them they had not had sin: they had been comparatively guiltless; they would not have had the sin of rejecting him, which was the greatest of which they could be guilty.

This applies to the members of the Church of Rome, especially such of them as live in Protestant countries. Some apology may be made for those who lived in the darker ages, and even for those who live at this day in the heart of Spain, where the dense atmosphere of a cruel superstition will not allow one ray of heavenly light to reach the benighted understanding. What can poor sinners do in these circumstances, but trust implicitly to their ghostly fathers, whose interest it is to keep them in darkness? They are sinners, no doubt; and they must perish in their sins, unless divine mercy shall find them out, in spite of their priests, and discover to them the way of salvation. But the wickedness of these is not to be compared with the wickedness of those who live within the sphere of divine illumination, and who shut their eyes against the light.

Rome itself cannot altogether exclude the light that now shines in our hemisphere. But Rome will not come to the light, lest her deeds should be reproved. Rome loves the darkness, and not the light, because her deeds are evil. Light has come, light is shining all around; but Rome will not have it; she prefers the darkness; her language is, "Depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy ways." Accordingly, the Pope has prohibited the formation of Bible Societies, and the circulation of the Word of God. This is greater wickedness in him, than it would have been in the Popes of the dark ages; because the dispensations of divine Providence, and the enlightened state of the public mind, should have taught him better. Maintaining the old superstitions and idolatries, while the light of divine truth is shining around, while the gospel of the grace of God is urged

upon them, the Papists of the present day are more wicked than their fathers; the Church of Rome is filling up the measure of her iniquities, until the wrath come upon her to the uttermost.

I know that PAX and AMICUS VERITATIS will call this bigotry, and uncharitableness, and what not. A bigot let me be, if I shall be the means of convincing them of their error, of showing them that they are in the way of destruction, of leading them to renounce all dependence upon fellow-creatures, and to trust in Christ alone for the salvation of their souls. Why will they trust in their priest, who is a sinner like themselves? Why will they trust in the Virgin Mary, or any of the saints, when Jesus Christ, the only Saviour, presents himself for their acceptance; and makes them welcome to come to him directly and immediately as the only refuge from the storm of divine wrath which must fall upon the heads of the ungodly? What interest can they have, unless they are priests, in propping up the crazy fabric of Romish superstition, which is well known to be an enemy to every social and personal comfort? It is a system that holds both the souls and bodies of men in bondage; and wherever it prevails, thick darkness covers the people. They must see that in Glasgow, and over the whole kingdom, the state of society is more comfortable, the intellectual and moral condition of the people more respectable, than in Popish countries. To what is this owing, but to the general diffusion of knowledge? Popery is hostile to this. He, therefore, who supports the Popish system, is an enemy to the temporal as well as the eternal welfare of his fellow-creatures; and he brings the displeasure of God upon himself.

No. VII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 29TH, 1818.

AT first view one is apt to think that such a fabric as that of Popish infallibility and supremacy must have some solid ground to stand upon. This, however, is by no means the case; and, indeed, for the purposes of error and superstition, the slighter the foundation on which the structure is built, the better. There is then greater scope for the exercise of human ingenuity, and the imagination is in less danger of being obstructed in its career by any troublesome truth.

In some of my late Numbers I have, I think, proved the fact, that the infallibility of the Pope is a doctrine generally held by the Church of Rome; and that the Pope claimed supremacy over persons and kingdoms in all matters, temporal as well as spiritual. In the present Number, I shall consider the arguments by which Papists maintain this infallibility and supremacy.

By the kindness of a friend, I am favoured with the use of the Rhemish translation of the New Testament into English, Fulke's edition, 1601, with the then authorized English version in parallel columns, with marginal notes and annotations. This, I believe, is the first version, in the mother tongue, which the Church of Rome gave to her members in England; and it is given professedly as an antidote to the poison of other translations, which they could not prevent being made into English: not that they by any means thought it necessary, or even proper, in all cases, for the common people to have the word of God in their own language. And they took very good care that this translation of theirs should be rendered as useless to common people as possible; for, besides making it a large and expensive volume, they have perverted, and even smothered the sacred text by their notes and annotations.

They deduce the infallibility of the Pope from Luke xxii. 30, 31. which, in their translation, is as follows: "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath required to have you, for to sift as wheat: BUT I HAVE PRAYED FOR THEE, that thy faith fail not: and thou once converted confirm thy brethren." One would think it is not easy to find the Pope at all in this passage, not to say his infallibility. Our Saviour, who knew the hearts of all men, saw the secret working of self-confidence in the mind of his disciple. He foresaw the melancholy fall to which this would lead him; and, as an antidote against that despair which might be the natural consequence of such guilt, and which should actually overwhelm another disciple, he told Peter that he had prayed for him, that Satan should not finally prevail against him,—that though his faith might be shaken, or even suspended for an hour in its exercise, the divine principle should not be destroyed. Peter was quite ignorant, at the time, of what Christ referred to, as is evident from the confident reply which he made: of course the words of his Lord could be no encouragement to the commission of the sin of which he was afterwards guilty. But when he found himself guilty of denying his Lord and Master, in the hour of darkness,—when overwhelmed with a sense of his crime; instead of being driven to despair, he would remember the kindness of his Master, who had prayed for him,—he would believe and trust in him anew.

See, now, how the Rhemists find the infallibility of the Pope in this passage:—"*Simon, Simon.*] Lastly, to put them out of doubt, he calleth Peter twice by name, and telling him the devil's desire to sift and try them all to the uttermost (as he did that night,) saith that he hath especially prayed for him, to this end that his faith should never fail, and that he, being once converted, should after that for ever con-

firm, establish, or uphold the rest in their faith. Which is to say, that Peter is that man whom he would make superior over them and the whole Church. Whereby we may learn, that it was thought fit, in the providence of God, that he who should be the head of the Church should have a special privilege, by Christ's prayer and promise, never to fail in faith, and that none Apostle, Bishop, or Priest, may challenge any such singular or special prerogative, either of his office or person, otherwise than joining in faith with Peter, and by holding of him. 'The danger (saith St. Leo) was common to all the apostles, but our Lord took special care of Peter, that the state of all the rest might be more sure, if the head were invincible: God so dispensing the aid of his grace that the assurance and strength which Christ gave to Peter, might redound by Peter to the rest of the apostles.' St. Augustine also: 'Christ praying for Peter, prayed for the rest, because, in the pastor and prelate, the people is corrected or commended.' And St. Ambrose writeth, that Peter, after his tentation, was made pastor of the church, because it was said to him, *Thou being converted, confirm thy brethren.* Neither was this privilege of St. Peter's person, but of his office, that he should not fail in faith, but ever confirm all others in their faith. For the church, for whose sake that privilege was thought necessary in Peter, the head thereof, was to be preserved no less afterward than in the apostle's time. Whereupon all the fathers apply this privilege of not failing, and of confirming others in faith, to the Roman Church, and Peter's successors in the same. 'To which (saith St. Cyprian) infidelity or false faith cannot come.' And St. Bernard saith, writing to Innocentius, Pope, against Abailardus the heretic, 'We must refer to your apostleship all the scandals and perils which may fall, in matters of faith specially. For there the defects of faith must be holpen, where faith cannot fail. For to what other see was it ever said, *I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith do not fail?* So say the fathers, not meaning that none of Peter's seat can err in person, understanding, private doctrine, or writings; but that they cannot, nor shall not, ever judicially conclude or give definitive sentence for falsehood or heresy against the Catholic faith, in their consistories, courts, councils, decrees, deliberations, or consultations, kept for decision and determination of such controversies, doubts, or questions of faith, as shall be proposed unto them: because Christ's prayer and promise protect them therein for confirmation of their brethren. And no marvel that our Master would have his Vicar's consistory and seat infallible, seeing even in the old law the high priesthood and chair of Moses wanted not great privilege in this case, though nothing like the church's and Peter's prerogative. But, in both, any man of sense may see the difference between the person and the office, as well in doctrine as life. Liberius in persecution might yield; Marcellinus for fear might commit adultery; Honorius might fall to heresy; and, more than all this, some Judas might creep into the office: and yet all this without prejudice to the office and seat, in which (saith St Augustine) *our Lord hath set the doctrine of truth.* Caiaphas, by privilege of his office, prophesied right of Christ, but, according to his own knowledge and faith, knew not Christ. The evangelists and other penmen of holy writ, for the execution of that function had the assistance of God, and so far could not possibly err; but that Luke, Mark, Solomon, or the rest, might not err in their other and private writings, that we say not. It was not the personal wisdom, virtue, learning, or faith of Christ's vicars that made St. Bernard seek to Innocentius the Third; St. Augustine, and the bishops of Africa, to Innocentius the First, and to Celestinus, ch. 90, 92, 95.; St. Chrysostom to the said Innocentius; St. Basil to the Pope in his time, ch. 52.; St. Hierom to Damasus, ch. 57, 80.; but it was the prerogative of their office and higher degree of unction, and Christ's ordinance, that would have all apostles and pastors in the world, for their confirmation in faith and ecclesiastical regimen, depend on Peter. The lack of knowledge, and humble acceptation of which God's providence, that is, that one is not honoured and obeyed of all the brotherhood, is the cause of all schisms, and heresies, saith St. Cyprian. A point of such importance, that all the twelve being in apostleship, like Christ, would yet, for the better keeping of unity and truth, have one to be head of them all, that a head being once appointed, occasion of schism may be taken away, saith St. Hierom, *lib.* I. *adv. Jovinian, c.* 14.'"

Fulke has a long note upon this annotation, in which he goes over and refutes the errors and absurdities contained in it; but it appears to me that any reader of common sense may refute it for himself, if he will be at the pains to read the passage in the Gospel of Luke, in conection with the history of Christ's sufferings, and the defection of Peter. They must be doctors of more than ordinary acuteness who can find in the words addressed to that apostle, in reference to his fall, a proof that he was infallible; and it must require still more acuteness to find, in these words, a proof of the infallibity of the Pope, who they say, sits in the chair of Peter.

That Peter was infallible in all that he preached and wrote, as an apostle of Christ, is not denied, but firmly maintained. He was not, however, more so than the other apostles; and Paul who was afterwards added to their number, speaks of himself as not a whit behind Peter, or any of them. He certainly did not hold his faith of Peter. The gospel which he

preached, he received not from man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ; and, as if to set aside any claim of superiority over the other apostles, which might be made on behalf of Peter, he was suffered to fall into some great mistakes, in his personal private intercourse with the believers in Antioch. He was himself by this time instructed with regard to Christian liberty. He knew that there was no sin in eating, or holding familiar intercourse, with believing Gentiles, and he had freely maintained such intercourse, Gal. ii. 11—14.; but when some Jews came from James (I suppose from Jerusalem), he was afraid that they would find fault with him for his condescension to the Gentile converts; and, instead of labouring to remove their Jewish prejudices, and not thinking how much the Gentiles would be afflicted by the circumstance, he withdrew, and separated himself from them, fearing them of the circumcision. Barnabas, and other believing Jews, were seduced by his example, and great mischief was likely to have followed, when Paul maintained the cause of truth, and righteousness, and Christian liberty, at the expense of what must have been painful to himself, withstanding Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed.

The Rhemish translators render the 11th verse,—"And when Cephas was come to Antioch, I resisted him in face, because he was reprehensible." They have a long annotation upon the humility of Peter, in condescending to be reprehended by an inferior, such as Paul, as they say a good priest, or any virtuous person, may even tell the Pope his faults; and then, upon the word *reprehensible* they have the following:—"The heretics hereof again infer, that Peter then did err in faith, and therefore the Popes may fail therein also. To which we answer, that howsoever other Popes may err in their private teachings or writings, whereof we have treated before in the annotation upon these words, *That thy faith fail not*, it is certain, that St. Peter did not here fail in faith, or err in doctrine or knowledge, for it was *conversationis non prædicationis vitium*, as Tertullian saith, *de præscript. nu.* 7. It was a default in conversation, life, or regimen, which may be committed by any man, be he never so holy, and not in doctrine. St. Augustine, and whosoever make most of it, think no otherwise of it. But St. Hierom, and many other holy fathers, deem it to have been no fault at all, nor any other thing than St. Paul himself did upon the like occasion: and that this whole combat was a set thing agreed upon between them. It is a school point much debated betwixt St. Hierom and St. Augustine, *ch.* 9, 11, 19. *apud August.*"

So, it seems, according to these fathers, Peter and Paul, like two mountebanks, agreed upon a sham dispute or combat, to amuse the people of Antioch, or to pick their pockets! Very much, indeed, like the tricks of Romish priests, but most remote from the whole conduct and character of the apostles.

Many a plain text is strained and tortured to make it appear that Peter was appointed head of the college of apostles, and universal Bishop. They make him out to have been Bishop of Rome, without any authority from the New Testament whatever, except that he dates his first epistle from Babylon.—"The church that is at Babylon saluteth you." "The ancient fathers," say the Rhemists, "namely, St. Hierom, and many more, agree that Rome is meant here by the word Babylon, as also in the xvith and xviith of the Apocalypse." So, it seems, rather than lose the honour and advantage of Peter's having been at Rome, they are content to assume the name which certainly was given to her by the Spirit of prophecy, as expressive of her unparalleled wickedness,—"Mystery, Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." And what though Peter had visited Rome, and though he had written his first epistle there? It does not follow from this that he was Bishop of Rome. But suppose for a moment that he was so; what then? Why, then, all the bishops of Rome, ever since, must have had the same authority and infallibility that Peter had; and as Peter was head over all the other apostles and of the whole church, so the Bishop or Pope of Rome is head of the church, and supreme over all her clergy!

The first thing to be established is, that our Lord appointed Peter to be head or prince of the apostles. This is proved by the Rhemists from John xvi. 17, "Feed my sheep." They give as many quotations from saints and fathers to prove Peter's supremacy from this passage, as would fill half my sheet. The substance of the argument is in the words of the translators: "And that Christ maketh a difference betwixt Peter and the rest, and giveth him some greater pre-eminence and regimen than the rest, it is plain, by that he asked whether he loved our Lord more than the other apostles do: where, for equal charge, no difference of love had been required." Thus Peter is proved to be the prince of the apostles!

Next, his supremacy over the whole church is to be proved. This is done from Luke v. 2, 3, which in their translation is,—"And he saw two ships standing by the lake: and the fishers were gone down and washed their nets. And he, going up into one ship that was Simon's, desired him to bring it back a little from the land. And sitting, he taught the multitudes out of the ship." Annotation: "*One ship, Simon's.*] It is purposely expressed that there were two ships, and that one of them was Peter's, and that Christ went into that one, and sat down in it, and that sitting, he taught out of that ship, no doubt to signify the church resembled by Peter's ship, and that in it is the

chair of Christ, and only true preaching." Thus the Church of Rome is proved to be nothing less than the ship of Peter; and who can deny that he ought to be sole commander in his own ship?

There remains to be proved that Peter was Bishop of Rome. This is not so easily done from the New Testament. That Peter ever was in Rome, is by no means certain; though the people in that city, within these few years, affected to give ocular demonstration of the fact: "A principal design of Peter's coming to Rome was to oppose Simon Magus, who, by his juggling tricks, had procured the favour of both the emperor and the people. At their first interview, the magician engaged to ascend into the air, in the presence of him and the whole city. With the help of the devil, he accordingly performed his promise; but Peter invoking the name of Jesus, the devil was so terrified, that he left Simon Magus to shift for himself; and the consequence was, that his body having a much greater predilection for the earth than heaven, made such haste downward as to break both his legs. Were any person to question the truth of this narration at Rome, the impression of the apostle's knees in the very stone upon which he kneeled on this occasion, would be shown him, and another stone still tinged with the blood of the magician." *M'Culloch, p.* 14. Allowing this to be sufficient proof of Peter's having been at Rome, where is the proof of his having been bishop of that see? There is in fact not a shadow of evidence for any such thing in the whole New Testament. Peter was the apostle of the circumcision. He received a commission, like the other apostles, to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; but he laboured principally for the conversion of sinners of his own nation, while Paul laboured chiefly among the Gentiles. Paul certainly was at Rome; but it was not consistent with the commission which he, or any of the apostles, had received, that they should be permanently fixed as bishops over one church. They appointed bishops, or elders, to be ordained in every church; they took the oversight of these, because they were divinely inspired to set in order all things in the churches, and to prescribe the duty of the office-bearers, as well as of the private members. The apostles were Christ's ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary; and they were fully qualified for this office by the Holy Spirit, who was in them, not only as he is in all believers, for their instruction, sanctification, and comfort, but also by the extraordinary gift of inspiration.

Peter was not, and from the nature of his office as an apostle, could not be, bishop of Rome: yet the whole system of Popery rests upon the assumption of this as a fact. The Pope claims all his power and authority as the successor of Peter in the see of Rome. It would be easy to show that Peter had no successor at Rome, or any where else; for the gifts of inspiration were not meant to descend from father to son, or from one bishop to another. The office of apostleship terminated with the lives of the apostles; and none can lawfully pretend to be their successors, unless they can show themselves possessed of the same power of working miracles, and of the other extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost. But, independently of this, as Peter never was bishop of Rome, the Pope's pretence of being his successor is a piece of gross imposition upon the credulity of his deluded adherents. His whole system rests upon a falsehood: and as is the foundation, so is the superstructure; it is lies and imposition throughout.

I would not be doing the Church of Rome justice, if I were to overlook one principal argument which they derive from the New Testament, to wit, from Matth. xvi. 18, 19. which the Rhemists render nearly as in our own version. "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in the heavens. And whatever thou shalt loose in earth, shall be loosed also in the heavens." On this passage they have copious annotations, intended to prove that Peter is the rock upon which the church is built; they maintain, on the authority of St. Hierom, that this rock is not Peter's person only, but his successors and his chair. "I join myself," says he, "to the communion of Peter's chair; *upon that rock I know the Church was built.* And that same apostolic chair, saith St. Augustine, that same is the rock which the proud gates of hell do not overcome." On similar authority they find that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to Peter *and his successors;*—"that is," say they, "the authority or chair of doctrine, knowledge, judgment, and discretion, between true and false doctrine: the heights of government, the power of making laws, of calling councils, of the principal voice in them, of confirming them, of making canons and wholesome decrees, of abrogating the contrary, of ordaining bishops and pastors, of deposing and suspending them; finally, the power to dispense the goods of the Church both spiritual and temporal." In short, the power granted by the gift of the keys to the Pope, as Peter's successor, is called, "in comparison of the power granted to other apostles, bishops, and pastors, *plenitudo potestatis*, fulness of power. Under the words binding and loosing, they seem to give to the Pope and his pastors all possible power in earth and heaven, with regard to the temporal and eternal state of men.

I allow that, in the words quoted from the xvith of Matthew, our Lord did confer singular

honour upon Peter; but what is all this to the Church of Rome, or to the Pope? The Church of Rome, in its best days, had no more connection with Peter, than the Church of Antioch,—perhaps not so much. Suppose it were not the truth which Peter confessed, (thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God) but the person of Peter on which the Church is built, (a very absurd supposition) what is this to the Pope of Rome? What though Christ did give the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter, and honour him to be the instrument of opening the door of the New Testament Church, by being the first to preach the good news of the glory of Christ to both Jews and Gentiles? What, I say, is this to the Pope? He has never proved his natural or ecclesiastical descent from Peter; it is impossible that he even can prove it; and all the elaborate arguments of saints and fathers, to prove the supremacy of the Pope from this passage, go for nothing.

No. VIII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 5TH, 1818.

IN my last number, I said it was very uncertain whether the apostle Peter had ever been at Rome. I do not say it is certain he never was there; for I admit there is a very early tradition of his having been in that city. It is, however, merely tradition; and no man is under any obligation to believe it. If it had even the authority of authentic history,—if it were a fact as well established as the murder of Julius Cæsar by Brutus, which it is not,—it would still be a matter of mere history, and not the subject of faith, in a religious sense. I should believe it just as I believe the fact of Cæsar's murder; but rest no religious principle or practice upon it.

The Bible is sufficient for every purpose of Christian faith and practice; and what I find not written in the sacred Volume, however true it may be as a matter of history, or however plausible as a speculative opinion, I hold it of no account whatever in determining any point in religion. The Rhemish translators are extremely angry with the Protestants for disbelieving Peter's having been at Rome, while I suppose most of them neither believe nor disbelieve it. It is a matter that cannot be ascertained; and if it could, it would be of little consequence. I shall give the Rhemists' account of the matter, with this remark, that they are generally most positive when they have the slightest ground to go upon: "Never sect-masters made more foul or hard shifts to prove or defend falsehood, than the Protestants: but on two points, about St. Peter specially, they pass even themselves in impudence. The first is, that they hold he was not preferred before the other apostles, which is against all Scripture most evidently. The second is, that he was never at Rome, which is against all the ecclesiastical histories, all the fathers, Greek and Latin, against the very sense and sight of the monuments of his seat, sepulchre, doctrine, life, and death, there. Greater evidence, certes, there is thereof, and more weighty testimony than of Romulus', Numa's, Cæsar's, or Cicero's being there: yet were he a very brutish man that would deny this to the discredit of so many writers and the whole world. Much more monstrous it is to hear any deny the other." They then give the opinions and assertions of many fathers on the subject, all of whom, however, derived their knowledge of the fact from a vague tradition; and they are by no means agreed about the time of his coming there, or how long he stayed, or when, and what death, he died. As for the proof of his being there, derived from his sepulchre, this is about as good as the story of his contest with Simon Magus, as related in my last Number; for the half of his body is at St. Peter's, in Rome, the other half at St. Paul's; he has, besides, another head at St. John's, Lateran; his under jaw, with the beard upon it, is at Poictiers, in France; many of his bones are at Trieirs; and part of his brain at Geneva, or rather was so before the days of Calvin; for he, or some other heretic, found out that this was only a pumice stone. This precious relic is now at Rome, having been brought thither by order of the Pope, after Geneva had, by her apostasy and heresy, become unworthy to retain it. It stands in the catalogue of relics thus:—"The brains of St. Peter, from Geneva. —*Note.* These are the individual brains which that arch-heretic Calvin declared were a mere pumice stone, sinning against God, the holy apostle, and his own soul."—*Philos. Lib. for June,* 1818.

The above may be considered supplementary to my last Number, in which I had not room for it. It is my earnest desire to do my opponents no injustice, which they would accuse me of doing, if I were to omit their strongest arguments in support of the fact of Peter's having been at Rome. As for his being at any time bishop of Rome, that is what I most confidently deny, and I defy the whole Church of Rome to prove it from any authentic history. Nay, I defy them to show who were the first, second, and third bishops of that see. Suppose it were admitted that Peter was the first, no one can tell who succeeded him. There is a blank in the Pope's genealogy which all the world cannot fill up.

The following short sketch of the rise and progress of the papal supremacy may be interesting to the reader. It is taken from the Philosophical Library of June last:—"The apostles and bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome, for preaching Christ

crucified, were so occupied for the space of the first three hundred years, that they had no leisure to dream of supremacy: after which time, (as rest breeds rust) by little and little they grew ambitious, and now and then one bishop or other would affect priority: so that, about the end of the next three hundred years, they began to desire primacy but not supremacy; as Polycarpe, bishop of Jerusalem, challenged the first place, 426 years after Christ. Gelacius, bishop of Rome, after him, about 445. Justin, emperor of Rome, made Misda bishop of Rome, patriarch, about 520. About the same time, John, bishop of Constantinople, was called universal bishop."—"Pelagius, bishop of Rome, was the first that challenged the primacy by Scripture. John, bishop of Constantinople, called himself universal bishop, 582. Gregory the great, bishop of Rome, first of that name, reproved John of Constantinople, for calling himself universal bishop, 591." His words are, —"I do confidently affirm, that whosoever doth call himself universal bishop, or desire to be so called, is the forerunner of Antichrist in his pride."—"Before him, John the third, bishop of Rome, declared that none should be called *summus sacerdos*, or universal bishop, about 562.

"All this while not one thought of a Pope, or of Peter's successor in Rome.

"Now Phocas, servant to Mauritius, the emperor, killed his master, the empress, and children most cruelly: at this time Boniface the third, bishop of Rome, obtained of this butcher the title to be called universal bishop, anno 607. Therefore, the primacy of the bishop of Rome was first established by a murderer and a traitor, who died afterwards most miserably; for, in 612 of Christ, he was slain by the soldiers of his guard."

Thus we see that six centuries of the Christian era elapsed before the bishop of Rome rose so high as to be called universal bishop. Where was the chair and the supremacy of Peter all this while? and who was the man that so much as imagined that the bishop of Rome was the successor of Peter, and, as such, the head of the Catholic Church? It was not till after the light of knowledge had been almost extinguished in Europe,—when artful priests could teach the people any thing they pleased without fear of being contradicted,—when they began to collect and teach, as infallible truths, the traditions, and opinions, and even the conjectures, of their predecessors, whom they honoured with the titles of saints and fathers: it was not, in short, till they found the people in a state of the most sottish ignorance, and prepared to believe any thing, that they began to put forward the claim of the bishop of Rome to be the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ, and the head of the Church.

The Papists lay great stress on the evidence of antiquity; but the evidence of real antiquity proves the Pope to be no more the successor of Peter, than of Judas Iscariot; and if the proof arising from similarity of character be of any weight, the Popes will be found to have been worthy successors of the last named apostle. But, as I have said already, the whole system of Popery rests upon the assumed fact of the Pope being the successor of Peter in the see of Rome. As this, then, is not a fact,—as Peter never was bishop of Rome, and as he never had a successor in office,—the monstrous fabric of Popish superstition and domination is left without so much as a stone to stand upon.

I have said much more on this subject than was necessary in merely replying to the letter of PAX; but, as I had my hand in the work, I thought a few hours could not be employed to better purpose than in giving a short sketch of the arrogant claims of the Romish Church, and of the arguments by which they are supported. This is a subject deeply interesting at the present time; and, I am sorry to say, it has been much neglected, even by the reading part of the community. Papists have been long working their way under ground, in order to regain the footing which they once possessed in this country. From the extreme liberality of the age, it has been reckoned a cruel thing to say a word against them; we were all willing to view Popery as now quite harmless, whatever it might have been in former ages. Papists have therefore become more bold. From the indulgence and countenance which they have received from Protestants, they can now speak, and write, and publish, the grossest calumnies against the persons and religion of Protestants, expecting that they, poor simpletons! either cannot or will not be at the pains to answer them. I have partly shown already, and I hope yet farther to show, that the Popish system is as bad as ever it was,—that it retains all its malignity and opposition to the gospel of Christ, and to the best interests of men; and that, therefore, while I maintain that it would be unlawful to injure Papists in their persons or property, I hold it to be the duty of every Christian to maintain an unceasing opposition to their whole system of false religion,—the opposition of calm and sober argument, drawn from the word of God, which ultimately will prevail.

It does not at present occur to me that I have any more to say in reply to PAX. I think I have answered every thing in his letters that required an answer, that is, almost every sentence of them. I have, however, a great deal of work before me in performing the like duty towards AMICUS VERITATIS, whose letters, in the Glasgow Chronicle, are almost as full of errors and misrepresentations as of sentences. I expect these letters, along with my own, will be republished in a few days, after which the

reader will have it in his power to form a better judgment of my reply. In the mean time, I shall indulge myself and the reader with a little miscellaneous matter.

[The miscellaneous matter mentioned in the preceding paragraph, and which extended from this page to page 70, having been the subject of a jury trial, and found injurious to private character, the proprietors have judged proper to omit in the present edition. Their only object in republishing, as they know it was Mr M'Gavin's in originally writing the work, being the sincere wish to serve the Protestant cause, by diffusing the knowledge of the truth, and by a faithful exposition of Roman Catholic errors; and as the errors of that church are not only flagrant, but substantiated by her avowed standards, there is no need of departing from them to deal in personalities or fasten odium on individuals. The passages, therefore, above referred to, are suppressed, and the blank filled up with matter of a general nature.]

The following extracts, from unquestionable documents (quoted from Dr Brownlee's "Letters on the Roman Catholic Controversy: New York, 1834,") show the infamous resources of money-raising to which Popery addresses herself, wholly for secular, sensual, or pious uses, so called; together with the immoralities to which that church lends the sanction of her authority, and that, too, very obviously for the purpose of driving a better trade, in the matters of expurgation, confession, and absolution:—

"TAXÆ CANCELLARIÆ APOSTOLICÆ; ET TAXÆ SACRÆ PŒNITENTIARIÆ, THE POPE'S BANK, OR CHANCERY TAX BOOK.

"I have before me these taxæ in two different editions; first taxæ from the archives of the 'Roman Chancery,' in the British museum, Nos. 1650, 1651, 1652. The money is marked in *Grossi;* it is in the original Latin.—Second, an edition in the original Latin, with a French translation; having the text as copied and corrected by Antoine du Pinet, Lord of Noroy, in Franchecomte. Rivet drew the exact copy of his edition from the Paris edition of the Chancery Book of A. D. 1520. Voetius also exhibits the ancient editions; and Bayle, in his Dict., article *Banck.* Claud D'Espence, a popish doctor, mentions 'Les Taxes de la Chancellarie Apostolique,' as a book well known in his day, and holds it up to odium; see his Digr. ii. ad Epist. ad Titum. cap. 1. There were three editions of the Taxæ at Paris; one is dated 1523; two at Cologne, one dated in 1532; two at Venice; one at Wirtemberg, dated 1538. The copy from which I take my extracts is printed from that of Pinet of 1564. It bears date of 1744. Several editions were published by Protestant doctors in the 17th century; they were carefully printed from the early Roman Catholic editions. No literary man now denies the authority of this genuine Romish work. I refer to the edition now before me, and the statements of Dr Drelincourt, and Mons. Bayle, in defence of its authenticity. The following is offered as a specimen, in addition to what is given page 22; the pages marked are of the edition of Pinet, which I use.

"'Absolutio, &c. Absolution, in form, for a dying person, the tax is fourteen carlins.' See p. 73. 'Absolution for a confraternity, or a *societas,* fifty carl., p. 74. 'Absolution of a priest for celebrating a clandestine marriage, seven carl.,' p. 88. 'Absolution of a priest for keeping a concubine, and a dispensation for his *irregularities,* &c., seven carlins,' p. 89. 'Absolution of a layman for keeping a concubine, eight carlins,' p. 89. (It is one carlin more wicked in him than in a 'holy priest!')

"'Absolutio pro eo qui matrem, sororem, aut aliam consanguinem, aut commatrem, carnaliter cognovit, taxatur ad quinque carlinos,' p. 89. 'Ablutio pro eo *qui virginem defloravit,* six carlins,' p. 89. 'For forging apostolical dispensations, seventeen carlins,' p. 94. 'For simony, six carlins,' p. 90. 'A layman killing any ecclesiastic less than a bishop, provided he present himself at the apostolical seat, is taxed at seven, or eight, or nine carlins,' p. 94. 'For a layman killing a layman, five carlins,' p. 96.

"From Titulo XX. I copy the following. 'Absolution for him who has killed his father, his mother, his brother, sister, wife, or other relative, tax is five carlins, provided he be a layman; if any of them be of clerical rank, he must, besides that fine, visit the apostolic seat,' p. 97, 98. In Titulo XXI., entitled 'Additions of Absolutions,' this crime is taxed at 'one ducat, five carlins,' p. 102. 'For striking one's wife and causing a miscarriage, eight carlins,' p. 98. 'For a woman to use poisons to cause abortion, tax five carlins,' p. 99. In Titulo XXI., p. 103, the female doing this 'is taxed one ducat, six carlins.' 'For pushing oneself into holy orders without the bishop's license, tax two ducats,' p. 102. 'For a priest who stikes another priest after mass, three ducats,' p. 103. 'But if he beat him before he celebrated the mass, the tax is two ducats,' p. 103. (In the first case, the wafer-god is in him; in the last, it is not!)

"'Absolution and permission to bury a suicide in holy ground, one ducat, nine carlins,' p. 104. 'For a priest entering holy orders by simony, four ducats, four carlins,' p. 105. 'For an abbot or bishop killing a man, his tax is fifty tournois, twelve ducats, six carlins,' p. 123. 'For killing a bishop, or abbot, or any superior prelate, the tax is thirty-six tournois, nine ducats,' p. 136. These are among 'the *additional* taxes.'

"In Titulo XXXII. and XXXIII. I find the following;—'Absolution for a man killing a wife, the same as killing a father or mother,

four tournois, one ducat, eight carlins, p. 139. 'Dispensation to the man who has killed his wife, to marry another wife, the tax is eight tournois, nine carlins,' p. 139. 'For killing an infant, four tournois, one ducat, nine carlins,' p. 139.

"'Absolution for theft, sacrilege, burning houses, rapine, perjury, thirty-six tournois, nine ducats,' p. 145. 'Absolution of a priest for the most licentious deeds, thirty-six tournois, three ducats,' p. 154. 'Absolution and dispensation for a priest keeping a concubine, twenty-one tournois, five ducats, six carlins.' 'Absolution of a nun for fornication, thirty-six tournois, five ducats,' p. 155. 'Absolution of an adulterer, four tournois.' 'Absolution of a layman *for any act of uncleanness*, six tournois, two ducats,' p. 156.

"This is a specimen of the Pope's Chancery Book, which was ordered, by papal authority, to be denied, and held up by all priests, '*as a wicked forgery of the Protestants.*' But editions still exist in Europe that were printed in 1520. Of course it could not have been invented by them. Besides, as we have hinted already, Romish doctors of more pure morals have declaimed against it, as a regular, authorized book. And it is an historical fact, that this denial was not given out until it was discovered by the Papists that the book had fallen into the Protestants' hands! But why deny the book of tariff, when every one who goes to confession *does pay;* and every friend of souls in purgatory *must pay*, for masses to bring them out!

"I beg leave to add one curious quotation. At the end of the chapter of 'Absolutions to marry within a certain degree,' and 'in case of divorces,' it is added,—'*Note well: graces and dispensations of this kind are not conceded to the poor: because they have no means, therefore they cannot be comforted!*' See folio XXIII., edit. of 1520; and p. 208, edit. of 1625; also folio CXXX., edit. of 1545; and p. 19 of the edition which I use.

"It appears that in each country the priests adapted the tax to the current money of the realm, and to the poorer or richer circumstances of the knaves who applied for relief, and a good bargain in this popish 'traffic of human souls.' —See Revel. xviii. 13.

"GROSS IMPURITY ENJOINED BY POPES AND COUNCILS.

"In the Decretals of Gratian, Dist. 39, we have the following canon from the council of Toledo:—'Qui non habit uxorem, loco illius concubinam habere *debet*. He who has not a wife *ought*, in the place of one, to have a concubine.'

"In the seventeenth canon of that council it was enacted,—'Christiano habere licitum est unam tantum aut uxorem, aut certe loco uxoris concubinam. It is lawful for a Christian to have only one wife, or certainly, in the place of a wife, a concubine.' Pithou Corpus Jur. canon, p. 47, Paris edit, 1687. Binius, Concil. Tom. i. p. 737, 739, 740, states the same; and adds, that the canons of this council were confirmed by Pope Leo. Edgar's Var. of Popery, p. 503. This permission, says Gianon, extends to the clergy and laity; Hist. of Naples, xi. 7.

"Behold the imposing claims of *sanctity* admirably demonstrated! And we are not copying the doctrines and practices of the *dark ages*. POPERY NEVER CHANGES TO THE BETTER! This is the immutable law of its nature! And no well informed man, nor any who has travelled in popish countries, needs to be told this. Men who read not on this subject, and who think less, and those who have none of the genuine Roman Catholic books, but who draw some superficial views from some of their amiable and liberal Catholic neighbours and friends, are seen to labour under fatal mistakes in this matter. They believe the Romish sect *to be improved and reformed!* My humble prayer to God is, that he would open their eyes, and convince them of their error. I declare with deep solemnity, and I appeal to ancient and modern history for evidence,—that *the popery of Rome never has altered, never can alter for the better, without being destroyed and annihilated.* The Romish church claims immutability and infallibility. She appeals to God, and says she never has erred, never committed deadly sins, never has changed, never has reformed, nor has ever needed reformation!

"Every man who has been in Italy, in Spain, in Portugal, in Switzerland, in South America, and Mexico, has seen this inscription on the fronts of the various churches, even to this day, 'Plenary indulgences sold here,' at such and such prices. Again—'The bishop of———— sells indulgences here,' at—such and such *low* prices. 'An English gentleman,' said my friend Dr. Avery, 'was with me at Naples, and on reading the sign over the *Indulgence shop*, he went in and gravely purchased, for a small sum, an indulgence to do any sin for *one hundred days!*

"I would beg those men who think so favourably of modern popery to read Dr Moore's 'Tour in Europe,' and Graham's 'Rome in the Nineteenth Century.' I refer to 'Rome as it Is, a Tour in Italy, by Miss Morton:' she finds and pronounces Italy a large nation of atheists! Also Lady Morgan's 'Rome in the Nineteenth Century.'"

No. IX.

A PARABLE.

THE following vigorously-written parable is extracted from the Rev. Dr Brownlee's "Letters

on the Roman Catholic Controversy," published at New York in 1833-4.

Once upon a time, the good St Peter was sitting, in the cool of the morning, under a rich clustering vine in the lovely green vale of Jehosaphat, and in earnest discourse with a friend. The holy apostle, and he, had retired from the dust and heat of Jerusalem; and they were discussing an important question, in a grave and solemn manner befitting such men. The apostle's friend was a chief priest; a noted man, and a bosom friend to Nicodemus. His faith had been shaken in the Jewish system; and he was devoutly inquiring how he should arrive fully at the truth and be saved. He had discovered with no small degree of alarm, that the truth was no longer in the Jewish system and church. The pure word of God the Jewish doctors had impiously displaced, and rendered void by the fatal traditions of their fathers. The pure system of Moses was no longer honoured and received by them; and with a singular inconsistency, what was abolished in the ceremonial law, they now clung to with great obstinacy. The high priest and his associates in despotism, had usurped power over the souls and consciences of men; they set no bounds to their avarice, pride, and luxury. They traded "in the souls of men;" they even professed to open heaven and shut the gates of hell, at the ecclesiastical chancery prices! They sold pardons and permissions to sin at all rates; from Judas's sum of thirty shekels up to the talent of silver, and the lordly talent of gold!

"The temple is converted into a house of merchandise,—my dear Peter," said the chief priest, as he fanned his burning brow with his snow-white turban,—"In the midst of this universal corruption, the kingdom of God I cannot find. Now inasmuch as he declared to our father Abraham, that his church should never fail, and repeated it to David, and all the prophets, and it would be mockery to look for it amid the universal corruptions of our high priests, and our chief priests, and rulers of the synagogue; it must be found somewhere else, it must be found in *the new upstart, Christian church* just organized; or is it not to be found even there?"

St Peter opened up to him the Scriptures, and went on comparing the Old Testament doctrines with those of Christ, in order to show him that this *new reformed upstart church, the Christian church, alone* held the whole and only genuine truths of God. And he was patiently bringing home to his heart, with many prayers, these apostolical instructions; and instructing him in the right way of the Lord God of his fathers; while he kept a strict eye on a singular, suspicious, and ill-looking stranger, who had entered the arbour, and had placed himself not far from them. He was bedecked in a fantastic dress, of many colours, neither exactly Jewish, nor altogether Gentile in its shape; and there was a wildness in his looks and antic gestures, which indicated the phrenzy of a madman, or to say the least, the air of a designing knave!

St Peter went on discoursing of the trinity, the incarnation, the atonement, faith and repentance; and the justification of a sinner by faith in Christ without the deeds of the law; and thence the absolute necessity of good works and a holy life. He was very particular in showing him that God only is the supreme Lord of the conscience; that no human or ghostly power on earth, should be permitted by any who calls himself a man, and not a dumb brute, to usurp power over the conscience, or dictate a form of religion to it. "Think, read, judge, decide for yourself. None of the Jewish priests, nor any priest under these heavens, can dare to prescribe to your conscience; go to God's law, and word, and his inspired apostles. God speaks: listen, obey; and count that man an emissary of the devil, fresh from the burning lake, who would dare to lord it over your conscience; to offer to appease God for you; or to pardon your sins for a few Jerusalem coppers! He is the arch-impostor—the antichrist; of which our beloved brother John will tell you more fully."

Here the singular stranger grew so impatient, that he could no longer contain himself; and he rudely cut short the apostle's discourse, by abruptly crying out—"Do you call me the impostor or the antichrist?" Then addressing himself to the chief priest, for he was evidently a stranger to St Peter,—he besought him not to give heed to one word uttered by that "*hoary-headed deceiver;*" for the holy order of the high priest, and the chief priests, have the entire keeping of men's consciences. And they negotiate with Heaven the whole of man's salvation for a *moderate consideration.*—But I am forgetting myself. To give divine efficacy to my words, and confound all heretics, I must have in my soul *the intention;* and on my body the consecrated apostolical raiment, such as St Peter the prince and pope, were he present,—would laud and bless;" and upon that he applied himself to the work.

He rose up and made certain genuflections, and prostrations to the east and west; he then decked himself out in party-coloured patches and rags, of red, purple, and white, and green; and putting on a thing resembling three crowns on his head, he went to an adjoining thicket, and cut a tall rod, the top of which he twisted into a shepherd's crook. And coming gravely up, he stood with a solemn, demure, half-crying countenance, for a few moments; then whispered—"Now I have got the *unction of holy intention;* now for the grace-procuring gestures and genuflections." And with that he applied himself gravely to a succession of bodily exercises, *forty-five* in number; sometimes he bowed; then he kneeled; then he elevated his

arms aloft. And having counted his *forty-fifth*, he sat down quite out of breath. "Now," said he, "what I am going to say, no one dare gainsay, under peril of salutary *cold steel* and the *hot fire*,—to wit, heading and burning! This crown, the emblem of power, and this sceptre, the symbol of pastoral qualification and care, God Almighty made with his own hands; and with his own hands he placed on my head, and in these hands!"

The apostle would have interrupted him;—but he silenced him with an outrageous clamour; and he went on engrossing the whole conversation to himself. "I am God's vice-god upon earth; I am supreme: by me kings and priests reign and act; I am the lord of the human conscience: God has put this ghostly power in my unworthy hands, who am a servant of servants."—And while the words of humility were on his lips, he tossed his sceptre; and waved his lordly triple crown on high,—then he went on;—"The revelation which God has given to the Hebrews and the Christians, derives all its authority and all its evidence from ME; it is the word of God if I say it; it is not if I say *nay:* I add to it and I take away, and who shall set bounds to this spiritual sceptre! I have the keys of hell and death! I open heaven; and I open hell! I shut them both as I WILL! Through me alone God speaks! Through me alone men shall apply to God. I am on earth what the Almighty is in heaven! Hence I have power to alter what Christ did establish; I can add to his doctrines, when it can be made profitable to bring in much gold. I can add as many sacraments as I please to his humble and plain *two*. For this is also profitable,—if not for doctrine, at least for establishing my supreme power over the souls of my slaves and minions, and they also bring much silver and gold to our coffers; then *gold* brings *might;* and *might*, according to sound ghostly policy, always makes *right!* These are the maxims of my court!"

Here the wrath of St Peter was kindled fiercely against him. He had hitherto set him down in his own mind as stark mad, and he had viewed him with pity. But as he went on in detail, he saw that he was a knave, possessed with a legion of raving devils! "Who is he?" said he to his host, "Verily I know him not;" —said the horror-stricken chief priest, "I took him for some of your friends; then in my mind I thought him a poor demoniac, humbly following in order to get the devil cast out of himself; he frequently, I thought, mentioned your name and your authority. I suspect he was a noted companion of Judas Iscariot!" "Who are you? who sent you, sirrah?" cried St Peter, addressing him in terms of strong indignation, and unsubduable zeal for God's glory.

"Who am I?" replied he, slowly and solemnly:—"I am the spouse of the church; and the church is my chaste and beautiful spouse;—God's vicegerent, and the infallible vicar of Christ; I am come from holy St Peter, the prince of the apostles."

"Your proof, sirrah!" said St Peter. "There is my proof!" said he gravely; and he held out a roll of parchment: "I certify this roll to be the true and genuine roll, and deed of right and power, conveyed to me, through lord pope St Peter, from God!"

"Very well, sir, impostor," said Peter,—"you certify for that *roll's* authenticity; then, pray, who certifies for *you?*" "Why, look you here,—my pity on your weakness, old man; only inspect this roll, and it will tell all about me, and fully certify that I am the only legal claimant."

"And what then, sir knave, will you do, if we ridicule this ludicrous reasoning in a circle?" said Peter. "Why, I'll tell thee, hoary-headed doubter, if any one expresses a doubt, I have the sword, the axe, the fire, and the stake! like the sword of earthly kings, this is my holy spiritual weapon; my *ultima ratio!* my unanswerable argument!

"What is your object," replied St Peter; "for you are a creature I never to my knowledge saw before,—is it your object to save men's souls?" "That is a *secondary* object." "What is your *primary* object then? You may suppose me to be your St Peter, and tell me." "You St Peter!—you a plain fisherman, St Peter!—why, St Peter wore his red and purple, and fine white robes, and his golden mitre! Christ made him Prince of the Apostolical College!" "Thou art stark mad, I tell thee," said St Peter; "but go on—dost thou set up thy kingdom solely to save men?" "Yes; I save them in the way of making a good job of it." "But now, I pray thee, go on."

"Why, heaven is a great way off, and the way is very steep, and my flock are not very steady, or moral sometimes." "Very well," said St Peter; "you lead them to the fountain of the Redeemer's blood, I hope." "It is far easier, I tell thee, ignorant man, to lead them to a basin of *holy water*." "Holy water!" cried St Peter; "I do not know that thing; and never heard of it before—but do you not teach the holy atonement to be the *only sacrifice* for the sins of man?" "No, no; we are inventing a thing called the *mass*, though it will take centuries to get men so well taught, as to leave me all the right of thinking for them; and then take my bare word for everything; to call black white, and the Devil Christ, if I only say it!" "*The mass!*" said St Peter; "that is perfectly new to me: the Master never said a word of it; he appointed the holy supper to commemorate his death, and his one real and perfect atonement."

"You know nothing at all," cried the wild man; "*We* need not the atonement of Christ; *we* offer up in the mass daily, a sacrifice for the quick and dead, to appease God!" "Hold

in silence thy blaspheming lips," cried St Peter; "thou must be *the Antichrist!* But what said you about getting your people near the *far distant heaven?*" "Why, we make a sacrifice for them; and what is defective in that we make up by putting the deceased souls into *purgatory;* and there a smart burning of well applied flames consumes in a salutary manner all their sins and follies." "Well, that we know is taken from the abominable heathen; but you do not mean to say, that it has anything to do with us Christians? I never taught it; and the Master never spoke of it; this he said, —'The blood of Jesus washes all sins away.' That is God's only purgatory that I ever heard of; for there is no other Saviour than Jesus. But what get you for all this? Are your holy water, and masses, and purgatory, a free job?"

"Oh! no; we save souls in the way of making gold and silver, and building up our power! If we condescend to spare the time from our luxuries and pleasures, souls should be very thankful, and pay their fees with less grumbling!" "And as you have added *five* new sacraments," said St Peter; "do you bestow grace through them free to all, and *gratis?*" "Oh no; there is no divine efficacy in one of them, unless the Church's dues be paid; it is the Church's dues; it is *St Peter's pence!*" "So, then, this marvellous and newly invented system is all adapted to make gain—these shepherds shear the sheep, and flay them, and take all the milk to themselves! I thought that our Master said—'Ho! every one that thirsteth, come drink; come without money, and without price;' God's word says this." "That may be," said the demon, "but times shall be changed: these *were* Christ's laws; but I speak now of *our Holiness's* laws." "Why, the Master had his children mainly among the poor," said St Peter; "and to the poor is the gospel preached." "No, no; *our* infallibles declare, that the rich can buy pardons for any space,—limited only by the limit of money; *where that stops short, reprobation begins!* Know ye not, that the streets of heaven are paved with gold? As we have the laying out of the city, and, of course, all *the paving,* how can we have the paving of gold ready in every street, unless the people give us *their gold!*" "Marvellously said," whispered St Peter; "now do I see whither we have got; but repeat what thou saidst about a certain *St Peter.*" "Why, St Peter was the Prince of the apostles, infallible, and"—"Ah!" cried the apostle, interrupting him, "where gottest thou that novelty?"—"Aye, Prince he must have been, because he was a blundering, forward man!" "*Infallible* too!" added the humble apostle, with deep sorrow; "they have got me to be what I never heard of from the Master:—*infallible,* verily! Ah! this mockery is offered because I did deny my Lord! I am humbled and mortified," continued he; "they call *me infallible,* and *Prince,* I suppose, because Paul sternly rebuked me, and showed himself justly my superior! But, go on," added he aloud; "after this ebullition, what shall we hear next, I wonder?" "Why, we select St Peter to be the foundation of our Church." "The blessed Master keep me out of such a Church, with such a rotten foundation," exclaimed St Peter, with holy indignation. "Give me, O my blessed God, give me grace to belong to that Church that is built on the ROCK of eternity, the Lord Jesus Christ! That is the Christian Church," cried St Peter: "And that is the only pure, and immutable Church, which I also long to be a member of," said the pious chief priest; "but, go on; let us hear all!" "You know nothing," cried the demoniac in reply; "did I not lay hold of *holy intention?* Do I not stand up in my sanctified robes? Am I not, therefore, infallible? If you doubt, you shall be damned by me! I will cast you into purgatory; and none of my holy priests shall pray you out, unless for a ruinous sum from your heirs."

Here, the apostle eyeing the motley buffoon from head to foot, burst into a loud laughter; but suddenly recollecting himself, he said—"I am determined to hear the possessed madman out. Go on; I will not interrupt thy extravagance: the pagan kings claim power over sun, moon, and stars; but thou art the wild beast whose tail sweeps the third part of the stars from heaven; and with thy paws thou throwest men into sheol! Go on, I pray thee."

"Having laid my foundation of empire on St Peter, I shall go forth to subdue all nations, kingdoms, tongues, and countries. My power extends to all the world, and all heaven, and all hell."

Here the apostle sprang up from his seat; he could not stand it. "Nay, then, Sir Gascon, have done at last; I see who thou art. Our sovereign and blessed Master, Jesus Christ, warned us of the great *Western maniac prince,* who would be intoxicated with the blood of the saints. The system was conceived and plotted in hell; and thou art the demon let loose for a season, and charged with the execution of it! Already, I see, art thou wandering to and fro through the earth, and hatching thy diabolical plots. Now, hear me, I *am St Peter!* and had not the Master drawn the veil over thy mind, thou mightest have known me." Then, by a holy impulse, he laid the glorious system of *the truth of Christ,* as opposed to *the system of Antichrist,* before the vigorous intellect of the mischievous demon. It shone brilliantly, as a polished steel mirror of the daughters of Judah; the truth beamed from it with unutterable brightness, and flashed over his guilty conscience and heart.

The demon, who is the soul and spirit of Antichrist, cast his small, sunk, and twinkling

eyes, first on St Peter, with fear and terror; and then on all the objects around him, exclaiming—"Art thou come, then, to betray in thy apostolical writings, and those of thy associates, the secret of our kingdom, which I have thoughtlessly blabbed out! Art thou come to torment me and mine before the time?" Then, with a hollow scream, he fainted away under the beams of truth; and a sweeping whirlwind, and vivid flashes of fire, and roaring of thunder—the symbol of heaven's irresistible vengeance—swept him away down the vale into the Dead sea!

CENSORSHIP OF BOOKS.

The censorship of books originated with the Roman Catholic priesthood. The council of Lateran extended the censure to all kinds of books; the council of Trent confirmed this decree; the Index Expurgatorius is accordingly the catalogue of the works which are proscribed, and which are every where taken from the faithful, and given up to the inquisition.

Dr Doyle, in a pamphlet, entitled "A Vindication of the Religious and Civil Privileges of the Irish Catholics, by I. K. L.," makes the following false statement:—"A committee of the council (that is, of Trent,) was appointed to consider and report to the council of the books then in circulation, and what regulation ought to be adopted with regard to them. The report of the committee was not made till the last day of the last or second session; and as the synod could not then discuss the subject of the report, they referred it to the pope. The Index, therefore, or list of books to be prohibited, with the rules annexed, was not sanctioned by the council of Trent, and that which was afterwards published by the pope, and which included such translations of the sacred Scriptures as were not approved of by the proper authorities has not the force of a church law, unless in those countries where it has been published and received."

The reply to this is brief and simple. The council delegated its power to the committee, the committee delegated its power to the pope, and both that pope and his successors, confirming the decision, have exercised that power accordingly.

Let it be noted that the very first book in this list is, "Bacon de Augmentis Scientiarum!" the "Paradise Lost" of Milton, and Locke on the "Human Understanding," follow.

Locke is prohibited by the inquisition, "because the doctrines contained therein destroy the true notions of moral good and evil, leaving men in the state as depicted by Hobbes, Espinosa, and other impious characters, and tend to naturalism and atheism." *

* Edict of the Inquisition of Seville, 26th Feb., 1804.

The inquisition likewise prohibited the last six volumes of Condillac's Cours d'Etudes pour l'Instruction du Prince de Parme, "because it contains heretical propositions, scandalous ones, tending to disturb public peace, injurious to the high pontiffs and the supreme secular powers, especially to our catholic kings and lords.

No. X.

SATURDAY, September 19th, 1818.

At the close of the last number it was stated that the censorship of books originated with the Roman Catholic priesthood. "The inveterate enmity," says Mr White, "of a sincere Roman Catholic against books which directly or indirectly dissent from his church, is unconquerable. There is a family in England who, having inherited a copious library under circumstances which make it a kind of heirloom, have torn out every leaf of the protestant works, leaving nothing in the shelves but the covers. This fact I know from the most unquestionable authority.

"This, however, will not for a moment appear wonderful to those who consider that all men are without the pale of popery who presume to exercise their reason in matters of religion. Bossuet says, '*The heretic is he who has an opinion*, for such is the meaning of that word. But what are we to understand by having an opinion? It is the following of our own fancy and particular sentiment. But the catholic is—catholic; that is universal, who, without maintaining any particular sentiment, hesitates not to follow the doctrine of the church.'

"This indeed he does most blindly, (and this is fortunate for his ease and quiet;) for popery, which refuses him the Bible in his vernacular tongue, presents to him the Vulgate, which is notoriously erroneous; and though the editions of Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. are full of contradictory translations, both were ordered to be received by these popes respectively—both are enjoined under a curse.

"Cardinal Toletus asserts 'that if a rustic believes his bishop proposing a heretical tenet for an article of faith, such belief is meritorious.' Cardinal Cusanus tells us, 'that irrational obedience is the most consummate and perfect obedience, when we *obey without attending to reason, as a beast obeys his driver*. The same cardinal further asserts, that 'there are no precepts of Christianity but those that are received as such by the church [of Rome.] *When the church changes her judgment, God changes his judgment likewise.*'

"Popery, however, hesitates not to approve, even in the name of God and the whole hea-

venly host, of any work calculated to promote its interests. Accordingly, the life of Veronica of Burasco by F. Joan Freire, was licensed by the Definidor in Portugal, as a book deserving to be printed, becaue it had been inspected and reinspected by angels, and approved of by God, (ja visto e revisto pellos anjos, e aprovado por Dios.)

"But it would be endless," says Mr White, "to trace all the links, of which the inquisition has formed the chain that binds and weighs down the human mind among us. Acquiescence in the voluminous and multifarious creed of the Roman church is by no means sufficient for safety. A man who closes his work with the O. S. C. S. R. E. *(Omnia sub correctione Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ)* may yet rue the moment when he took pen in hand. Heterodoxy may be easily avoided in writing; but who can be sure that none of his periods *smacks of heresy* (sapiens hæresim)—none of his sentences are of that uncouth species which is *apt to grate pious ears* (piarum aurium offensas)? Who then will venture upon the path of knowledge, where it leads straight to the inquisition?

"To expect," continues Mr White, "a rational system of education where the inquisition is constantly on the watch to keep the human mind within the boundaries which the Church of Rome, with respect to divines, has set to its progress, would show a perfect ignorance of the character of our religion.

"Popery has debased the fine imagination of Italy. Popery has banished the chivalry of Spain, with the science of her Arab conquerors. Popery has thrown its portion of Germany behind Protestant Germany, as many centuries as Ireland is behind England. Such also has been the case with the respective portions of other countries—of the popish countries of Switzerland compared with the protestant ones, of Savoy compared with Geneva, &c. Popery has moreover bound its iron chain around the hearts of the Irish peasantry, and made them the slaves of an artful and disloyal priesthood.

"In fine, the result of this hatred to knowledge is, that, with the exception of France, every popish state will be found to be behind every protestant state in civilization.—And why is France thus an exception? For this single reason, that the French naturally are by no means a religious people; and that, in that country, religion is an affair only of state or of fashion. The condition of Italy is lower, because notwithstanding the greater natural talent of Italians crushed only by internal division, and their seeing the papal system so close as to contemn it, still the mass of the people are more popish than the French. The condition of Spain and Portugal is lowest, because they are the slaves of popery."

Can any one wonder at the uncivilized—the debased state of Popish countries, when he is informed by an excellent observer, that the following is the day of a popish gentleman?

"Every church," says Mr White, "may be compared to a great school or establishment for religious education. I will represent to you a pupil of that school, that you may infer what is taught in it, and I will draw the picture from various Roman Catholics whom I have intimately known.

"Imagine my Romanist friend retiring to his bed in the night.—The walls of the room are covered with pictures of all sizes. Upon a table there is a wooden or brass figure of our Saviour nailed to the cross, with two wax candles, ready to be lighted at each side. Our Romanist carefully locks the door; lights up the candles, kneels before the cross, and beats his breast with his clenched right hand, till it rings again in a hollow sound.

"It is probably a Friday, a day of penance: the good man looks pale and weak, I know the reason—he has made but one meal on that day, and that on fish; had he tasted meat, he feels assured he should have subjected his soul to the pains of hell!

"But the mortifications of the day are not over.—He unlocks a small cupboard, and takes out a skull, which he kisses and places on the table at the foot of the crucifix. He then strips off part of his clothes, and with a scourge, composed of small twisted ropes hardened with wax, lays stoutly to the right and left, till his bare skin is ready to burst with accumulated blood.

"The discipline, as it is called, being over, he mutters several prayers, turning to every picture in the room.

"He then rises to go to bed; but, before he ventures into it, he puts his finger into a little cup which hangs at a short distance over his pillow, and sprinkles with the fluid it contains, the bed and the room in various directions, and finally moistens his forehead in the form of a cross. The cup, you must know, contains holy water, water in which a priest has put some salt, making over it the sign of the cross several times, and saying some prayers, which the church of Rome has inserted for this purpose in the mass book.

"The use of that water, as our Roman Catholic has been taught to believe, is to prevent the devil from approaching the places and things which have been recently sprinkled with it; and he does not feel himself safe in his bed without the precaution which I have described. The holy water has, besides, an internal and spiritual power of washing away venial sins—those slight sins, I mean, which, according to Romanists, if unrepented, or unwashed away by holy water, or a sign of a cross made by the hand of a bishop, or some other five or six methods, which I will not trouble you with, will keep the venial sinner in purgatory for a certain time.

"The operations of the devout Roman Catholic are probably not yet done.—On the other side of the holy water cup there hangs a frame holding a large cake of wax, with figures raised by a mould, not unlike a large butter pat. It is an Agnus Dei, blessed by the pope, which is not to be had except it can be imported from Rome. I believe the wax is kneaded with some earth from the place where the bones of the supposed martyrs are dug up. Whoever possesses one of these spiritual treasures, enjoys the benefit of a great number of indulgences; for, each kiss impressed on the wax gives him the whole value of fifty or one hundred days employed in doing penance and good works; the amount of which is to be struck off the debt which he has to pay in purgatory.

"I should not wonder if our good man, before laying himself to sleep, were to feel about his neck for his rosary or beads, perhaps he has one of a particular value, and like that which I was made to wear next my skin, when a boy. A priest had brought it from Rome, where it had been made, if we believe the certificates, of bits of the stones with which the first martyr, Stephen, was put to death.

"Being satisfied that the rosary hangs still on his neck, he arranges its companion, the scapulary, formed of two square pieces of the stuff which is exclusively worn by some religious order. By means of the scapulary, he is assured either that the virgin Mary will not allow him to remain in purgatory beyond the Saturday next to the day of his death; or he is made partaker of all the penances and good works performed by the religious of the order to which the scapulary belongs.

"At last, having said a prayer to the angel who, he believes, keeps a constant guard over him, the devout Romanist composes himself to sleep, touching his forehead, his breast, and the two shoulders, to form the figure of a cross.

"The prayer and ceremonies of the morning are not unlike those of the night.

"Armed with the sprinkling of holy water, he proceeds to mass. If it happen to be one of the privileged days in which souls may be delivered out of purgatory, you will see him saying a certain number of prayers at different altars. He will repeat his rosary in honour of the virgin Mary, dropping through his fingers either fifty-five or seventy-seven beads, which are strung in the form of a necklace.

"There may be a blessing with the sacrament, which the good Catholic will not lose, for the sake of the plenary indulgence which the pope grants to such as are present. On that occasion, you would see him kneeling and beating his breast, while the priest, in a splendid cloak of silk and gold, in the midst of lighted candles and the smoke of frankincense, makes the sign of the cross with a consecrated wafer, enclosed between two pieces of glass set in gold.

"It would, indeed, be an endless task were I to enumerate all the methods and contrivances of this kind recommended by the church of Rome to all her members, and practised by all who are not careless of their spiritual concerns.

"These are facts which no honest Roman Catholic will venture to deny. I therefore ask, whether, since revelation is the only means we have of distinguishing between religion and superstition—between things and acts which really can influence our manner of being when we shall be removed to the invisible world, and fanciful contrivances which there is no reason to suppose connected with our spiritual welfare—I ask whether the whole system of the church of Rome, for the attainment of Christian virtue, is not a chain of superstitious practices calculated to accustom the mind to imaginary fear, and fly to the church for fanciful remedies."

If Popery were Christianity, I should rejoice in its propagation. If the Priests of Rome were employed in showing men the way of salvation by free grace, through the righteousness of a crucified Saviour;—if they were labouring to instruct and edify those who believe in him;—if they were themselves examples of being dead to the things of this world, and alive to those of another;—if they were, in short, like the apostles of Christ, whose successors they profess to be, I would contemplate no danger, but much benefit to society, from the increase of their number. But every one acquainted with the subject knows, that the reverse of this is the case. Popery is not Christianity, but the counterfeit of it. It is Antichrist; that is, against Christianity. The priests of that religion are not employed in preaching salvation by free grace, but by the merit of men's own doings; they are not labouring to instruct the people, but to keep them in ignorance; and instead of being, like the apostles, dead to this world, and alive to another, their greatest efforts are directed to the things of this world: how they may extort money from their deluded adherents, and how they may promote the reign of ignorance and *error*. The propagation of this religion, therefore, and the multiplication of its priests, are evils to be deprecated as much as the introduction of the plague into the country. They are the pests * of human society; and wherever they shall obtain a footing, farewell to every social and domestic comfort.

---

* Perhaps some will consider this the language of abuse. It is, however, no more than plain truth: and so far as regards the Jesuits, my assertion is confirmed by all the Courts in Europe, who procured the suppression of the order about the middle of the last century. The present Pope has, however, restored it; and the mischievous effects that shall follow, will, no doubt, engage the attention of future historians.

But how, it will be asked, can we prevent the increase of Popery? I confess I know no way but that of promoting the knowledge of real Christianity among the people; and forbearing to give any countenance or encouragement to Popish ceremonies and worship. Some will perhaps be surprised that I should speak of promoting the knowledge of real Christianity among the people of a *Christian* country; but their surprise would cease, if they would consider the real state of the people in general, with regard to religious knowledge. They are not all Christians who are called Christians; and those who are Christians only in name, are in the greatest danger of taking up with any counterfeit of Christianity that may be artfully imposed upon them, or that may soothe and quiet their consciences, while they continue to live in sin. Popery is exactly such a religion as persons of this description are prepared to embrace.

Without going further from home, I shall suppose one to make the following experiment:—Let him go to the Green of Glasgow, on a Sabbath evening: among the hundreds of men and women whom he will see there, he will not find one in ten who can give him a proper answer to the simple question—What is real Christianity? or, what is the gospel of Christ? Yet these are all Christians in their own esteem, and would be affronted should any one refuse them the name. Let him make a more extensive survey: let him go through all the parishes in Scotland: let him even make his inquiries of the people whom he meets coming from church on a Sabbath-day: he will, no doubt, find among the church-going people more religious knowledge than among those who spend their Sabbath evenings on our Green; but still he will be obliged to come to the conclusion, that the proportion is but small that can tell him what real Christianity is; or, what is the gospel of Christ.

I shall suppose an artful, well-informed Papist, (and many of them are such,) going to our Green on a Sabbath evening, and entering freely into conversation with all he meets: I could venture to assure him, that he would not find one in a hundred who could tell why he is a Protestant, or make any sensible reply to his arguments in support of Popery. Nay more, that I may not be charged with drawing my conclusion from the state of knowledge among the lower classes of society, I shall suppose one going into our coffee-room in the busiest hour of the day, and putting the same questions—What is real Christianity? What is the gospel of Christ? Why are you a Protestant? And I question if one in ten would give a sensible answer, unless it were, that he could not tell.

The melancholy fact is, that a large proportion of our population, of all ranks, are *not Protestants* from a conviction of those truths on which the Protestant religion rests, as opposed to that of Rome: shall I say, *not Christians*, from a belief of that truth on which the Church of Christ is built? Now, with regard to such, they are prepared to go over to Rome, whenever her religion shall become respectable and popular.

I said I know no way of preventing this, but, first, by promoting the knowledge of real Christianity. Let the number of evangelical preachers be increased; let them be encouraged and supported in preaching the gospel in all parts of the country. Every obstruction thrown in the way of this belongs to Antichrist, and subserves the cause of Popery. The sooner, therefore, it is removed the better. Christ says, "Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to every creature;" and who is that servant of Christ who dares to say, Ye shall NOT preach the gospel *in my parish?* The preaching of the gospel is the divinely appointed means of turning men from idols to serve the living God: it is, therefore, the means which God has appointed to turn men from Popery, or to preserve them from being deceived by it. The success of some eminent ministers of the Church of Scotland, and of some zealous Dissenters, in preaching the gospel of late years in the Highlands, shows what might be expected from the united exertions of all Christian ministers, accompanied by the divine blessing, which the divine promise warrants them to expect. This, with the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, and the establishment of schools, is the legitimate way of opposing the progress of Popery, and it would ultimately prove effectual.

The second part of my proposal is, to give no countenance or encouragement to Popish ceremonies and worship. Much evil has been done in Glasgow, by the attendance of many of the respectable inhabitants, on Lord's days, in the Popish chapel. It has, indeed, become a fashionable lounge for a Sabbath forenoon. Heads of families can without scruple go there, and take their children with them. If one has a friend on a visit from the country, and who must see all that is to be seen in Glasgow, he must of course attend worship in the Popish chapel. If persons are entire strangers, they cannot go to one of our own churches, unless they know beforehand where to get a seat, lest they be allowed to stand in the passage: but, in the Popish chapel, they receive the most polite attention, and are instantly shown into the best seats in the house, especially if they have given silver into the plate.

It is true, many persons go out of mere curiosity, and some of them have told me that they were disgusted with the mummery which they saw, and the nonsense which they heard; but they did not tell this to the people or to the priest. Their presence was taken as a compliment; their money went to support the idolatrous system; and some who would give only

a halfpenny to the poor at the door of the parish church, would, for the honour of the thing, give sixpence or a shilling, on entering so fine a house as the chapel. The consequence of this has been that the Papists here have become more bold in declaring against our religion; and have become more sanguine in their hopes of soon seeing their own prevail. A few years ago, not one of them would have had the effrontery to publish such things against Protestants and the Reformation, as AMICUS VERITATIS has done in the Glasgow Chronicle. If Protestants be reviled and insulted by their Popish neighbours, they have themselves to blame. They ought not to have given them such flattering encouragement.

Besides, as Papists look upon theirs as the best of all possible modes of divine worship;—as they adore their own manner of performing divine service, they flatter themselves that all who witness it must also approve,—that they will in due time become admirers, and at last conform to it. Every Protestant, therefore, who honours them by his presence, contributes to confirm them in their delusion; and cherishes in them a hope that, by and by, we shall all return to the communion of the Church of Rome.

But more seriously, I do not know how any Christian can justify himself to his own conscience, after having spent part of the Sabbath in witnessing the mummery of the Popish service. We are taught to pray, "lead us not into temptation;" and to be delivered from the counsel that causes to err from the way of knowledge. But he that voluntarily puts himself in the way of hearing error, cannot, without gross hypocrisy, offer such a prayer to Him who searches the heart.

No. XI.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 26TH, 1818.

POPERY is the religion of depraved human nature. What Toplady said of Arminianism is applicable to it. Every man is born a Papist. He is born not only in a state of alienation from God, but with an innate propensity to trust in himself, or in something done by himself, or by fellow-creatures, to obtain the favour, or remove the displeasure of God. Christianity reveals a Saviour, who has obeyed and suffered in the room of the guilty; who has, in short, done every thing that was necessary to reconcile sinners to their offended Creator: and every sinner who believes in him is so reconciled. This reconciliation, however, is necessarily and invariably accompanied by a radical change in the character, as well as the state of the individual. He becomes a new creature. *He commences a new and spiritual life;*—or, to use the emphatical words of our Saviour, he is *born again:* and without this no man can see the kingdom of God. The future life of such a person is characterized by a hatred of sin, and a daily opposition to it, in all its motions and operations in his own heart, together with a love of righteousness, and an earnest desire to please and serve God. It requires nothing less than the power of the Holy Spirit to produce this change: and nothing short of this will be recognized by the righteous Judge as real Christianity.

But Popery can do very well without any change in either the state or character of persons who submit to the discipline of their ghostly fathers. By the sacrament of baptism, a priest can regenerate a sinner. This is all the change he is taught to seek; he is told that by baptism all his sins are taken away, and he is reconciled to God.* By the sacrament of penance, all the sins committed after baptism are forgiven; and by extreme unction, when he comes to die, he is assured of everlasting happiness;† or that, at the worst, he will only be detained some time in purgatory, which will be made as short as possible, if he bequeath a handsome sum to the priests, or if his surviving friend shall pay them for their prayers and masses. All the time, from his baptism till his death, the person is unconscious of any change having taken place in the state of his heart towards God, or holiness. His affections are carnal; he is in love with sin; and he continues to live in it, flattering himself that his soul is safe, because he observes all the prescribed forms of his religion.

It will be granted, that his life is much more miserable than that of the Christian who hates, and is daily striving, against sin. He lives in perpetual bondage, under the discipline of his

---

* "*Quest.* What are the effects of baptism? *Ans.* A total remission of original and actual sin, with the pains due to them. Hence no satisfaction is appointed, when adults are baptized. Again, all spiritual and supernatural gifts are given at the same time. It is an entire regeneration, or new life; it gives a right to all the other sacraments; it opens the gates to heaven; it gives a character, and cannot be reiterated. All these points are defined by the Council of Trent.—*Quest.* Is it lawful to receive baptism twice? *Ans.* No; it is not lawful, on any account, more than once, Heb. vi. ver. 4—6; and the reason is, because it imprints a spiritual character in the soul, which will remain for ever, either to our great joy in heaven, or our confusion in hell."—Let my Baptist friends look to their own safety, if Popery shall ever prevail. "*Quest.* What are the penalties of rebaptizing? *Ans.* By the old civil law, it was *death:* and now, by the canons of the church, it is irregularity, and *otherwise punishable.*"—*The real Principles of Catholics: or a Catechism for the Adult, Dublin,* 1750, p. 199.

† "*Quest.* What are the effects of this sacrament?" (extreme unction). "*Ans.* 1st, It remits all *venial* sins and mortal sins forgotten; 2dly, It remits something of the debt of punishment due to past sins; 3dly, It heals the soul of her infirmity and weakness, and a certain propensity to sin, contracted by former sins," &c. It does other wonderful things, for which I have not room: see the same book, p. 254.

ghostly fathers, who prescribe fastings, and penances, and pilgrimages, and who never cease their pecuniary exactions. Notwithstanding that his sins are forgiven by baptism and penance, he is taught that he must still do something, or suffer something, to merit heaven, unless he shall pay for indulgences, or for the transference of the good works of the saints to his account.

Miserable, however, as is the condition of such a man, it is that which the carnal mind will prefer to the salvation which the gospel reveals; because it is consistent with the love and practice of sin; it does not require the universal mortification of natural corrupt passions, nor the submission of the heart to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Christ crucified.

It is on this account, that I am concerned for many who are called Protestants. While they do not submit to the plainly revealed way of salvation by Jesus Christ; while they are trusting for salvation to any thing, or nothing, or are not thinking about the matter, and living in the practice of sin, they are ready to become a prey to the agents of that religion which professes to save sinners, while yet they continue in their hearts without love to God, and without hatred of sin. The sinner has many misgivings of heart, when he thinks of death and judgment, and he will catch hold of any thing that will afford him relief, and soothe his conscience, without requiring a change of heart and conduct. Popery is exactly suited to his wishes; and he will submit to all its impositions and exactions, for the sake of the peace which it affords him. It is, however, a false peace; and it issues in the ruin of all who suffer themselves to be deceived by it.

Who can think of this, and not contemplate danger from the encouragement given to Popery, and the imposing attitude which that religion now assumes among us? I shall be told, perhaps, that the Protestants I have referred to, are men of no religion at all; and that their becoming Papists will not make them worse than they are. It will not make them worse, perhaps, with regard to their state before God, and their prospects for eternity; but it will make them worse members of society, and more dangerous neighbours. Popery is a stern, exclusive, persecuting religion. It will suffer no other to exist, if it has the power of putting it down. Every addition, therefore, made to their communion, I should consider an accession of strength to the enemies of our civil and religious liberties.

I quote the following from a Popish writer of the present day, to prove that the sentiments of that body, on the subject of persecution, are the same that ever they were; and though it may seem strange, I make the quotations from a passage which contains, in words, a strong, affected disavowal and condemnation of persecution, on account of religion. "For my own part," says this writer, "knowing that the doctrines of my religion teach me to *practise* brotherly love towards *all* my fellow-creatures; —knowing that the structure of the Catholic Church is grounded upon the most sublime principles of charity and truth;—knowing that the formation of her constitution is so foreign to despotism, as to become a model for that established form of civil government under which we live;—knowing that *religious* persecution was scarcely ever practised, in this or other Christian countries, until it was introduced by *Protestants*, at the period of the pretended *Reformation*, with all the refined cruelty which the ingenuity of passion and malice could invent;—knowing, that the most barbarous and sanguinary code of laws against the professors of the Catholic faith, which ever disgraced the annals of a Christian country, was invented and enacted by Protestants, and is to be found in the statute books of *England* and *Ireland*, &c."—*Orthodox Journal, or Catholic Monthly Intelligencer, for December*, 1815.

I infer, that the sentiments of Papists, with regard to persecution, are the same that ever they were, from these words,—"*Knowing that religious persecution was scarcely ever practised in this or other Christian countries, until it was introduced by Protestants, at the period of the pretended Reformation.*" If I knew any means by which it were possible to make a Jesuit speak the truth, I would appeal to the writer of the above passage, Whether it be not his opinion, that violence done to heretics is not persecution? It CANNOT be his meaning, that violence was not done to persons on a religious account, by the agents of the Church of Rome, long before the Reformation. He must know, that those who professed to think differently from his Church, on religious subjects, were slaughtered by thousands and ten thousands, long before the word Protestant was heard of. But this was not persecution. It was a righteous and meritorious work, highly pleasing to the head of the Romish Church; in evidence of which, see the Pope's own words in my Second Number.* The assertion of this writer, who, I believe, is the Editor of the above Journal, and who, I doubt not, speaks the sentiments of his brethren, as well as of himself, can be true only on the principle, that persecution is that which is done against the adherents of Rome,—not that which is done against Protestants.† Indeed, they con-

* What was formerly a meritorious work, in the esteem of the Church of Rome, must be so still, for she is incapable of change; and, notwithstanding the above apparent disavowal of persecuting principles, and the profession of being taught by their religion to do good to *all* their fellow-creatures, it will still be found a righteous thing to drive heretics from their errors, and into the true Church, by force.

† The Rhemish translators of the New Testament, speak the mind of their Church very plainly on this subject. They tell us honestly and openly, that putting heretics, that is,

sider it a merciful thing to torture heretics out of their errors, for they believe it is impossible that any can be saved, but within the pale of their Church. Papists of the present day will, with one voice, condemn persecution for conscience sake; but they mean only persecution of the Catholic faith; and whenever they become so numerous as to gain the ascendancy, wo be to the Protestants who shall be within their reach, or subject to their dominion! Who can think of this, and not contemplate danger from the encouragement given to Popery in this country, and particularly in this city?

"Every false or corrupt religion is a sanguinary and persecuting religion. It was so with the religion of heathenism; as the character of the heathen wars before Christianity, and of the heathen persecutions after its introduction, sufficiently testifies. Now, such has been remarkably the case with the Romish religion, which, from its earliest period, has been a religion of bloodshed and of bigotry: in proof of which fact, its whole history might be cited, but the present space will only permit the enumeration of a few instances; such as the Papal wars in Italy, fomented and perpetuated by the pretended successors of the Prince of peace. The civil wars in France, which lasted a whole century, and which are so ably recorded by Davila. The continental wars of Germany, France, and Flanders, as recorded by De Thou. The massacre of St Bartholemew in Paris and the provinces, for which the Pope of that day solemnly returned public thanks to Almighty God, in the cathedral of St Peter. The Sicilian vespers. The cruelties of the Duke of Alva, and of the Jesuits, in the Low Countries. The horrors which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, by that splendid scourge of Europe, Louis XIV. The abominable cruelties of the Inquisition in Spain, Portugal, and elsewhere, from the earliest period of its establishment. The martyrdoms of England, in the reign of Philip and Mary. The appalling conspiracy of the 5th November, and the other sanguinary plots of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. The atrocious and extensive massacre of the Protestants in Ireland, in the reign of Charles I., as recorded by Sir John Temple; and the Irish rebellion, in 1798, whose main object was the extinction of Protestantism, and which was fomented and conducted by the Romish priests, as authenticated by Sir Richard Musgrave. In all these abominable cruelties, the mystical woman of the Apocalypse has trodden in the tract of her heathen precursors; and, in either case, their footsteps have been marked with blood. If modern Rome has not caused her children, like the ancient idolaters, to pass through the fire to Moloch, she has not, on that account, slain fewer in other ways: and sanguinary rites of the ancient superstition have only given place to the immolation of human victims in another form, though not on a less extensive scale."—*Preface to the Letters by Ignotus.—From the Times.*

It may be interesting to the reader to know, how the matter stands at present in France, with regard to toleration. If Papists were capable of learning moderation and tenderness, on the subject of religious difference, one should think the kindness which thousands of them received in this country, when driven from their own, would induce them, if not to think well of our religion, at least to tolerate those who profess it. But such is not the case. It seems that this very summer, our Protestant brethren, in France, are exposed to persecution; they are harassed, and brought to trial, and fined, because they will not decorate their houses in honour of the consecrated host that is carried, on certain days, through their streets; that is, because they will not do honour to an idol. They know that the host is an object of worship; they see their deluded neighbours falling down before it; and they believe, that if they were to pay any respect whatever to this idol, they would be guilty of consenting to idolatry; yet they must do so, notwithstanding the constitutional charter which professes to allow perfect freedom, with regard to religious worship, or they must be dragged as criminals before their courts of justice, and fined, as an example to others, and as an earnest of what they may further expect, if they persist in their contumacy. The following information, on this subject, is extracted from the Philanthropic Gazette, of the 9th instant, which, I am glad to see, has been published also in the Glasgow Chronicle, as I wish the facts to be as extensively known as posssible:—

"*Persecution of Protestants at Bourdeaux.*—On Sunday, May 31st, being *Corpus Christi Day*, the several parishes of the city of Bourdeaux went in procession through the streets, preceded by the public crier, who proclaimed the orders of the Mayor to all the citizens, to line the front of their houses, without any regard to the difference of religion. No *arrété* of the municipal authority, no proclamation whatever, was posted or inserted in the public papers. The citizens, of a religion different from the Roman Catholic, believed, that without a manifest violation of the constitutional charter, they could not be compelled to an act of outward homage, which offered violence to their religious sentiments. From these considerations, several Israelites and Calvinists did not hang out cloth in the front of their houses. The Commissary of Police of that division, in

Protestants, to death, is not worse than putting to death thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors. In their note on Rev. xvii. 6, "*drunken with the blood of saints,*" they say, "Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, for that there they put heretics to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries: but their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors; for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."

person, ordered several of them to obey. Two of them answered, that, though such an order offered violence to their conscience, and infringed on the liberty of their religious opinions, if he gave them an order, signed by himself, they would submit. This he refused to do, and at the same time noted their disobedience.

"All the citizens who had not complied with the order of lining the front of their houses, were cited to appear, June 12th, before the tribunal of ordinary police: some obeyed the mandate, and others neglected. Those that were present denied the legality of the citation.

"1st. They alleged that no existing and known law prescribed such an obligation: that the municipal authority had not published, by means of the public prints, any *arrété*, or ordonnance, relative to the subject; and that they were ignorant of what had been published by the crier.

"2d. That they were by profession Calvinists, or Israelites, and that they were forbidden, by their religion, to render any external homage to a religion not their own.

"3d. That the third article of the charter gave equal liberty to all religions, and granted the same protection to every form of worship; and that every individual was perfectly free, in regard to his religious duties, nor was obliged to any act contrary to his conscience. The defendants, therefore, demanded to be released from the accusation, asking, at the same time, that their defence should be registered, together with the judgment pronounced, reserving to themselves the right of protesting, &c.

"The commissary of police, on the side of the prosecution, answered by reading a decision of the Court of Cassation, by which the appeal of a Protestant lady had been rejected. This lady was condemned to pay a fine of six francs, for having refused to *line*, according to a printed order of the Mayor of *Puylaurent*. He maintained, that the Mayor of Bourdeaux had given sufficient notice to his constituents, by the crier, and that no one could justly pretend ignorance. He argued from the ordonnances of the *Jurats*, in 1759, from ancient edicts of the police of Paris, of a date still more remote, and from an article of the law of 7th of August, 1790. Thus, without any reference to the present code, he condemned the defendants to a fine of six francs for those who were present, and fifteen francs for the absentees, with costs.

"It may be proper also to state, that, on the 12th of June, four persons, Israelites, waited on the Mayor again, to request that the procedure might be discontinued. The Mayor refused, stating, that he did not intend to offer violence to the rights of conscience, but that he would abide by the decision of the Court of Cassation. It was answered, that notwithstanding the respect due to the decisions of that Court, the persons who requested his interference would address a petition to the Chamber of Deputies next session, that the legislative body might pronounce on so important a subject, which, as from its nature it belonged to the political, and not to the administrative, was not to be determined by the Court of Cassation. In the name of many citizens of Bourdeaux.—(Signed) LANGE."

Such, it seems, is the state of religious toleration in France, in the year 1818. If a Jew or a Protestant refuse to violate the law of God, that is, if he shall refuse to do honour to an idol, he must pay a fine. It matters not that the fine is a very small sum, six francs being only five shillings sterling, since the principle is admitted, that it is a crime in law not to do honour to the consecrated bread: that is, what they call the real body of Christ, which is carried in solemn procession through the streets on *Corpus Christi*, that is, the Body of Christ Day;—since, I say, the principle is acted upon, that this is a crime, the punishment will not be long continued upon so low a scale as a fine of five shillings. We shall soon hear of imprisonment, and banishment, and perhaps death, inflicted upon our Protestant brethren, who refuse to do homage to the Popish idol.

The Papists in this country enjoy as much liberty of conscience as other Dissenters. There are no obstructions whatever thrown in the way of their worship. They are not required to conform to any part of the established religion. They enjoy the most ample protection of their persons and property; and any person injuring them would be amenable to our laws, the same as if he had injured any other subject; yet we are told, by the Editor of their *Orthodox* Journal, that the most sanguinary and barbarous code of laws, against the professors of the Catholic faith, which ever disgraced the annals of a Christian country, is to be found in the statute books of England and Ireland! Certainly then they are in the statute books only, and not to be found any where else; at least, they are not to be found in the practice of Protestants towards Papists; whereas, in France, the law is in favour of religious freedom, but the practice is against it. Besides, the principal laws against Papists in England and Ireland have been repealed during his present Majesty's reign; but it did not suit the purpose of the Orthodox Journalist to tell this. He wishes the world to believe that his brethren are objects of sanguinary persecution.

No. XII.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3D, 1818.

IT is time to return to AMICUS VERITATIS, who writes to the Editor of the Glasgow Chronicle thus:—"When I first addressed you, it was far

from my intention to enter upon religious controversy, but only a desire of putting bigotry to the blush, and of advocating the cause of truth."—*Prot.* p. 24. *Bigot* is a name which Papists are very fond of applying to their Protestant neighbours, while they consider themselves injured when they are called Papists. AMICUS VERITATIS trespassed, he says, upon the public, merely from "a desire of exposing the weakness and futility of censorious *bigotry*." He "thanks Heaven, the phantoms raised by *bigotry* and by prejudice have fled before the light of reason."—P. 12. He asks the PROTESTANT—"Will he again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and *bigotry?* O how shameful and obstinate a thing is *bigotry!* To what end, says Philips, is an argument with the *bigot?*" &c. P. 3.

It is easy calling names, when one is at a loss for arguments. AMICUS VERITATIS knows, that a bigot is an odious thing; and he cannot but know, that it has been pretty generally attached to his own communion. He does, therefore, what he can, to throw it upon the Protestants, and to make it attach to me in particular; thinking, perhaps, that in this way he will get quit of it.

That the reader may be able to judge to whom this word is most applicable, I shall give the definition of it by Dr Johnson:—"BIGOTRY; prejudice;—unreasonable warmth in favour of party opinions. BIGOTTED; blindly prepossessed in favour of something; irrationally zealous." Bigotry, it is evident from this, is not warmth and zeal in any thing; or rather, zeal and warmth, and prepossession, are not bigotry; but *unreasonable* warmth,—*blind* prepossession,—*irrational* zeal, are bigotry. I shall not disavow either warmth, or zeal, or prepossession. I confess that my mind was prepossessed, or pre-occupied by certain truths, before I entered upon this controversy. It was prepossessed by a conviction that the word of God is true; that this word is contained in the holy Scriptures; and that these contain all that God has to say to us, till the day of judgment. But this is not bigotry, because it is not *blind* prepossession.—The Bible proves itself to be the word of God, and there can be nothing more reasonable than to believe, that what He says is true. Neither shall I acquit myself of zeal, but rather confess that I have not enough of it; but zeal is not bigotry, unless it be irrational. I must also plead guilty to the charge of occasional warmth; but this is not bigotry, unless it be unreasonable. It would ill become me to say I am entirely free from prejudice; but it would be unfair to charge me with it, unless I have advanced something for which I cannot give a satisfactory reason, of which nobody has yet convicted me. As for party opinions, if this is meant for principles founded upon the word of God, I do not disavow being prepossessed in favour of them. In matters of religion, there are, properly speaking, only two parties in the world; and I hope I shall always be found ready to advocate the opinions, or rather the principles, of that party which is on the side of real Christianity; against those of Antichrist; but neither is this bigotry, unless it be done with *unreasonable* warmth.

But it would be no difficult matter to show that, with regard to every part of the definition, a true Papist is a bigot. He is so full of prejudice, that, without reasoning or inquiry, he believes all that his church teaches; and holds it undoubted, that whatever is not taught by his church, must be heresy. This would be reasonable, if it were the result of conviction, from the consideration of sufficient evidence. But with Papists this is not the case. They hold and teach many things, for which no man on earth can give a satisfactory reason. They are, therefore, bigotted in the strongest sense of the word. Their religion is founded upon prejudice, not upon evidence. They are blindly prepossessed in favour of it; they are irrationally zealous in its support and propagation; they are unreasonably warm in their anathemas against those who expose their errors, and who propagate the truth. Papists, undoubtedly, are bigots.

They are extremely zealous, for instance, in maintaining, that Peter was Bishop of Rome, and that the Pope is his successor. This is blind prepossession; it is a mere prejudice; for, as I have shown in my Seventh and Eighth Numbers, Peter never was Bishop of Rome; and I defy the whole world to produce the shadow of evidence of the fact, from any authentic history. Yet they will part with any thing sooner, than give up this point. They are so blindly prepossessed in favour of it, that rather than renounce it, they would deny the evidence of their own senses. I have before me what is publicly sold in Italy for the Bible. It is a collection of stories, taken from the historical books of the Old and New Testament, and the Apocrypha, with what are called moral reflections. This is all the Bible that is generally circulated among the Italians, in their own language; at least, that the gentleman whose copy is in my possession, could get to buy when lately in that country; and great care has been taken that nothing should be contained in it, that is dangerous to the Romish religion; that is, in short, nothing that can teach a sinner the way of salvation, by Jesus Christ alone, without the aid of a priest. In this work, they profess to give the genealogy of the Popes, from Jesus Christ downward, to the present day, as if that were a matter as certainly known as the genealogy of Christ from Abraham. For the amusement of the reader, I shall give the first century:—

Anni

1. Gesù Cristo Pontifice eterno, secundo l'ordine di Melchisedech, mori l'anno 4 della sua predicazione, e nel 33 con 3 mesi di sua erà: elesse per sua successore, e Vicario San Pietro Principe degli Appostoli.

34. S. Pietro Galileo Appostoli . . 1
66. S. Lino Toscano 2
67. S. Clemente Romano 3
77. S. Clero Romano 4
83. Anacleto d'Atene, Greco . . . 5
96. S. Everisto di Betlemme 6

Thus Jesus Christ is set at the head of the list of Popes; he is said to have chosen, as his successor and vicar, St Peter, Prince of the apostles; and Peter began his reign in the 34th year of the Christian era; that is, in the very year that Christ was crucified. Now, this is downright imposition. Peter is made Bishop of Rome, before there was a Christian in Rome; Linus is made his immediate successor, and Clement follows Linus; all which is mere fancy; yet, it is held forth, by the Church of Rome, as certain; her members believe it without evidence, and so far as relates to Peter, against the direct evidence of the apostle Paul, who tells us, that he went to Jerusalem to see Peter three years after his return from Arabia to Damascus; and fourteen years after that, he found Peter at Jerusalem, with James and John, which must have been above the fiftieth year of the Christian era. I know it is pleaded, that Peter was occasionally absent from Rome; and particularly, that he went to Jerusalem, to be present at the first general council; but it is unfortunate for the argument, that we read so much of Peter being in other places; but not so much as once within the bounds of his own see. The non-residence of Bishops certainly was not practised so early in the Christian church. It is, in short, not true that Peter was Bishop of Rome; it is not true that he had a successor in office, in Rome, or any where else; yet Papists must believe this; they maintain it most zealously and pertinaciously, for their whole system depends upon it. It is nothing but prejudice,—blind prepossession. Papists then, above all others, are the bigots.

Nothing can be more irrational than transubstantiation, yet they are warm and zealous in maintaining this doctrine, in spite of the evidence of their own senses. What can be greater bigotry?

During nine centuries of the Christian era, priests were allowed to marry like honest men. It required a miracle to persuade those in England, that it was unlawful for them to have wives;* this miracle is now believed to have been an imposition; yet do Papists most zealously maintain the doctrine pretended to have been proved by it; and if any clergyman were to take a wife, he would be rendered incapable of any clerical function;—he would be held guilty of a greater crime than if he had violated all the ten commandments. What foolish prejudice! What bigotry!

The following is an instance of bigotry such as we may look for in vain among Protestants. One of the Dukes of Brunswick took it in his head, in his old age, to forsake the religion in which he had been educated, and to become Papist. He wrote a book to justify his conversion, entitled, "*The Duke of Brunswick's Fifty Reasons for preferring the Roman Catholic Religion to all other Sects.*" This book has lately been reprinted in Manchester, and is strongly recommended to all who wish to find the true faith. The Duke writes with all the sophistry of a Jesuit; and, having given forty-nine reasons for changing his religion, he gives the following as the last and crowning one. "I observed, that many sectaries, who had seemed for many years to be fixed in their persuasion, were converted towards the end of their days, and desired to die in the Roman Catholic faith. But never did I meet with a Catholic who wished to die in another religion. Now, it is chiefly at the hour of death that the soul opens its eyes into a clearer prospect of things eternal. For my own part, I resolved to live as I should wish to die, and for that reason I came to a resolution to embrace immediately the Catholic faith; because death is as certain, as its hour is uncertain. *Besides that, the Catholics to whom I spoke concerning my conversion, assured me, that if I were to be*

* "In this time the celibacy of the clergy was violently urged, and married priests thrust from their livings; which raised great stirs in the Church, but the particulars are not recorded, nor the broils which thereon ensued. I read in the Antiquities of the Britannic Church, that, in the year 977, a Council was gathered at Calne, in Wiltshire, for that business, to which Beornallus, a bishop of Scotland, was called by Alfritha, the widow of King Edgar, who favoured the cause of married priests. This bishop, a man of great learning and eloquence, is said to have defended the conjugal life of priests, by solid reasons, taken out of Scripture, and to have put all the opposites to silence. But Dunstan, the archbishop, who presided in that Council, when he saw that reason could not bear out the errand, fell a threatening, and said, that, notwithstanding all their arguments, they should not carry away the victory; which he had no sooner spoken, than the beams of the house, wherein they sat at Council, bursting asunder, all were overturned, and fell headlong to the ground; many were bruised, and some killed with the fall: Dunstan himself only escaped without harm; the beam whereon he stood remaining whole and entire. Such as favoured the cause of monks did interpret this accident to be a sentence given by God on their side; others said that Dunstan had wrought this mischief by sorcery, for many supposed him to be a magician. However it was, the married priests (though repining) were forced, indeed, to yield and submit themselves. What became of Beornallus, I read not; nor whether he returned to his own country."—*Archbishop Spotswood's History of the Church of Scotland, folio*, p. 27. I believe the above accident may be easily accounted for, without either sorcery or a miracle; but it served the purpose of answering the powerful arguments of the Scottish bishop; and the priests were compelled to put away their wives.

damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves, an assurance I could never extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion. Whence, I inferred, that the Roman Catholic faith was built upon a better foundation than any of those sects that have divided from it." Here is blind prepossession, prejudice, bigotry, with a witness! Here is a man who trusts his salvation on the word of his fellow-creatures, and seems content if they shall be damned in his stead; and this book is earnestly recommended by Papists of the present day.

I might go over every doctrine and rite of the Romish Church, and on every one of them I could convict her members of bigotry; but, in few words, I ask AMICUS VERITATIS, if he would not rather that all the Popish children in Glasgow should live and die in ignorance, than that they should be taught by a Protestant school-master? Is not this prejudice, blind, irrational prepossession? Is not this bigotry?

This is the man who had no view in writing, but to put bigotry to the blush, and to advocate the cause of truth: and poor Protestants must sit down quietly blushing, and ashamed of their religion. In a tone of great self-sufficiency, he assumes it as indisputable, that the principles of Protestants are "phantoms raised by bigotry and prejudice." This is quite in the style of other Popish writers in the present day. Those of the Orthodox Journal, for instance, assume a lofty tone: they write as if their religion were indisputably the religion of England and Ireland, and as if they considered the Protestants as a sect of mere intruders.

It seems I must submit to the charge of intolerance as well as bigotry. AMICUS VERITATIS asks, if I will "again spout out the noxious venom of religious intolerance and bigotry?" I may fairly ask him, What sentiment, bordering on intolerance, has been published by the PROTESTANT? On this point I have made a greater concession in favour of Papists than many of my Protestant brethren will thank me for, and such as no Papist, so far as I know, ever made in favour of Protestants.—*See* p. 30. In fact, I know neither toleration nor intolerance. Neither of the words belongs to the gospel of Christ. Popery I believe to be in its own nature intolerable, by which I mean, that it ought not to receive any positive encouragement from Christians, any more than the rites of Bacchus, or any other idol. But no man can reasonably infer from this, that I would persecute the votaries of Bacchus, or of Rome. I pity the poor man who wastes his strength and his substance in drunkenness; but still, if his drunkenness does not extend to riot; if he is not guilty of a breach of the peace, I should not think him a fit subject of punishment. I pity also the poor man who worships the Pope, or the Virgin Mary, or any of the saints, or who worships the work of his own hands in the consecrated wafer; but still, if he is not guilty of a breach of the public peace, if he does no ill to his neighbour, I should not think him a proper subject of punishment by his fellow creatures. In short, I think no weapon can be lawfully used against heretics, or even against the grossest idolaters, but that of persuasion. It belongs to idolatry and to Popery, as such, to use violent means for the conversion of heretics, and for the propagation of their religion.

In my last Number, I gave proof of this by numerous instances of wholesale murder, at the instigation of the Church of Rome, or the Pope as her head, for the purpose of extirpating heretics. I gave the opinion of the learned Doctors of Rheims, who translated the New Testament into English, that putting heretics to death was no worse than shedding the blood of thieves and man-killers. I shall now give the sentiments of modern Papists on the subject of persecution. In my last Number, I quoted a passage from the Orthodox Journal, in which persecution for conscience sake was strongly disavowed; and I gave reasons for believing, that the writer meant only the persecution of his own sect. This is confirmed by the same Journal, in the passage which I am now about to quote. I know it will be objected, that the Orthodox Journal is not the Catholic Church; and, therefore, Papists are not responsible for its errors. I shall not, therefore, give it as the doctrine of the Church; but as the opinion of modern Papists; for bad as it is, it is not by any means so sanguinary as the doctrine and practice of the Church in former times.

Speaking of the right of every man to read the Scriptures, and judge for himself, as to the meaning of their contents, the writer, who subscribes himself CATHOLICUS ROMANUS, proceeds:—"Never did the Church of England commit a greater error, than when it promulgated this absurd tenet. She then struck a dagger in her own heart, which must in the end destroy her. Thousands, every year, are leaving her communion: we find none embracing it. If the Scripture alone is the rule of faith, and every man of common sense a sufficient judge of its meaning, where will fanaticism end? It is yet in its infancy. When the Lancasterian system has taught the nation to read, and every man is equipped and furnished with his Bible, then will there come forth a swarm of sectaries, preaching new, and, as yet, unheard of doctrines. It has hitherto been a good speculation, where there was all to gain and nothing to lose. A good appearance, and an easy flow of words, is all that is required to make a fortune; whatever doctrine he chooses to preach, it is of little consequence, provided he proves it by a text; either side out, like a smuggler's coat, to delude his followers. Hence,

we daily see so many spruce blackcoats, who, the other day, had not a shoe to their feet. It may ill become a Catholic to prop up by his advice the Protestant establishment, otherwise, I should certainly advise them to call in all their Bibles. *Would not, Mr Editor, some cunning financier do well, if he took advantage of this rage for Bibles, and laid a smart tax upon the reading of it? Permitting none to read it, without first taking out a licence. And why not tax this as well as other nostrums?* Or might it not serve as a commutation for the window-tax? For, if they are determined that the light of Heaven shall be thus obscured by so many contradictory doctrines, we might at least have a little more terrestrial light to illuminate our darkness."—*Orth. Journ. Feb.* 1814.

There is a long series of letters in the same style, in which the Bible Society, and those who support it, are abused as a parcel of fools and knaves; and, as such sentiments pass unreproved by the Editor, and without animadversion by any other correspondent, so far as I have seen, they are not to be viewed as merely the sentiments of an individual Papist, but as those of the general body in England, of which this Journal seems to be the organ. But the present subject is the persecution which is here recommended against all who shall presume to read the Bible. It is suggested to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to lay a smart tax, or, which in this case would be the same thing, impose a severe fine upon all who shall read the word of God. There could not be more direct persecution for conscience' sake; and, with regard to the poor, it would be no less than depriving them of the bread of life, and starving their souls by law. What a hue and cry would be raised among Papists, if it were proposed to lay a tax upon their holy water! What dreadful persecution would this be! and yet they gravely propose a tax upon the water of life!

The reluctance of popery to commit the bible freely into the hands of the people, is rendered manifest by its recent acts. Two papal briefs, issued by Pope Pius VII.; the first to Ignatius, archbishop of Gnezn, primate of Poland, dated 29th of June, 1816; the other to Stanislaus, archbishop of Mohileff, in Russia, dated 3rd of September, 1816; are directed against Bible Societies in those countries. The first says,—"We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined."—To remedy this "pestilence . . . this defilement of the faith, most dangerous to souls . . . we again and again exhort you, that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness."

The other brief is to the same purpose.

The encyclical letter, however, of Pope Leo XII., on his accession to the pontificate, is still more remarkable. "You are aware," he says, "venerable brethren, that a certain society, commonly called the Bible Society, strolls with effrontery throughout the world; which society, contemning the traditions of the holy fathers, and contrary to the well-known decree of the council of Trent, labours with all its might, and by every means, to translate—or rather to pervert—the holy bible, into the vulgar languages of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared, that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages, may occur with regard to others; to wit, 'that, by a perverse interpretation, the gospel of Christ be turned into a human gospel, or, what is still worse, into the gospel of the devil.'"

No. XIII.

SATURDAY, October 10th, 1818.

Amicus Veritatis accuses me of both bigotry and intolerance. In my last Number, I endeavoured to show, that such terms belong more properly to the adherents of Rome. I convicted them of bigotry, inasmuch as they are blindly prepossessed in favour of a system, and irrationally zealous in maintaining it, not only without evidence, but against the evidence of the word of God, and of their own senses. With equal ease, I can convict them of intolerance. Popery is, and always has been, a persecuting system: and though it cannot be denied, that some Protestants have also been persecutors, yet it can easily be shown, that they learned to be so from Rome, and continued to be so, because they had not renounced the whole of Rome's abominations.

I intend, in the present Number, to prove the Church of Rome guilty of intolerance and persecution, notwithstanding the assertion of the Orthodox Journal, that persecution for conscience sake was scarcely known in any Christian country till it was introduced by Protestants; and I shall take the word *persecution* in the sense in which it is commonly understood in this country; not in the sense in which it is now used by Papists, who use it only to denote what is done against themselves.

Early in the twelfth century, a great number of persons in Lyons, and other parts in the south of France, had their eyes opened to perceive the idolatry and absurdity of the Romish worship. They laboured for a long time under many disadvantages. The Vulgate Latin Bible was the only edition of the Scriptures at that time in Europe; and very few of the people were capable of reading it. We may well suppose, then, that their knowledge of divine things was very scanty; but nobody can tell

how small the degree of knowledge is, by which a sinner may be saved, if it be but the knowledge of Christ. Multitudes, who were called the poor men of Lyons, had obtained that knowledge, and were enabled to maintain the truth, at the expense of being hated and persecuted by their neighbours.

Providence raised up one among them, who was highly honoured as an instrument of extensively propagating those truths which were, three hundred years after, embraced by Luther and his colleagues, at the time of the Reformation. This was Peter Waldo, a rich merchant of Lyons, from whom it is supposed the Waldenses took their name. Having had a better education than most of his neighbours, he was able to teach the people the text of the New Testament, in their mother tongue. Here he saw clearly the way of salvation by Jesus Christ, and found peace and comfort to himself. He was desirous of communicating to others the knowledge of that truth which he found to be to his own salvation. He abandoned his mercantile pursuits, distributed his wealth to the poor, as occasion required; and, while the latter flocked to him, to partake of his alms, he laboured to engage their attention to the things which belonged to their everlasting peace. He either translated, or procured to be translated, the four Gospels into French; and had the honour of being the first who gave the word of God in any modern language of Europe. —See this subject more in detail in *Jones' History of the Waldenses, 2d Ed. chap.* v. §. 1.

Waldo laboured incessantly in propagating the truth, and in demonstrating the great difference there was between the Christianity of the Bible, and that of the Church of Rome. "The Archbishop of Lyons heard of these proceedings, and became indignant. Their tendency was obvious; the honour of the Church was involved in them; and in perfect consistency with the usual mode of silencing objectors among the Catholic party, he forbade the new Reformer to teach any more, on pain of excommunication, and of being proceeded against as an heretic."—Waldo replied, "that though a layman, he could not be silent in a matter which concerned the salvation of his fellow-creatures." "Information of these things was then conveyed to Pope Alexander III. who no sooner heard of such heretical proceedings, than he anathematized the Reformer and his adherents, commanding the Archbishop to proceed against them with the utmost rigour." He was now compelled to leave Lyons, and afterwards, "persecuted from place to place, he retired into Picardy, where also success attended his labours. Driven from thence, he proceeded to Germany, carrying along with him the glad tidings of salvation; and, according to the testimony of Thuanus, a very authentic French historian, he at length settled in Bohemia, where he finished his course, in the year 1179, after a ministry of nearly twenty years." *Hist. Wald. vol.* ii. *p.* 12.

Attend now to the intolerant spirit of the Popish religion, and the cruelties exercised upon the followers of Peter Waldo;—The doctrines which he had taught, which were evidently those of the gospel, spread extensively in Alsace, along the Rhine, and in many other places. "Persecutions ensued—thirty-five citizens of Mentz were burned in one fire, at the city of Bingen, and eighteen in Mentz itself. The bishops of both Mentz and Strasburgh breathed nothing but vengeance and slaughter against them; and, in the latter city, where Waldo himself is said to have narrowly escaped apprehension, eighty persons were committed to the flames. In the treatment and in the behaviour of the Waldenses, were renewed the scenes of martyrdom of the second century. Multitudes died praising God, and in the confident hope of a blessed resurrection." *Ibid. p.* 13.

That these cruelties were inflicted, not on the mere authority of individual bishops, but on the authority and at the instigation of the Pope of Rome, as head of the Church, appears by a decree of Pope Lucius III. against heretics, A. D. 1181, which commences thus:—"To abolish the malignity of diverse heresies, which are lately sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that the power committed to the Church should be awakened, that, by the concurring assistance of the imperial strength, both the insolence and mal-pertness of the heretics, in their false designs, may be crushed, and the truth of Catholic simplicity shining forth in the holy Church, may demonstrate her pure and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines. Wherefore we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son, Frederick, the most illustrious Emperor of the Romans, always increaser of the empire, with the common advice and counsel of our brethren, and other patriarchs, archbishops, and many princes, who, from several parts of the world, are met together, do set themselves against these heretics, who have got different names from the several false doctrines which they profess, by the sanction of this present decree, and by our apostolical authority, according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated.

"More particularly, we declare all Catharists, Patorines, and those who call themselves the Poor of Lyons; the Passagines, Josephites, Arnoldists, to be under a perpetual anathema. And because some, under a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the apostle saith, assume to themselves the authority of preaching; whereas the same apostle saith, "How shall they preach, except they be sent?" —we therefore conclude, under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema, all those who

either being forbid, or not sent, do notwithstanding presume to preach publicly or privately, without any authority received from the apostolic see, or from the bishops of their respective dioceses," &c. &c. Thus, by authority of the holy father, the Emperor of the Romans, and many princes from different parts of the world, any man who shall tell his neighbour about salvation by Jesus Christ, however privately, is subjected to a perpetual curse: and the decree proceeds:—"As for any layman, who shall be found guilty, either publicly or privately, of any of the aforesaid crimes, (that is, preaching, or speaking improperly of the sacraments,) unless by abjuring his heresy, and making satisfaction, he immediately return to the orthodox faith, we decree him to be left to the sentence of the secular judge, to receive condign punishment, according to the quality of the offence." *Hist. Wald. vol.* ii. *p.* 15, 16. This of giving over to the secular judge, was well understood to infer certain death, often accompanied by the most cruel tortures that the ingenuity of men could invent.

Ildefonsus, king of Arragon, followed up this decree of the Pope, by one of his own, in 1194, in which he ordains that all heretics, found in his dominions, "be condemned and persecuted every where;" that any persons who should receive any of them into their houses, or "be present at their pernicious sermons," shall "be punished, as if they were actually guilty of high treason." The Emperor Frederick II. published a similar edict, with regard to those in his dominions. "The care of the imperial government," says his Majesty, "committed to us from heaven, and over which we preside, demands the material sword, which is given to us separately from the priesthood, against the enemies of the faith, and for the extirpation of heretical pravity, that we should pursue with judgment and justice, those vipers and perfidious children, who insult the Lord and his Church, as if they would tear out the very bowels of their mother. We shall not suffer these wretches to live, who infect the world by their seducing doctrines, and who, being themselves corrupted, more grievously taint the flock of the faithful." In another edict, the emperor accuses them of savage cruelty to themselves; "since, besides the loss of their immortal souls, they expose their bodies to a cruel death, being prodigal of their lives, and fearless of destruction, which by acknowledging the true faith they might escape, and, which is horrible to express, *their survivors are not terrified by their example.* Against such enemies to God and man, we cannot contain our indignation, nor refuse to punish them with the sword of just vengeance, but shall pursue them with so much the greater vigour, as they appear to spread wider the crimes of their superstition, to the most evident injury of the Christian faith, and of the Church of Rome, which is adjudged to be the head of all churches." *Page* 94—97, *2d. vol. Jones, who refers to the first vol. of Limborch's History of the Inquisition, where the edicts are to be found entire.*

The whole power of the Romish Church, clerical and laical, was mustered against these unoffending people, whose only crimes were presuming to read and understand the word of God for themselves, and refusing to believe all the nonsense which was taught by the Romish priests. The latter were constantly employed in preaching up crusades against them. Their favourite text was Psalm xciv. 16, "Who will rise up for me against the evil doers? or who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?" and the application of their sermons usually ran in the following strain:—"You see, most dear brethren, how great the wickedness of the heretics is, and how much mischief they do in the world. You see, also, how tenderly, and by how many pious methods, the Church labours to reclaim them. But with them they all prove ineffectual, and they fly to the secular power for their defence. Therefore, our Holy Mother, the Church, though with great reluctance and grief, calls together against them the Christian army. If then you have any zeal for the faith; if you are touched with any concern for the glory of God; if you would reap the benefit of this great indulgence, come and receive the sign of the cross, and join yourselves to the army of the crucified Saviour." The Pope had despatched preachers throughout all Europe, to entice men to engage in this holy warfare. He promised paradise, and the remission of all their sins, to those who should serve forty days, which, I suppose, is what is meant by the "great indulgence" mentioned above. After telling them that "they were not to keep faith with those who do not keep faith with God," he thus proceeds:—"We exhort you, that you would endeavour to destroy the wicked heresy of the Albigenses, and do this with more rigour than you would towards the Saracens themselves; persecute them with a strong hand; deprive them of their lands and possessions; banish them, and put Catholics in their room." I shall not torture my readers with the horrible details into which this subject would lead me. It is enough to say, that, by fire and sword, the armies employed by Pope Innocent III. murdered above two hundred thousand, in the short space of a few months.

For many years, the work of extirpating heretics was continued, at the instigation of the Pope, who commanded the princes who were subject to him, that is, all the princes in Christendom, to kill, to destroy, and cause to perish, all who presumed to differ, in any point of religion, from the doctrine of the Church of Rome. To Louis, King of France, he says,—"'*Tis the command of God,* who says:—'If thou shalt hear say in any one of thy cities,

which the Lord thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known, thou shalt smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword.' Although you are under many obligations already to God, for the great benefits hitherto received from him, from whom comes every good and perfect gift, yet you ought to reckon yourself more especially obliged courageously to exert yourself for him, against the subverters of the faith, by whom he is blasphemed, and manfully to defend the Catholic purity, which many, in those parts, adhering to the doctrines of devils, are known to have cast off."

Louis was very ready to obey the command of his ghostly father, by raising an army to destroy the heretics; but he was afraid the King of England would invade his territory, while he was employed in so godly a work. The Pope, therefore, endeavours to keep the English monarch at home, by writing to him as follows:—"Make no war, either by yourself, or your brother, or any other person on the said king, so long as he is engaged in the affair of the faith and service of Jesus Christ, lest by your obstructing the matter, which God forbid you should do, the king, with his prelates and barons of France, should be forced to turn their arms from the extirpation of heretics, to their own defence."

In short, it seems as if the whole soul of the Pope, and of all his clergy, and of all the princes under his control, had been directed to this one object:—the murdering of those who received their religion directly from the word of God. The Waldenses and Albigenses were a simple harmless people; they professed no principles, and were convicted of no practices, hostile to the good order of society. Their very enemies bear ample testimony on behalf of their manner of life, as being more moral than that of those who persecuted them. Even an inquisitor, who wrote against them, says,—"These heretics are known by their manners and conversation; for they are orderly and modest in their behaviour and deportment. They avoid all appearance of pride in their dress, they neither indulge in finery of attire, nor are they remarkable for being mean or ragged. They avoid commerce, that they may be free from deceit and falsehood. They get their livelihood by manual industry, as day labourers or mechanics, and their teachers are weavers or tailors. They are not anxious about amassing riches, but content themselves with the necessaries of life. They are chaste, temperate, and sober. They abstain from anger. Even when they work, they either learn or teach. In like manner also, their women are very modest; avoiding backbiting, foolish jesting, and levity of speech, especially abstaining from lies or swearing, not so much as making use of the common asseverations, "in truth," "for certain," or the like; because they regard these as oaths—contenting themselves with simply answering, "yes," or "no."

Claudius Seisselius,* archbishop of Turin, says, "that, their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians."—"In their lives and morals," says he, "they are perfect, irreprehensible, and without reproach among men, addicting themselves, with all their might, to the service of God." Yet this prelate wrote against them, and joined in persecuting them, because they would not submit to all the absurdities and impieties of Rome.

Lielenstenius,† a Dominican, speaking of the Waldenses of Bohemia, says,—"I say, that in morals and life they are good, true in words, unanimous in brotherly love; but their faith is incorrigible and vile, as I have shown in my treatise." Samuel de Cassini, a Franciscan friar, speaking of them in his "*Victoria Trionfale,*" explicitly owns in what respect their faith was incorrigible and vile, when he says, "that all the errors of these Waldenses consisted in this, that they denied the Church of Rome to be the Holy Mother Church, and would not obey her traditions."

In the time of a great persecution of the Waldenses of Merindol‡ and Provence, a certain monk was deputed by the bishop of Cavaillon, to hold a conference with them, that they might be convinced of their errors, and the effusion of blood prevented. But the monk returned in confusion, owning that in his whole life he had never known so much of the Scriptures as he had learned during those few days that he had been conversing with the heretics. The bishop, however, sent among them a number of doctors—young men, who had lately come from the Sorbonne, which, at that time, was the very centre of theological subtilty at Paris. One of these publicly owned, that he had understood more of the doctrine of salvation, from the answers of the children in their catechisms, than by all the disputations that he had ever before heard.

Such was the character of those who professed the doctrines of the Reformation, long before the Reformation took place; and this is the character which their enemies gave them. Undoubtedly, then, they were the Church of Christ,—they were the followers of the Lamb,—they were the saints of God; and the Church of Rome became drunk with their blood—intoxicated with rage against them, and by success in destroying them. The details of the murderous warfare which was carried on against them, for more than three centuries, are the most horrible that can be imagined. I shall

* His work printed at Paris, 1520. See Allen's Remarks upon the Ancient Church of Piedmont; page 214, 8vo., Oxford, 1821. Dupin, 16th Century, p. 367.

† See Thuanus, 6—16.

‡ See Usher de successione et statu Christi. Eccles. cap. 6. § 15.

give only one instance of the manner in which they were treated. It is by no means the worst, but, I believe, it is as bad as any of my readers will be able to bear:—

"About the year 1400, a violent outrage was committed upon the Waldenses, who inhabited the valley of Pragella, in Piedmont, by the Catholic party resident in that neighbourhood. The attack, which seems to have been of the most furious kind, was made towards the end of the month of December, when the mountains were covered with snow, and thereby rendered of difficult access, that the peaceable inhabitants of the valleys were wholly unapprized that any such attempt was meditated; and the persecutors were in actual possession of their caves, ere the former seem to have been apprized of any hostile designs against them. In this pitiable plight, they had recourse to the only alternative which remained for saving their lives—they fled to one of the highest mountains of the Alps, with their wives and children, the unhappy mothers carrying the cradle in one hand, and in the other leading such of their offspring as were able to walk. Their inhuman invaders, whose feet were swift to shed blood, pursued them in their flight, until night came on, and slew great numbers of them, before they could reach the mountains. Those who escaped were, however, reserved to experience a fate not more enviable. Overtaken by the shades of night, they wandered up and down the mountains, covered with snow, destitute of the means of shelter from the inclemencies of the weather, or of supporting themselves under it by any of the comforts which Providence has destined for that purpose: benumbed with cold, they fell an easy prey to the severity of the climate, and when the night had passed away, there were found in their cradles, or lying upon the snow, fourscore of their infants deprived of life, many of the mothers also lying dead by their sides, and others just upon the point of expiring."

This was the work of the holy Roman Church, and a thousand such things she has done. It was done by authority of the head of the Church, with the concurrence of his prelates and patriarchs, and by the agency of kings and princes, who degraded themselves, by becoming the common executioners of the ghostly father of Rome. I should not bring such things against Papists of the present day, if they would honestly say, that they condemn the conduct of the head of the Church, for such barbarous proceedings. But they will do no such thing. I never heard of one of them who would say that the Pope had done wrong, in commanding the slaughter of so many thousands of men, women, and children, for the sake of religion. I hold them all, therefore, guilty of consenting to the bloody work of their fathers; and it is not unfair to infer that, if they were placed in the same circumstances, and had the same power over heretics, their conduct would be the same.

No. XIV.

SATURDAY, October 17th, 1818.

It was not till towards the end of the eleventh century, that the Church of Scotland was brought into full conformity with that of Rome. The simplicity of the Culdean mode of worship was preferred by our fathers for ages after other countries in Europe, not excepting England, had submitted to the superstitious and ridiculous mummery of the Romish Church. This simplicity of worship was called barbarism, by the Popish writers of those days; as, I believe, our mode of worship is esteemed barbarous still, by those who prefer the Popish ritual. Margaret, queen of Malcolm Canmore, who has been canonized as the patroness of Scotland, was the instrument of bringing the church to a nearer conformity with Rome, both in doctrine and worship. She was an Anglo-Saxon princess, and having been educated on the Continent, where she had been accustomed to witness the same pompous rites, she was much offended by "certain erroneous practices," which prevailed in the Scottish Church. She was at great pains to annihilate those barbarous rites which were contrary to the universal practice of the church. Her arguments at length prevailed. The people were persuaded to keep Lent at the proper time, to celebrate mass in the proper manner, and, I suppose, to become in every respect good Christians, according to the will of the queen. It would appear, however, that, after her death, many relapsed to their former "beastly rites," as a Popish saint was pleased to denominate the simple worship of the Culdees.

In the twelfth century, it is affirmed, by Popish writers, there were Waldenses to be found both in England and Scotland, so that the thick darkness of Popery did not rest long upon our highly favoured country, without being relieved by a few rays of heavenly light. "In the year 1160, some real Christians sought in Britain an asylum from the persecutions of Germany. But, alas! they found only a premature grave. Regarding them as contemptible heretics, the writers of the times record their history in a way so cursory and confused, that it is difficult to ascertain facts. It is, however, confessed that the leader of these refugees, whose name was Gerard, was neither ignorant nor illiterate, though we are told his followers were, because, it seems, they made no other reply to the cavils of their enemies, than, 'we believe as we are taught in the word of God.'" These simple people received such treatment from the Popish rulers in England, as their brethren did in Germany and France. A coun-

cil was called by the king, to meet at Oxford, to try these heretics, whose number, it seems, amounted to no more than thirty. They were not likely to meet with either mercy or justice, from an assembly of haughty prelates. They were condemned—branded on the forehead—publicly whipt out of the town—and, being turned into the fields, in the depth of winter, when all were forbidden to relieve them, they perished. Even their enemies allow, that they behaved with great calmness and moderation; and when the inhuman sentence was executed upon them, they sang, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and persecute you." Warner justly observes, that "their conduct was worthy of the best and most righteous cause, and would incline one to think favourably of their doctrine." These were probably the first martyrs in Britain, for pure Christianity; at least, the first that suffered from the Church of Rome. What now shall we think of the assertion of modern Papists, that persecution was scarcely known in any Christian country, till it was practised by Protestants? The fact is, wherever there appeared the smallest symptom of any person being about to form his own judgment on matters of religion, from the word of God, he was considered a fit subject for the fire, and such is the hardening influence of Popery, upon the hearts of people otherwise humane, that it renders them perfectly insensible of the miseries of fellow creatures; it makes them even delight in inflicting tortures, if it be only for the sake of the faith. England, in the twelfth century, was not a country of savages. Considerable progress had been made in civilization; but it was a land of Papists; and, therefore, thirty poor strangers, who sought an asylum among them, and who were guilty of no crime, but professing to believe what they were taught in the word of God, were branded, and whipt, and with their bodies thus lacerated they were driven from the abodes of men, and left to perish of hunger and cold, in the depth of winter! The above fact is related by Bogue and Bennet, who refer to Warner's Ecc. Hist. —Petries' Ecc. Hist. and Gillies' Collections."

The Popish writers affirm not only that the Waldenses were found in England and Scotland, but they mention Wickliffe as one of their followers; and every reader of history knows what he and those who embraced pure Christianity suffered from their Popish rulers. Through the powerful influence of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, Wickliffe was indeed saved from the fury of his persecutors, and suffered to die a natural death; but the council of Constance, which burned John Huss, condemned Wickliffe as a heretic; and by its order his bones were dug up and burnt, and the ashes thrown into a neighbouring brook. This deed of impotent rage was the deed of the holy church in council assembled; and is therefore chargeable upon the church herself, and not upon any individual bishop or king.

At Glasgow, in the year 1422, James Retby was burnt for denying that the Pope was Christ's Vicar. I have no doubt many suffered before this date; but Retby is the first that remains on record, and he is mentioned by Knox, whose History commences at this year; and begins with remarkable extracts from the records of Glasgow. The historian observes "that it was by the merciful providence of God that such things, as are after-mentioned, were kept even by the enemies of truth, in their registers, to show that God preserved, in this realm, some sparks of his light, even in the time of the greatest darkness." In 1431, Paul Craw, a Bohemian, apprehended in the University of St Andrews, suffered death there. His enemies put a ball of brass in his mouth, that what he said for the truth, might not instruct the people. Wickliffe is said to have received the knowledge of the truth from one Lollard; hence, those who embraced the same sentiments were called Lollards, and they appear to have been numerous in both parts of the island, before the end of the fifteenth century. In the year 1494, thirty persons of those called the Lollards of Kyle, (that is, part of Ayrshire) were accused before Blackadder, archbishop of Glasgow, of about thirty-four articles contrary to Popish errors. Among these Lollards were George Campbell of Cesnock, Adam Reid of Bars-Kimming, John Campbell of New Mills, Andrew Shaw of Polkennet, Helen Chamber Lady Pokellie, and Isabel Chamber Lady Stair. Archbishop Spotswood informs us what sort of errors were held by those Lollards of Kyle, of which the following are a specimen:—That images ought not to be made or worshipped;—that the relics of saints ought not to be adored;—that it is not lawful to fight for the faith;—that after the consecration of the mass there remaineth bread, and that the natural body of Christ is not there;—that every faithful man and woman is a priest;—that the Pope is not the successor of Peter, except in that which our Saviour spoke to him, "Go behind me, Satan;"—that the Pope deceives the people with his bulls and indulgences;—that the mass profiteth not the souls in purgatory;—that the Pope exalts himself above God, and against God;—that priests may have wives, &c. "The archbishop of Glasgow laying these things to the charge of the above persons, they answered all with such confidence, that it was thought best to demit them, with an admonition to take heed of new doctrines, and content themselves with the faith of the church. The archbishop's accusation is said to have been very grievous, yet God so assisted his servants, partly by inclining the king's heart to gentleness, for several of them were his familiar friends, and partly by enabling them to give bold and godly an-

swers to their accusers; so that, in the end, the enemies were frustrate in their purpose. Adam Reid, in particular, gave such answers as turned the cause of the persecutors into ridicule, in the presence of the court where the king presided."—See *Spotswood and Gillies' Hist. Coll.*

Those worthy persons of Ayrshire thus escaped the fury of their persecutors; but no thanks to the archbishop of Glasgow, or to the Church of Rome, who would gladly have had them all at the stake. Considering the articles laid to their charge, one is astonished that they should have acquired so much spiritual light in an age of darkness, while yet the Bible had not been printed in their language, and Wickliffe's translation in manuscript must have been possessed by few of them.

Blackadder was not the only archbishop of Glasgow, who distinguished himself as a persecutor. Spotswood remarks of Beaton, who was translated to St Andrews, "that herein he was most unfortunate, that, under the shadow of his authority, *many good men* were put to death for the cause of religion, though himself was neither violently set, nor much solicitous (as it was thought) how matters went in the Church." I cannot sustain this apology of the Scottish Protestant primate on behalf of his Popish predecessor. If good men were put to death under his authority, he was undoubtedly their murderer; and that he was not solicitous how matters went in the church, only presents his character in a light so much the worse. He was a Papist, however, and I believe not worse than the average of Popish bishops,—he would rather have seen half the nation brought to the stake and burnt, than that one man should be allowed to read the Bible, and form his own judgment of its contents.

It is not my intention to write an ecclesiastical history; nor do I intend to narrate all that our fathers suffered, on account of religion from Papists, and men popishly inclined. If such were my intention, I could not flatter myself, or my readers, with the prospect of a termination of my labours in less than seven years. I must be indulged, however, in relating one or two instances, to show the true spirit of Popery, and what may be expected if that system shall again obtain the ascendency.

Of the "many good men" that suffered death under archbishop Beaton, archbishop Spotswood says,—"The first that was called in question, was Mr Patrick Hamilton, abbot of Ferm, a man nobly descended, for he was nephew to the earl of Arran, by his father, and to the duke of Albany, by his mother, and not much past twenty-three years of age. This young man had travelled in Germany, and falling in familiarity with Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, Francis Lambert, and other learned men, was by them instructed in the knowledge of true religion, in the profession whereof he was so zealous, as he was resolved to come back into his country, and communicate the light he had received unto others. At his return, wheresoever he came, he spared not to lay open the corruptions of the Roman Church, and to show the errors crept into Christian religion; whereunto many gave ear, and a great following he had both for his learning and courteous behaviour to all sorts of people. The clergy grudging at this, under colour of conference, enticed him to the city of St Andrews; and when he came thither, appointed friar Alexander Campbell to keep company with him, and to use the best persuasions he could to divert him from his opinions. Sundry conferences they had, wherein the friar, acknowledging that many things in the Church did need to be reformed, and applauding his judgment in most of the points, his mind was rather confirmed than in any sort weakened. Thus having stayed some few days in the city, whilst he suspected no violence to be used, under night he was apprehended, being in bed, and carried prisoner to the castle; the next day he was presented before the bishop, accused of maintaining the articles following."—These are substantially the doctrines of the Reformation. Confessing that he held some of them as undoubted, and others as disputable, he was put to trial,—condemned as a heretic, and delivered over to the secular judge. "The same day, (for the execution was hastened, lest the King, who was gone at that time in pilgrimage to St Duthac, in Ross, should impede the proceeding,) he was condemned by the secular judge, and, in the afternoon led to his place of suffering, which was appointed to be at the gate of St Salvator's college. Being come to the place, he put off his gown, and gave it, with his bonnet, coat, and other apparel to his servant, saying, This stuff will not help in the fire, yet will do thee some good; I have no more to leave thee but the ensample of my death, which I pray thee keep in mind. For albeit the same be bitter, and painful in man's judgment, yet is it the entrance to everlasting life, which none can inherit, who denieth Christ before this congregation. Then was he tied to the stake; about it a great quantity of coal, wood, and other combustible matter was heaped, whereof he seemed to have no fear, but seriously commending his soul into the hands of God, held his eyes fixed towards heaven. The executioner firing the powder that was laid to kindle the wood, his left hand and the side of his face were a little scorched therewith, yet the fire did not kindle. Whereupon some were sent to the castle to bring more powder; whilst this was bringing, he uttered divers comfortable speeches to them that stood by: the friars all that time molesting him with their cries, bidding him convert, pray to our lady, and say *Salve Regina:* amongst them none was more troublesome than friar Alex-

ander Campbell, who, as we said, kept company with him, at his first coming to the city. Often he besought him to depart, and not to vex him; but when he would not cease his crying, he said, Wicked man, thou knowest that I am not a heretic, and that it is the truth of God for which I now suffer; so much thou didst confess to me in private, and, therefore, I appeal thee to answer before the judgment-seat of Christ.

"The powder by this time was brought, and the fire kindled, after which, with a loud voice he was heard to say, How long, O Lord, shall darkness oppress this realm? how long wilt thou suffer this tyranny of men? and then closed his speeches with these words, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. His body was quickly consumed, for the fire was vehement, but the patience and constancy he showed in his dying stirred up such compassion in the beholders, as many of them doubted not to say that he suffered an innocent, and was indeed a martyr of Christ."

It became, however, a capital crime to say that Patrick Hamilton died a martyr, and some suffered death for it. According to Spotswood, "one Henry Forrest was delated for saying that Mr Patrick Hamilton died a martyr, and thereupon was brought to St Andrew's; but, because the probation was not clear enough, friar Walter Lainge, was appointed to confess him. The simple man that feared no harm, being asked by the friar, what was his judgment of Mr Patrick, answered, that he esteemed him to be a good man, and that the articles for which he was condemned, might well be defended. This confession, revealed by the friar, was taken for sufficient evidence, and the poor man was condemned to be burnt as a heretic. As he was leading out to be degraded, he complained grievously of the friar who had betrayed him, crying out, Fie on falsehood, fie on false friars, revealers of confession. Never let any man trust them after me. They are despisers of God, and deceivers of men. And when they were taking from him his orders, (for he was of the order of Bennet and Collet, as they used then to speak) he cried aloud, Take not only your orders from me, but your baptism also. So being carried to the place of execution, (which was appointed to be at the north stile of the Abbey, to the end the heretics of Angus might see the fire) he suffered death most constantly. Whilst they were consulting upon the manner of his execution, one John Lindsay, a plain and simple man who attended the bishop, gave advice to burn him in some hollow cellar; for the smoke, saith he, of Mr Patrick Hamilton hath infected all those on whom it blew.

"Yet the persecution still proceeding, divers were cited to appear at *Halirudhouse*, by James Hay, bishop of Ross, who sat as commissioner for the archbishop of St Andrews; amongst others, James Hamilton of Livingston, brother-german to Master Patrick, with Catherine Hamilton, his sister. The gentleman was advised by the King, secretly, (for he loved the man) not to appear, and was for his contumacy condemned. His sister appearing, and questioned upon the point of justification by works, answered simply, that she believed no person could be saved by their works. Master John Spence, the lawyer, held a long discourse with her about that purpose, telling her that there were different sorts of works, works of congruity, and works of condignity; in the application whereof, he consumed a long time. The woman growing thereupon into a chafe, cried out, 'Work here, work there, what kind of working is all this? I know perfectly, that no works can save me but the work of Christ my Saviour.' The king was present all the time, and laughed heartily at the answer, yet, taking the gentlewoman aside, he moved her to recant her opinions, and by her example divers others at the same time abjured their profession." How honourably would this lady have appeared in history, had she been burnt at the stake as her brother was, instead of being prevailed upon by the king to make shipwreck of the faith.

I shall, at present, give only one instance more of Popish cruelty and intolerance. It happened in our own city, in 1538: "This year, in Glasgow," says Spotswood, "Hieronymus Russel, of the order of Grey Friars, and one Kennedy, a young man of Ayr, not past eighteen years of age, were accused likewise of heresy, but because the archbishop, Mr Gavin Dumbar, was esteemed somewhat cold in these businesses, Master John Lawder, Master Andrew Oliphant, and Friar Maltman, were sent from Edinburgh to assist in the trial." "The friar reasoned long and learnedly against his accusers, and, being answered only with railings and bitter speeches, said, 'This is your hour and power of darkness; now you sit as judges, and we stand wrongfully condemned, but the day cometh which will show our innocency, and you shall see your own blindness, to your everlasting confusion; go on, and fulfil the measure of your iniquity.' At which words the archbishop was greatly moved, affirming that these rigorous executions did hurt the cause of the Church more than could well be thought of, and therefore he declared that, in his opinion, it should be best to save the lives of the men, and take some other course with them: but these others, who were sent to assist, told him expressly, that, if he followed any milder course than that which had been kept at Edinburgh, they could not esteem him the Church's friend; whereupon he was compelled to give way to their cruelty, and thus these innocents were condemned to be burnt alive." "When they were brought to the place of their suffering, they used not many words, but, commending

their souls to God, after they were tied to the stake, endured the fire constantly, without expressing any token of fear or amazement."

I could give a much more detailed account of the preaching and sufferings of Hamilton and others, from other historians; but I prefer giving that of archbishop Spotswood, Lord Primate of all Scotland, because his word will go farther with Papists than that of a meaner man, especially as he was, as his title page bears, "Privy Counsellor to King Charles the First, that most religious and blessed Prince."

After saying so much of the severity of Popish persecutions, it may be interesting to know something of the manner in which Protestants persecute Papists. One instance, at present, shall suffice. It is reported of a late Popish priest, in a neighbouring town, that he complained much of being persecuted. The good people, his neighbours, could not think what he meant, for he seemed to be living in as much peace and comfort as any of themselves. On inquiry, it turned out that, when he had gone into a cotton mill, to inquire about some of his people, the children whispered to one another, That is the Popish priest. This was his persecution!

If it be objected, that this is only an instance which has occurred in modern times, while my instances of Popish persecution are of an old date, I answer, that the older a doctrine or practice is, Papists like it the better; that Popery is always the same; that the practice of their Church in former days is her practice still, wherever she has the power and the opportunity of doing what she formerly did; whereas Protestants acknowledge their former imperfections, are thankful for any improvement they have made, and they hope to improve still farther.

No. XV.

SATURDAY, October 24th, 1818.

I HOPE the facts given in my two last Numbers will be considered by my readers as sufficient to fix the charge of intolerance upon Papists themselves. Popery is avowedly an exclusive system. I have shown that it was so in ages past; and I have now to show that it is so still. In doing this, I shall not rest my proof on the recent persecutions in France, but on a document published in the Orthodox Journal of last month.

It is the misfortune of the King of the Netherlands, that, in the greater part of his kingdom, the Romish religion prevails, while he is a Protestant, and is desirous that all his subjects should enjoy equal liberty. The constitution of the kingdom, indeed, provides for unlimited freedom in religious worship, by all denominations who shall live peaceably; nay, more, "all the subjects of the King, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments whatsoever." On this very account, the new constitution is condemned by the Popish bishops; and they refuse taking the oath prescribed by law. They declare, in effect, that Jesus Christ has given to each of them a certain portion of the surface of the globe, which is called a diocese. "The power," they say, "which bishops have to watch over the teaching of Christian faith and morality, through the whole extent of their dioceses, like that of fulfilling all the other functions of the ministry, emanates from the will and authority of Jesus Christ." Hence, they will not allow the sovereign so much as the power of regulating public instruction in the schools; and they will not suffer that any faith but that of Rome shall be taught or professed in those parts of the globe which Christ has given them. I should give the document entire were it not too long. It is entitled, "DOCTRINAL DECISION *of the bishops of the kingdom of the Netherlands, on the oath prescribed by the new constitution.*" After stating the duties of bishops as guardians and deposits of the faith and morality of the gospel, they say, "It is to them, therefore, that are particularly addressed these words of the Holy Ghost:—*Even unto death fight for justice, and God will overthrow thy enemies for thee.*" These, by the by, are no more the words of the Holy Ghost, than those of the Orthodox Journal are, but merely those of an apocryphal writer, (*Ecclesiasticus* iv. 28. which the bishops quote, Eccl. iv. 33; which, with an ignorant reader, may pass for the acknowledged canonical book, *Ecclesiastes.* These bishops declare that they cannot take the prescribed oaths, because, say they, "In fact, they bind themselves by the said oaths to observe and maintain all the articles of the new constitution, and, consequently, those which are opposed to the spirit and maxims of the Catholic religion, or which evidently tend to oppress and enslave the Church of Jesus Christ. Now, such are the following articles:—Article 190. Liberty of religious opinions is guaranteed to all. Article 191. Equal protection is granted to all the religious communions which exist in the kingdom. Article 192. All the subjects of the king, without distinction of religious belief, enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and employments whatsoever. Article 193. The public exercise of any form of worship cannot be prevented, except it be liable to trouble the public order and tranquillity. Article 196. The king takes care that all worships keep themselves within the obedience due to the laws of the state."

Such are the laws in the new kingdom of the Netherlands, with regard to religious freedom, and it is difficult to conceive any thing more

liberal, where there are laws about religion, and, indeed, the House of Orange have been for ages distinguished as the friends of religious liberty. But the Romish bishops will not consent to such articles: they abhor such liberal ideas. As to Article 190 and 191, they say:—"1st. To swear to maintain the liberty of religious opinions, and the equal protection granted to all forms of worship, what else is it but to swear to maintain to protect error as well as truth; to favour the progress of anticatholic doctrines; to sow, as much as in us lies, the tares and poison which are to infect the present and future generations; to contribute thus, and it cannot be done more effectually, to extinguish gradually, in these fine countries, the torch of the true faith? The Catholic Church, which has ever rejected error and heresy from her bosom, could not regard as her true children, those who would dare to swear to maintain that which she has never ceased to condemn."

"Article 192.—2. To swear to maintain the observance of a law, which renders all the subjects of the king, of whatsoever religious belief they may be, capable of maintaining all dignities and employments whatsoever, would be to justify beforehand and to sanction the measures which may be taken to confide the interests of our holy religion in these provinces, so eminently Catholic, to Protestant functionaries."

I have not been an opposer to what is called Catholic emancipation, on the liberal ground of emancipating all dissenters alike, and putting them all, if good subjects, upon an equal footing with regard to civil privileges; but, supposing I were an opposer, I could not use a stronger argument than that furnished by these Belgian bishops. If all the subjects of the king are eligible to public offices, then they contemplate great danger to their holy religion, from the appointment of Protestant functionaries in their provinces so eminently Catholic. I am sure, the argument applies with double force to our country, so eminently Protestant; —if all shall be equally eligible to public offices—if we shall thereby come under the government of Popish functionaries, there will be more danger to Protestantism in Britain, than to Popery in Belgium, in proportion as Papists are more zealous than Protestants, in propagating their peculiar tenets.

The declaration of these Belgian bishops is given in the Orthodox Journal, without animadversion, and, I believe, with approbation, as it seems to accord with the general spirit of the Editor and his correspondents. With what face then can they cry out against our government for refusing them here, what they will not grant to Protestants in the Netherlands? They are continually railing against the British government for refusing them their just rights, —their undoubted rights,—their unalienable rights, of which, they say, they have been unjustly deprived by the intolerance of the British government. Will they grant that the rights of Protestants in the Netherlands, and in Spain, are as just, and undoubted, and unalienable, as theirs are in Britain and Ireland? I am sure they will not; and if they possessed a particle of modesty or discretion, they would forbear making such an outcry about their deprivations, and their rights, till they had prevailed with their ghostly father at Rome, to command their dear sons, the kings of Spain and Portugal, and the Belgian bishops, to grant as much liberty to Protestants in their dominions and dioceses, as Papists already have in Britain and Ireland. They cannot reasonably complain, if they receive as much as they would give; and they have received a great deal more.

But, let any one ask Papists to say plainly what they mean by their just rights? and, if they are candid, they will answer, The entire possession of the kingdom, and all things in it. This, they say, they formerly possessed, and they complain of having been unjustly deprived of it, by the violence of Knox and others, at the Reformation. Let things be restored to the condition in which they stood before that period, and they will have obtained their just rights; then, if any Protestants shall remain in the country, they may have the choice which Henry VIII. gave to his heretical subjects, "turn or burn."

To come nearer our own door, Popery is proved to be intolerant by a furious philippic against THE PROTESTANT, in the chapel in Clyde Street on Sabbath, the 4th of this present month. The unhappy individual, who writes these pages, was as good as excommunicated, after the solemn pantomime of high mass, in the presence of a vast congregation of Protestants and Papists. I do not say that his excommunication was accompanied by the usual solemnities; it was not done from the altar, but only from the pulpit, and the lights were not extinguished; but he was declared to be no Christian, which was putting him without the pale of the Church; and his person and publications were consigned to everlasting infamy. As the person principally concerned was not present, he cannot give a particular account of the matter; but, from some reports which have reached his ear, he believes he was loaded with nearly as many curses as the Pope pronounced upon the poor alum-maker, for which see my fifth Number. This violence of the priest was merely the raging of the tiger in his cage; but it showed what he would do, if he were under no restraint. By one summary and *flaming* argument, he would refute, and for ever silence, the enemy of the true faith.

Having occupied about three numbers and a half, in replying to one sentence of AMICUS VERITATIS, about bigotry and intolerance, I must now endeavour to get over the ground a little faster. Page 24, this Gentleman

says, "Before I proceed, I may recall to your recollection the remark of Demosthenes, the orator, "such is the natural disposition of mankind, that invective and accusation are heard with pleasure, while they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience." AMICUS VERITATIS did right to inform us that it was Demosthenes, *the orator*, who said this, lest we should have ascribed it to some other Demosthenes; and certainly there is not much in the sentence that would make any admirer of the orator contend for it. If it is meant to be a reflection on the natural disposition of mankind, that "they who speak their own praises are heard with impatience," I would very cheerfully vindicate this trait in the character of my fellow creatures. A much greater than Demosthenes said, "Let another praise thee, and not thine own lips."

In fact, the Papists are incessantly praising themselves and their church; and I am not surprised that they should find people who hear this very impatiently. AMICUS VERITATIS speaks of his brethren as "a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue." (Page 25.) And, in the short advertisement published in the Glasgow Chronicle, (*Prot.* page 54,) he calls them "the most numerous and respectable body of Christians in the world." Now, it is very probable that if he talks this way of his brethren and of himself, in company, he will be heard with impatience, as he deserves to be. I have no quarrel with my private Popish neighbours, who are living peaceably, and following their lawful occupations: I have no wish to diminish their respectability; and if they are the most respectable body of Christians in the world, it is the better for themselves. My controversy is with their priests, and with others who deceive them, and who flatter them with their goodness, and their virtues, and respectability, instead of directing them, as poor sinners, as all men are, to Christ, the only refuge of the guilty.

A leading subject in the sermons of Popish priests is, I am informed, the praise of their own church. She is an apostolical church,—she is a catholic church,—a perpetually visible church,—an infallible church,—but, above all, she is a *holy* church. Now, I do not wonder that this should be heard with impatience. My astonishment is, that so many citizens of Glasgow, otherwise men of sense, should be able to sit with patience, and hear such nonsense. The Church of Rome is neither apostolical, nor catholic, nor infallible: that she has been perpetually visible for many hundred years, aye, and tangible too, has been experienced by thousands of men, women, and children, who have felt the weight of her arm; but it is not so clear that she is a *holy* church. In the common acceptation of the word, holy is to be free from sin—to be separated from the world, in its principles and practices—to be like Jesus Christ, who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners. Those who believe in Christ, are made, in this respect, somewhat like him; very imperfectly, indeed, while in this world; but they possess a resemblance. They will not live in sin: they will not knowingly commit sin; or, if they do, they will have no rest till they obtain pardon and peace through the blood of atonement. Contrast this with the character of the Church of Rome, as given by a divine of her own, which I repeat from Page 22. "Provided money can be extorted, every thing prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for money; so that, as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime that a man can commit, is to be poor. Shameful to relate; they give permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots, who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And in some places they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying that they may keep a concubine if they please. There is a printed book, which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, The Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of the Summists. And of these crimes, there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." Such is the testimony of Claude D'Espence,* a Parisian divine, of great note in the Romish church.

If the Church of Rome be a holy church, it will, of course, be holiest at the head. Be it known, then, that Pope Paul III. in the third year of his Papacy, granted a bull for publicly licensing brothels: and gave an indulgence for the commission of lewdness, provided the man paid a certain fine to the holy see, and the woman a yearly sum for her license, and entered her name in the public register. In the days of this Pope, there are said to have been forty-five thousand such women in Rome; and, besides the amount of the annual license which each took out for the privilege of prostitution, the Church received a part of their weekly income. Each brothel had an iron chest fixed into the wall, into which every man put his offering; and three agents of the holy see went round weekly to open the chests, and divide what was found in them;—one third part went to the house, one third to the woman, and one third to the holy church, for the purpose, it was pretended, of redeeming captives of the Romish religion from the Turks. If any man chose to be wicked, in a more private manner, and went to a person, or a house,

* In his commentary on the Epistle to Titus, pp. 67, 68, 8vo. Parisiis, 1568.

unlicensed, he was, on discovery, to be excommunicated, or to pay seven times the price which his sin would have cost in a lawful way.

Such was the holy church at its very head, and it would be easy to trace the same character through all its members. I do not mean individual members, for there were some individuals who knew, acknowledged, and deplored, the wickedness of their church; such as the Parisian divine whom I have quoted; but I mean the different parts of the church, as it appeared in different countries, in its brotherhoods, and sisterhoods, and monastic establishments, resembling so many brothels. On this subject much might be said, but I shall not pollute my pages by being more particular. Their very catechisms and books of devotion are full of the poison of impurity. The questions asked at confession, according to a small manual in my possession, are disgusting in the extreme, and must inevitably pollute the minds of young persons who submit to be catechised privately by a priest.

In short, it is one of the worst characters of that church, that real holiness is no way necessary to the enjoyment of all its privileges and honours. If one will but implicitly submit to all its impositions, he may live as wickedly as he pleases, and be assured of heaven at last. Of this we have a striking instance in our own King Charles II. Papists strongly maintain that he died in the faith of Rome; and I have by me two documents which are understood to prove the fact. They are certified by his brother, King James II. to have been found, in Charles' own hand-writing, after his death. Now we all know what sort of life Charles lived till the very last; we never had any evidence of his repentance; yet the church of Rome eagerly claims him as one of her children, which led the historians of the English dissenters to say, "That must indeed be a *holy* mother church which contends for the honour of having such a son as Charles the Second."

Among Papists it is as common to call their church holy, as to call the Pope his Holiness, or the King his Majesty; and they are continually praising their holy church. I find in general that the more of man and the less of God there is in any church, the more it is praised by its members; and the reason is, people are always ready to praise what is their own. Whenever we hear the terms, holy church, or apostolical church, or incomparable church, we may be sure there is something wrong. The real church of Christ, like the virtuous woman, does not make a talk of her holiness or virtue, but lets her works praise her in the gates.

The Orthodox Journal follows up the praise of its own church with the praise of its members. The Editor speaks as if it were universally admitted that his brethren are more decent and moral than their Protestant neighbours. He tells us that it was the laxity of morals, encouraged by the Reformers in the time of Henry VIII. that made so many forsake the Church of Rome; and he predicts that, if the veto is conceded, and the Catholic priest taught to depend upon the ministry for promotion, "he will neglect to practise the duties of his office, his flock will become indifferent to religion, and, in the course of a few years, Catholics will not be distinguished from the rest of their countrymen for the infidelity of their opinions, and the looseness of their morals." From this we are led to believe, if we can believe it, that the state of morals is much better among Papists than among ourselves, and that Papists are in danger of becoming depraved in their morals by contact with us.

The Orthodox Journalist tells us further, still speaking the praise of himself and his brethren, "The only chain which binds the ardent attachment of the Irish laity to the clergy, is the spotless purity of their character, and the knowledge which they have, that they derive their functions from the Holy Ghost." This is speaking their own praise with a witness. The *spotless purity* of the character of the Irish priests! We had very lately an opportunity of judging of this, in the person of one of them, who, in the chapel in Clyde Street, for nearly an hour together, poured forth a rhapsody of scurrilous abuse, and downright lies, about John Knox and the Reformation;—barefaced impudent lies,—known to be such by every person then present, who professed a moderate knowledge of history. But I believe, lies are not considered spots in the character of a Popish priest, if they be *lies* for the advancement of the *true* faith. The Jesuit Missionaries in China, finding the people despise Christianity, because its founder was crucified, denied the fact of the crucifixion, and told the Chinese that it was a falsehood invented by the Jews to discredit the gospel. I have no doubt the Jesuits in Clyde Street would do the same, if they thought it would increase their popularity, or bring more money into their chest. And, indeed, to deny the fact of the crucifixion of Christ, is not worse than to deny the sufficiency of his atonement, which is done by them every day, when they direct sinners to satisfy divine justice for themselves, or to rely on the merit of saints.

If we would judge truly of the moral character of a sect, we must see them not where they are few and despised, but where their system is predominant. Attend, therefore, to the testimony of all travellers who have lately visited France, where Popery is the established religion, and it will be found that there the state of morals is most deplorable. I need not go into details, for the fact is well known to every one who has conversed with such travellers, or perused their writings. I am not, by

any means, disposed to praise the national morality of Protestants, though I am sure it would not shrink from a comparison with that of Papists; but I know that the tendency of Protestant doctrines is to produce true morality, and that such is their invariable effect, wherever they are cordially embraced; whereas, he who embraces the doctrines of Rome, has positive encouragement to live in all manner of vice, knowing that, for a little money, he can procure pardon at any time: and that, should he even die unpardoned, a small legacy to the church will procure his release from purgatory, and his admission into heaven. Besides, the priests have actually a motive to encourage the commission of sin, for they would have no trade without it—no income but from the pardons which they grant; as some excisemen are said to wink at smuggling, for the sake of the seizures and the fines.

No. XVI.

SATURDAY, October 31st, 1818.

Amicus Veritatis writes as if he laboured under great disadvantage in this controversy. The "Protestant," he says, "has greatly the advantage, and more particularly so, as he assumed a signature that will very generally ensure him of being received with approbation." This Gentleman chose a signature which signifies a "Friend of Truth." How justly he is entitled to this name, my readers are now able to judge. Let them think of his falsehood with regard to Luther, and many other falsehoods in his writings, and say whether I may not with justice prefix a syllable to his name, and call him Inimicus Veritatis?

It is really not worth while to descend to personalities of this kind; but since I have undertaken to answer all that my Popish adversaries have written, I must not overlook even this trifle. He means it to be understood, I suppose, that my signature will go farther than his; and that a Protestant has a better chance of being favourably received, write what he may, than a Friend of Truth, who writes nothing but the truth. This is about as good as his other assertions and insinuations. Papists are continually boasting of the truth, as if the truth lived with them, and would die with them; whereas their whole system is built upon falsehood, and is supported by lies; which I have, I think, proved already, and may prove again before I have done.

When he asserted that my signature, "A Protestant," would very generally ensure my being received with approbation, he said more than he knew to be true, and I believe more than was warranted by truth, at the time. I have the satisfaction to know, that now, and for some weeks past, my Papers have been received with approbation, in different parts of the country, and their circulation is much beyond any thing that I contemplated: in so much, that some of the Numbers have been printed a second and a third time. For this I express my gratitude to a numerous class of readers; and I am encouraged by it to persevere in labours which would sometimes be irksome, if they were not relieved by a persuasion that they may be useful to my fellow Protestants, and that, at least, they can do no harm to my fellow creatures of the Romish communion, many of whom, I am informed, read what I write; and I shall not have written in vain, if any one of them shall be led to read the Bible, and judge for himself, whether or not the things which I have written are true.

But I cannot allow myself to forget that, at the time when Amicus Veritatis wrote the sentence which I have quoted, and for some time afterwards, there were many Protestants from whom I received no encouragement. There were some from whom I received hints, directly and indirectly, that they thought I had engaged in a very unnecessary and invidious undertaking, and who blamed me for writing against the "Roman Catholics," as if that were now a thing quite inconsistent with liberality and Christian charity. I know that this proceeded from ignorance, and I was neither surprised nor offended by it. Most people had forgotten, and the younger part of our population did not know, what Popery was. It appeared among us a very harmless thing. Great pains were taken to make us believe that it never was, at any time, or in any country, worse than we have seen it in Glasgow for twenty years past; and I believe the general impression upon the community, especially upon the young and the sentimental of both sexes, has been in favour of that system, ever since so many of their priests sought and found an asylum in this country from the miseries that threatened them, at the time of the French Revolution. At that time the sympathies of the people in general were awakened on their behalf. The support of the Popish exiles became identified with the preservation of social order; our ministers ceased to pray for the downfal of the Man of Sin; they ceased to instruct their people with regard to the nature of Popery, or to warn them of their danger from it. I believe most of them did so, in the simplicity of their hearts, not contemplating the possibility of danger from a system which seemed to be overthrown while Bonaparte was sovereign of continental Europe. From these circumstances, great ignorance with regard to Popery prevailed all over Britain; and the labours of the Protestant were at first received very coolly, except by Christians of the old school, who could not forget what their fathers

had suffered from the cruelty of the Antichristian Beast.

It does not become me to say that my writings have produced any important change in this respect; but it is certain that they are now received with more favour, and read with more avidity, than they were at first. Many have confessed to me that they did not know what Popery was till they read my Papers; and from the noise which has been made about them at different times in their own chapel, I am led to believe that Papists themselves feel the truth of what I have written.

I had said, in my first Letter in the Glasgow Chronicle, if the subjects of the late Oratorio could be considered as matter of amusement, then the permission of the bishop was nothing less than a Popish indulgence to commit sin. AMICUS VERITATIS replies, (see *Prot.* p. 24.) "I am really astonished to see him trifling thus. Does he not know that the Catholic chapel was asked for a charitable purpose? Does he not know that charity is the essence of religion? Consequently the chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement."

My remark did not regard the charitable object of the Oratorio, but the feeling of those present with regard to the *subjects* of it. (For the subjects, see *Prot.* p. 11.) They embrace some of the most important doctrines of the word of God. I do not think it lawful, in any case whatever, to make these the subjects of amusement. AMICUS VERITATIS disclaims the idea of their being so. Then the Oratorio is admitted to have been an act of solemn worship. I know, however, that it was not at the time held out as such; if it had, there would not, perhaps, have been so many Protestants present, especially as the whole service was conducted in Latin, in which no person could possibly worship, but those who understood the language. Of those Protestants who attended the Popish chapel on that day, I am persuaded not one went for the purpose of divine worship; but the Papists understand them to have done so.

AMICUS VERITATIS asks, if I do not know that charity is the essence of religion? I do know it, if it be the charity of the Bible; that is, love of God and of our fellow creatures. This is undoubtedly the essence of religion. The end of the commandment is charity, or love; but I do not know that giving and receiving money is the essence of religion, though I believe it is the best part of Popery. I think I am giving weekly evidence of my charity towards Papists, in my labours on their behalf. I do not know how I can show this better than by endeavouring to open their eyes to their own true interests, both for time and eternity. Their priests are deceiving them by means of lies and imposition; whether they profess to regenerate them by baptism, or establish them in Christianity by confirmation, or pardon their sins by the sacrament of penance, or clear their way to heaven by extreme unction, or deliver the souls of their friends from purgatory, on being paid for it,—all is downright imposition. And I have such charity for all the Papists in the world, that I wish every one of them was convinced of the truth; I wish that they would forsake their priests; or, what would be still better, they would all come to Christ, and bring their priests with them, not by force, but by means of persuasion —by convincing them of the truth.

Christ is exhibited in the Bible for the salvation of sinners; and he makes all sinners, without exception, welcome to come to him directly and immediately, promising, "him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out." What is the use of going to a priest for the pardon of sin? Priests are sinful fellow creatures; they need pardon as much as those whom they profess to pardon. Christ alone had power on earth to forgive sin; and he is exalted to heaven for the very purpose—a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the remission of sins. I request my readers, especially those of the Romish communion, not to take this on my word, but to read the Bible for themselves, and see if it be not so, that Christ bids them come to himself at once; and that a priest can no more save them, than they can save themselves. Charity requires me thus to tell them what I know to be true; and seeing so many of them do me the favour to read my writings, I hope none of them will be the worse, but that they will be the better, in consequence of what they read.

"Charity is the essence of religion." Then, why is it that my Popish opponents have no charity for me? They profess to believe that I am in error; and, I suppose, they think my error is a deadly one. Why, then, do they not use means to convince and reclaim me? I have invited Mr Scott to write against me, and to show where I am in error; I have even offered to print what he shall write without expense to him; but I cannot get a word from him. My other opponents are equally silent. It is evident, therefore, that they have no charity for the PROTESTANT—no wish to reclaim him from his errors. They brought a Dublin priest, indeed, to their pulpit to curse him, as Balak, king of Moab, brought Balaam to curse the children of Israel; and the modern false prophet was not like the ancient one, for he did curse most bitterly, without one word of blessing, or even of compassion for the object of his malediction. This, it seems, is their charity. This is the essence of their religion. They know no way of convincing a heretic but that of burning him, if they have the power, or of cursing him, if they have not.

Charity, I have said, in the Bible sense of the word, is love—the love which springs from

the belief of the gospel; and it leads him who possesses it, not to curse, but to bless his fellow-creatures. But it is evident, that AMICUS VERITATIS considers the word only as relating to the giving and receiving of money; and lest my readers of the Romish communion should suppose that my charity for them is of the same nature, and that I am at all this pains to enlighten them by my writings, for the sake of the profits which I derive from them, I hereby assure them that I have not pocketed a single farthing by all that I have written; and that I am determined not to receive any emolument whatever from this work. The price was fixed so low as not to afford a prospect of any profit; but the circulation of my Numbers has of late become so great, that my printers give me reason to hope there will be something over, after defraying all expenses. This, whatever it may be, shall be cheerfully applied to promote the education of poor persons belonging to the Church of Rome, if it shall be accepted for that purpose. I invite, therefore, persons belonging to that communion to buy and read THE PROTESTANT; and in doing so, they will contribute to the welfare of themselves and their children.

AMICUS VERITATIS lays down a somewhat curious principle, in the passage which furnishes the text of the present Number. "The Catholic chapel was asked for a charitable purpose; charity is the essence of religion;—consequently the chapel was granted for a religious purpose, not for the purpose of amusement." I believe there are few charities better entitled to the support of the benevolent than our royal infirmary. I believe also that stage-players, and mountebanks, and Indian jugglers, and incombustible ladies, have most, or all of them, performed for the benefit of this and other charities. Does it follow that their performances assumed a religious character when the profits were thus appropriated? Were the theatre, and the circus, and the trades' hall, not places of amusement, but of religious worship, on these occasions? Certainly, if the goodness or charitable nature of the object sanctified the means of promoting it; which seems to be the meaning of AMICUS VERITATIS, and which is, I believe, an acknowledged tenet of Popery.

AMICUS VERITATIS repeats his assertion, "that it never was a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or Bishop could grant indulgence to commit sin." I have, I think, refuted this assertion already, and I may take up the subject again, when I come to vindicate my evidences against his exceptions to their validity. In the meantime, I see plainly that he conceals a quibble under the words *doctrine* and *sin*. When any thing of this kind bears particularly hard upon Papists, they deny it to be a doctrine of their church. To be a *doctrine*, it is not enough that it has been practised without opposition for hundreds of years, by Popes and Bishops, and even sanctioned by general councils. Much less than this, indeed, will make any thing a doctrine, if it be not controverted—if it be not a thing which Papists find it convenient to deny: but if it be any thing that happens to be odious or unpopular at the time, or in the country where it is spoken of, though it has been sanctioned by ever so many councils, and practised by the Pope for ever so long; Papists will deny it to be a doctrine of their church.

They sometimes maintain that a doctrine of the church is that which has had the unanimous consent of the whole church, in all ages; and, upon this principle, they can deny whatever they please; for I believe there is no doctrine or practice known to exist, which has not, at one time or other, been impugned by some of their doctors and saints. We have doctors against doctors, councils against councils, and Popes against Popes; so that, upon this principle, there is nothing that can be brought home to the Church of Rome, but what the individual we are dealing with may be pleased to admit at the time, though it may be denied by all his brethren, and even by himself the next day. Yet this is the infallible church, which was never wrong or mistaken in any point whatever!

But I did not say that it was a *doctrine* of the Church of Rome, that the Pope or a Bishop would grant an indulgence or permission to commit sin. I spoke of their practice;—their avowed and long continued practice, of which the history of Europe, for the last six hundred years, furnishes abundant evidence. I know that Papists also conceal a quibble under the word *sin*. I have shown, in a former Number, from Bellarmine, that the Pope claimed the power of making that which is sin to be no sin; so that that was not *sin* which he granted permission to do. In short, there is no reasoning with Papists with regard to any principle, or even fact, which it is possible they can evade by quibbling or lying. Their system is supported by all deceivableness of unrighteousness.

AMICUS VERITATIS affects great tenderness, and moderation, and fear of giving offence. "If," says he, (Page 24.) "in replying to your correspondent, I should unknowingly touch the feelings of any of my Protestant brethren, I hope they will not attribute it to the spirit of recrimination, but to my necessity of disclosing the truth. I hope they will also recollect who was the cause of this dispute: and that

> 'The blood will follow where the knife is driven,
> The flesh will quiver where the pincers tear.'"

In order to get, as soon as possible, out of the way of the knife and the pincers, those instruments of torture with which my opponent seems so familiar, I shall answer the last part of the quotation first. And all that I have to say is,

that I know nothing of such weapons, in conducting an argument. I never applied them to any creature, for the purpose of conviction, or for any other purpose; though it is probable he may have done so, and perhaps he is familiar with those effects which he describes in so feeling a manner. The pen is the only weapon in my armoury; and I assure him I would not break his skin with it, though I confess I wish to make him feel ashamed of his misrepresentations and other delinquencies.

I do not know who was the cause of this dispute, but I know it was the person who wrote the paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle, which represented the Protestant *worshippers* at the Oratorio, as paying the like respect to the *place*, as to the solemn passages of the word of God, which were sung on that occasion. This certainly was not the PROTESTANT; and if this controversy has disturbed the peace of the Popish part of the community he is not to blame for it.

AMICUS VERITATIS, it seems, did not write with a view to touch the feelings of his Protestant brethren, or from a spirit of recrimination, but from a "necessity of disclosing the truth." What truth has he disclosed? I have again looked over his letters, and I can see nothing of importance that bears the smallest resemblance to truth, except what he says about the *Cutty Stool*, to which I shall pay all due respect when I come to that subject. But truth is a good thing; and by professing to maintain it, though he should do so by falsehood, he tries to deceive those who confide in him.

From whom did AMICUS VERITATIS learn to use the expression, "my Protestant brethren?" Certainly not from Rome, or from the ancient practice of his holy and infallible church. Does he not know that the Pope called all those who separated from the Church of Rome, "*venomous adders*," who were without mercy to be trodden under foot? (See his Bull for the destruction of the Waldenses, in my second Number.) Did not the holy father declare all who presumed to preach Christ without his consent, or that of his bishops, to be under a perpetual anathema or curse? Did not the king of Arragon, at the instigation of the Pope, declare all separatists to be "vipers and perfidious children?" Did he not declare that he would not suffer such wretches to live? and that against such enemies of God and man he would not contain his indignation, or refuse to punish them with the sword of just vengeance? (See No. XIII.) Did not the Pope declare Wickliffe, and those who learned the doctrines of the gospel from him, to be men "run into a kind of detestable wickedness, not only for openly publishing, but also for vomiting out of the filthy dungeon of their breasts, diverse professions, false and erroneous conclusions, and most wicked and damnable heresies?" This is plain language, and I believe it is so far honest that the Pope meant what he said; but AMICUS VERITATIS, a Papist, holding the Pope as his holy father, whence comes he to speak of these "adders and vipers," and detestable heretics, as his *Protestant brethren?* It is not because he believes the Pope to have been wrong; it is not because Popery has become more moderate, for it is incapable of change; it is not because the Protestant religion is viewed by Papists more favourably than before;—but it is because Papists, in the situation of this writer, study to make themselves popular by using "good words and fair speeches." This, in my opinion, is more offensive than the hardest words of the Pope.

No. XVII.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 7TH, 1818.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us (See Part I. p. 24.) that the Douay Catechism "is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church; and is put into the hands of every child that is learning its Christian doctrine." Alas, for the children who have no better means of instruction than that furnished by this Catechism!

This assertion, that it "is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church," like most of his other assertions, will not bear examination. When was this approbation expressed? When was it possible that it could be expressed? There has been no meeting of the Catholic Church by its delegates, or otherwise, since the Council of Trent; and I have before me, a Catechism founded upon the decrees of that Council, which differs very materially from the Douay one, as we shall see presently. The Douay Catechism itself does not profess to have the honour of general or universal approbation in the Catholic Church. It has, in short, no voucher whatever. It presents itself with as little ceremony, or introduction, as it were merely a collection of those "excellent new songs," which have been hawked about the country for a hundred years.

I have consulted a number of their Catechisms, several of which are much larger than the Douay one, and are, besides, formally authenticated by the Pope, or some other dignitary of the Church. For instance, "Catechismus ad Parochos ex decreto Concilii Tredentini editus," is published by authority of Pope PIUS V. "Instructions generales en forme de Catechisme," is printed by order of Charles Joachim Colbert, bishop of Montpellier; and the "Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire," is sanctioned by the present Pope, and the Archbishop of Paris. I find none of those originally published in English, or that are in

present use in this country, so well authenticated.

In one of my late Numbers, I said there were different versions of the Douay Catechism, or rather, perhaps, different Catechisms, intended for different parts of the world, according to the degree of knowledge or ignorance, which is supposed to exist among the people. I have examined a version that is in common use in Ireland, and another which is used among the Papists in the Highlands of Scotland; and, from this examination, I am confirmed in the idea above expressed. The Douay Catechism, recommended by AMICUS VERITATIS, with all its errors and imperfections, is the least gross, and the least exceptionable. The Papists, therefore, have shown their wisdom in adopting this version to be used in Glasgow, as any thing extremely gross would more readily be detected here than in either the Highlands or Ireland.

The Douay Catechism, for instance, gives the second commandment at full length, which is not done by any other of those which I have mentioned. This seems to have been omitted in most of their Catechisms, for the purpose, no doubt, of concealing the divine prohibition of making and worshipping images. But, as Papists do not publicly worship images in Glasgow, they have not this motive for concealing the commandment; and AMICUS VERITATIS would have us believe it is the same all over the world, and, therefore, he tells us, that this Catechism is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church.

The version used in Ireland has not a word of the second commandment. That in the Highlands has the first and second, as follows: —"The first commandment is, I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage, thou shalt have no strange gods before me, &c." * "The second commandment is, Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Thus we see the whole of the second is omitted; but, should any of our acute countrymen in the north, by intercourse with his southern neighbours, come to learn that he has been robbed of one of the commandments, his priest can save his credit, by telling him that it lies all under the comprehensive *et cætera*.

This mode of announcing a divine law has, however, the sanction of high authority,—not less than that of the Council of Trent, at least of the "*Catechismus ad Parochos*," founded on their decrees, in which we read as follows: —"Primum præceptum decalogi. Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus qui eduxi te de terra Ægypti, de domo servitutis. Non habebis Deos alienos coram me, non facies tibi sculptile, &c." (Page 310.) This gives four words of the second commandment, forbidding the making of images; but, as if afraid to venture any farther, lest they should divulge too much of the will of God, which is decidedly against the worship of images, they slur over all the rest with an &c.

The Montpellier Catechism, an elaborate work in three volumes, ventures a little farther. To the first commandment they add the following words of the second,—"Vous ne vous ferez point d'idole, ni d'image taillée en aucune figure pour les adorer, ni pour les servir." (Tom. ii. p. 153.) Here, there is no &c., and what is given must stand for the whole commandment.

A large work in English, entitled "The real principles of Catholics; or, a Catechism for the Adult," (Page 121,) gives a few words more of the same commandment, but not nearly the whole: and the Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire, does not give a word of it. It gives what is meant for both the first and second, in five words:— "Thou shalt worship one God;" (Page 75,) and then, after a few questions and answers, it proceeds to a direct contradiction of the divine law, as follows:—"Q. Does this commandment forbid honouring the saints as the Church does? A. No: because the Church does not render to the saints the same honour as to God; but only honours the saints as the friends of God. Q. Is it forbidden to honour the images of Jesus Christ or of the saints? A. No: because they are honoured only in remembrance of Jesus Christ or of the saints, and the honour paid to the images relates to the objects which they represent. Q. What say you of the honour shown to the relics of the saints? A. They are likewise honoured in remembrance of the saints." The Douay Catechism gives the same doctrine in a more guarded manner:—"Q. Is it lawful to honour the images of Christ and his saints? A. Yes, if rightly understood; because the honour given them is referred to the things they represent; so that by the images or crosses, which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we honour and adore Christ himself. Q. Do Catholics pray to images? A. No, by no means: we pray before them, indeed, to keep us from distraction, but not to them; for we know they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us. Q. What benefit have we then by them? A. They movingly represent to us the mysteries of our Saviour's passion, and the martyrdom of his saints." (Pp. 45, 46.) There is here evidently a strong hankering after the worship of images, or which is substantially the same, the worship of God by images; and, if our Glasgow Papists had their will, they would have the image of a saint, or of the cross, at the corner of every street.

* Wherever what we call the second commandment, or any part of it, is given in their Catechisms, it is attached to the first; then our third is their second, and so on to their ninth, which is divided to make up the ten.

This sufficiently accounts for the omission of the second commandment in most of their Catechisms, and it required no small assurance in the Douayists to give it entire; which says expressly, not only thou shalt not worship, but *thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.* It forbids the worshipping of God by means of any resemblance of any thing in heaven or in earth. But the Church of Rome teaches the very reverse. They permit the worship of images just as the heathen did, who did not profess to worship the image itself, but the God whom it represented. My present subject, however, is not the idolatry of the Church of Rome, but their jugglery, in suppressing the divine command which convicts them of idol worship. On the subject of their idolatry itself, I cannot too strongly recommend the excellent work of Mr Cunninghame of Lainshaw.

This gentleman convicts the Douay Catechism of a mistranslation in the second commandment, which serves to cover the Romish practice of doing honour to images, so that they be not *adored.* Their words are, "Thou shalt not *adore* nor worship them;" whereas, the words are literally rendered, "thou shalt not *bow thyself to them,* and shalt not serve them," which expressly condemns their kneeling and worshipping before images, as much as the worshipping of the images themselves.

As I am upon the subject of Catechisms, I shall occupy the remainder of this Number, by extracts from one which will show the doctrine in which our fathers were instructed. For this I am indebted to a friend who has been at great pains to copy the very orthography of the work. It is certainly a curiosity; and, as some late publications have acquired great popularity, for little other reason, that I can think of, than the mixture of broad Scotch in their composition, I expect that what follows will be a recommendation of my work, especially as it is not the vulgar Scotch of the present day, but the classical Scotch of the sixteenth century. It is entitled "Ane Catechism or Schort instruction, &c. be Father Peter Canisius, Doctour in Theologie." This Catechism of Canisius was held in the very highest reputation by the Papists of the sixteenth century, and translated into all the modern languages. The following translation was made by a zealous Scotch Papist, for the instruction of his countrymen. It has no date, but the table of moveable feasts begins with the year 1587;

"Quhat expresses ye nynt articl, (*i. e.* of the Creed). I believe the Halie Kirk Catholixe, the communion of sancts?—First, yat it is simple, ane, and soundlie agreing in faith—under hir one head Christ, and under his lieutenā, the heighe bischope. To men out of this blessit communion of sancts (as to yam quha war out of the arke of Noe) deathe certainlie is appointit; and none hope of salvation, quhether they be Iew or Ethnikes, quha never receved the faith of the Kirk, or haeretichis, quha has either forsaken ye faith that thay receaivit, or corruptit ye same, or the schismatiches quha has forsaken the peace and unitie of the Kirk, doubtless may not be participant of the grace of God, and eternal salvation, except they be recōcilit and restorit agane to the Kirk—for ye reul of Sanct Cyprian and Sanct Augustine is maist suir, he sal nocht haiv God to his Father quha will nocht haiv the Kirk to his mother."—P. 12.

The first commandment runs thus, "Thou sal haiv no unkouth gods befoir me; thou sal nocht mak to thyself ony graven idol to adore it,"—the remaining part is omitted altogether; and what we call the tenth is as usual divided thus:—Ninth, "Thou sal nocht covet thy nybour's wyffe." Tenth, "Nor his hous, nor mā, nor his maden, nor his ox, nor his asse, nor zet ony thing yat is his."

"The ancient Fathers' testimonies of the Virgin Marie. Sanct Ireneus, lib. V. com. hor. 8. As Eaive was seducit to flee frome God, so was Marie inducit to obey God, that the wergine Marie mycht be advocat for the wergine Eaive, and as mankind war bound unto deathe by ane wergine, so it mycht be lykwise lowsit by an wergine, the unequall ballance of an wergine's disobedience being maid equal by a wergine's obedience."—P. 26. A great part of the Popish books of devotion, in modern English, run in the same strain. In fact, the Virgin Mary is held forth as the Saviour and the goddess of Papists.

Hear St Chrysostom in Liturgia: "How worthy and rycht thing is it to glorifie ye mother off God, quha ever is most blessit, altogether unspotted. Mother of God, mair honourabill nor the cherubims, and mair glorious without comparison thane the seraphims, quha without all kinds of corruptions has borne God, we magnifie the truelie quha is the mother of God, Marie full of grace, the Lord is with the, blessit art thou amonges al wimen, and blessit is the fruiet of thy wombe, because thou hes brocht furthe the Salviour of our saulles."—P. 26.

"Sanct Ambros, lib. 2. de Virginibus. Let the virginitie and lyffe of the blessit wergine Marie be as it war in an image let furthe to us fra quhome, as out of a glass, schinnes brichtlie the patrone of chastitie and forme off all vertues.—Marie was so perfyte that the lyffe of hir alon may be ane reul off leiving to all others."—P. 26.

"Sanct Gregorio,—O Mother, blessit of wergines, ô thou light quha dwelles in ye tempill of heaven, maist bright, being free fra the filthe of our mortalitie, and now clothed with the robe of immortalitie, to my word, fra heaven incline thine ear, and my prayers, I beseech the, ô wergine, thow heir."—P. 27.

"Sanct Augustin.—Mary, succour the miserabl, help ye discomfortit, comfort the woful, pray for the pepol, mak intercession for the clargie, and pray for the deivote womankynd, let all feil thy relieff quha celebrats thy name."—Ibid.

"Quhat is the Kirk?—The Kirk is the hail nummer of all mē professing the feath and doctrine of Christ, quhilk the prince of Pastours, Christ, committet baith to the apostle, St Peter, and to his successoures, to be fed and governit, quhairfoir hæretiques and schismatiques deserve nocht to be includit in ye name of the Kirk, but falsclie throw arrogāce usurps the same; quha, albeit they appear to profes the word and doctrine of God, nevertheless, they refuse to be the scheep of the principal pastour and bischops quham Christ in his stead hes maid reuler of his fauld the Kirk, and be perpetual successione in the Romane Kirk hes alwais been keepit."—P. 48.

"Quhat is to be thocht of evil priests?—It is God's ordinance quhilk can nocht be abolishit, that nocht onlie good priests, but also evill, suld be honoured in his kirk. For he will be acknowledged, hond., and halden in reverēce in his ministers."—P. 110. Very comfortable doctrine this for the priests. Bad as well as good, it seems, are God's ordinances; and the one as well as the other are to be honoured in the Church.

"Is matrimonie permitted unto all men?—Nocht sa, (not so) for we are taught be ye Apostles' tradition, as S. Epiphanius witnesses, yat it is sinne to revolt to marriage, after that virginitie be promised and voued. Thairfoir, this place of ye Apostle,—It is better to marry than to burn, pertaines (as S. Ambrose does plainlie pronounce) to hir yat hes nocht zet receaved the vail. Bot she quha promised herself to God, and hes receaved the holy vail is already married, she is coupled to an immortal husband, and gif she will now marrie after the common law of marriage, she committes adultry, and is maid the handmaid of death. Now, the self same reason, and ye same judgement is to be given of monks, and yam yat is in holy orders, for they have damnation, gif they give ye bridle to the bodilye lusts, they falsifie yair former faith.—No man laying his hand to the ploughe, and looking bak again, is meit for ye kingdom of God."—P. 117.

"Compells the Kirk then certain persons to live single and unmarried?—Treulie, our godly and circumspect mother, the Kirk, compells nocht thairunto, quhilk burdens na man with continence or single lyfe without marriage, but requires of yam, yat they willingly receve yar law, (as befor said) that they violat nocht thair religion, neither cōtemne or brak ye promeis ād godlie band quhilk they haiv with Christ and his Kirk."—P. 119.

"Venial sinn is actual also, bot zet sic a ane as maks nocht ane man God's enemie, and for the quhilk the faithfull easily obteins pardon of God."—What can strike more directly at the root of all holiness than this doctrine? Any sin to which a man may be addicted, will be, in his esteem, a venial one; and here he is taught that such does not make him God's enemy, and that he will easily obtain pardon for it!

"A guid vif (wife) is praise worthie, bot a godlie virgin is far to be preferred. The one is under the law, the uther is under grace Marriage is guid, quhairbe is had posteritie, and succession of mankind, bot virginitie is better, quhairbe is gotten the inheritance of the kingdom of heavē, and the succession of heavenlie merits ar found. Be a woman cair cam in, bot be a virgin salvation is comme."—P. 202.

I intend, in a future Number, to give a particular account of one of the best of these godly virgins, of whose life and miracles I have got a genuine history. I say miracles, as well as life; for though she died about a thousand years ago, she still continues to perform miracles, if we may believe the Rev. Dr Milner, one of the Vicars Apostolic in England. My readers will then be able to judge how far these idle drones of godly virgins are to be preferred to their own thrifty good wives. But I must at present proceed with my Catechism:—

"Quhat is to be thought in few words of the evangelical counsels? That thay ar certaine motives and verray commodious supports and helps to give armour to the vaik agains the pleasours of the varld and the flesh, to further guid men's endeavour in the course of trew godliness to the obtaining of better things; and mairover, profitable as I have schawen to get the reward of eternal lyf and mair plenteous glorie in heaven."—P. 204.

"Of the remedie of original sin.—The onlie Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, quhas merit is applied to all men, zoung and awld, be the sacrament of baptisme dewlie administered according to the form of the Kirk. Quhasaever ze be that ar baptized ye have put on Christ, quhairfor they are,* quha denies that children new borne suld be baptized, howbeit they be the children of baptized parēts."—P. 216. "In the baptized, all that quilk has the proper and trew nature of sin is clean takken away; and not onlie hid or not imputit, for God haites nothing in the regenerat. So thair is na damnation to thame quha are buried with Christ be baptism in his death."—P. 218.

"Sinnes agains the first commandment. 1st. To doute of any article of the Catholique faith. 2d. Over curiously to reason or searche out things of faith. 3d. To favour heretics to the hurt of the Catholique kirk. 4th. To put oureselves in danger to crab God, that is nocht

* I cannot make out the word, but I doubt not it means something very bad.

to flee the occasion quhilk may cause ūs sinne." "Sinners agains the third commandment, (*i. e.* what we call the fourth.) 1st. To worke on halie days. 3d. Not to fast at times cōmādet. 4th. To eat fleshe or ony forbidden meat on days of fasting or abstinence."

This Catechism furnishes prayers to the Virgin Mary, to the halie angels, to our guid angel, and to all the sancts in heaven. There are several other curious passages which it is not convenient at present to transcribe.

In this, as in all their Catechisms, the true Christian doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, and by faith in him, is kept out of view; and what makes the system worse than downright infidelity is, that it effectually denies the Saviour, while it professes to honour him. For instance, in one of the last quotations, he is called the only Mediator, whose merit is applied to all men, young and old; yet it is applied only in such a way as that the priest shall have the doing of it. It is by the sacrament of baptism duly administered according to the form of the kirk. No man can do this but a priest: so that, without his aid, all that Christ has done, in working out a righteousness for the justification of the ungodly, and all that he does by his word and Spirit, go for nothing. Thus the priest actually gives himself out as the Saviour; for it is by the application of water, and salt, and spittle, by his fingers, that the regeneration of a sinner is effected. I request my readers, of the Romish communion, to reflect on this. They are not behind their neighbours in point of common sense; and, I am sure, if they will think seriously on the subject, and apply to it the principles of common sense, not to say of Scripture, they will soon be convinced of the folly of ascribing such powers to a creature like themselves.

Christ died for the ungodly. The gospel is the divine testimony concerning him. When the Holy Spirit opens the heart of a sinner to receive that testimony, he is born again. This is the work of God. A priest can have no more hand in it than in creating the world. Yet any man who shall make known the truth to his neighbour, may be honoured as the instrument of saving him. This is what I most earnestly desire as the fruit of my labours; but I know it will not—it cannot happen, but through the influence of the Divine Spirit.

No. XVIII.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14TH, 1818.

IN my last Number, I examined the assertion of AMICUS VERITATIS,—"The Douay Catechism is approved by the whole body of the Catholic Church;" and I showed that there are several other Catechisms of apparently higher authority in the Church, which differ materially from the Douay one, particularly with regard to the omission and mutilation of the second commandment. He quotes the Douay Catechism on the subject of indulgences; and he wishes to have it believed, that his Church holds no other doctrine than this:—An indulgence is "not leave to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come, as some slander the Church; but only a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance."

I could show that other Catechisms differ on this point, as well as on the second commandment. The Pope will be allowed, I suppose, to be higher authority than the Douay College; and he declares, "that the *dead* as well as the living, who truly obtain indulgences, are so far delivered from the punishment due to their actual sins, according to divine justice, as the indulgence granted and obtained is worth." (See his Brief, *Prot.* p. 23. quoted from Dupin, IV. 17.) I cannot suppose the Pope to be guilty of such an absurdity as to speak of delivering the *dead* from the *temporal* punishment due to their sins, for the dead have done with temporal things. He countenances, therefore, the doctrine of the French Catechism, that indulgences free from punishment, both in this world and the next. He says, indeed, expressly in the same brief, that the benefit of indulgences was granted to those who were alive, as to those who were *in Purgatory*. Perhaps, however, he will call Purgatory a temporal thing, though, from the hundreds of thousands of years, for which some are said to remain in it, and for which indulgences are granted to others, we should imagine it must remain after all temporal things have come to an end.

I shall, however, take the subject of indulgences as the Douay Catechism gives it, and answer AMICUS VERITATIS' challenge, which is:—"Now, Sir, I would ask any honest impartial man, possessed of Christian candour, could he infer from this answer, that an indulgence is a permission to commit sin? No, Sir, the idea is absurd; and I am astonished that your Correspondent, who gives his writing publicly to the world, should so far forget himself, as to draw inferences so unchristian and unreasonable as he has done."—(*Prot.* p. 24.)

It is not likely that this gentleman will allow the PROTESTANT to be "an honest impartial man." Be that as it may, he will endeavour to make good his position out of this most softened and modified definition of an indulgence. I said, (*Prot.* p. 13.) that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin; that he claimed, farther, the power of granting to individuals and families, a full remission of all their sins past and future, which would probably operate as an encouragement to commit sin, seeing the persons

knew beforehand, that they had got a full pardon. I think I have already established all this by a number of facts and documents; but I proceed now to show, that encouragement to commit sin rises naturally out of the doctrine of indulgences, as given even by the Douay Catechism. It is "*a releasing of the temporal punishment due to such sins as are already forgiven us by the sacrament of penance.*" Indulgences stand immediately connected with penance. By this sacrament, a priest grants full absolution. He declares the sinner to be relieved from the guilt of all his sins, and reconciled to God, but that he ought to make some remuneration for so great a favour,—that he should suffer something in his body as a punishment for his sins thus forgiven; and the design of our indulgence is to release him from such suffering, which is usually done for an adequate consideration.

Now, I shall not ask every impartial honest man, but I ask every intelligent Christian, whether such doctrine does not naturally lead to all the evil of which I have accused the Popish practice of granting indulgences? Every one whose religion is derived from the Bible, knows that human nature is corrupted and depraved; that every man in his natural state is an enemy to God, and a hater of his holy law; that he is in love with sin; and that he is, in one way or another, under the dominion of corrupt passions, which maintain a constant opposition to the law of God. There are, however, many restraints which prevent individuals from running to all the excess to which their passions would lead them. One of these restraints is, the fear of future punishment. The doctrine, therefore, which takes away this restraint, without imparting a new nature to the sinner, is justly chargeable with all the evil that shall result from it. Such is the Popish doctrine of indulgences connected with penance.

A person guilty of the greatest crimes, receives the sacrament of penance on the usual terms. He must, indeed, make a form of confession before a priest; he must profess contrition; he must promise amendment: but all this is mere form and mere words. His heart remains as hard as it was; he is as much in love with sin as ever. When, therefore, the sacrament of penance is over, he is told that he must do some good work, or suffer some punishment for all his great sins which he has confessed; but, that he may have an indulgence; that is, he may be released from such suffering, for a certain sum, which he cheerfully pays:—he sets off to plunge anew into the stream of wickedness, like the profligate seductress in the seventh of Proverbs: "I have peace-offerings with me; this day have I paid my vows;—come let us take our fill of pleasures."

That this is no overwrought picture, is sadly verified by the history of the Church of Rome, and of those nations which have submitted to her yoke. Independently of history and experience, an accurate knowledge of human nature would infer this result from the doctrine in question. Wicked men are often very superstitious. They stand in awe of they know not what. There is a judgment upon them. There is a tribunal in their own breast that condemns them. They know not well what it is; but they are taught to believe that it is something from which a priest can deliver them. Wherever, therefore, an opportunity of crime presents itself to a man of this character, whether it be to gratify his revenge, or avarice, or lust, he enters into it with all his heart, knowing beforehand that the priest can pardon his guilt; and, that if he should be ordained to make some satisfaction for his crimes, he can have that also remitted for a small sum by an inudlgence. The prospect of a divine tribunal, and of a righteous Judge, is concealed from his view. He seeks no pardon but that which the priest can give; and he is not taught to believe that any other is necessary. As corrupt human nature is constituted, such a doctrine must always operate as an encouragement to commit sin.

I might corroborate this reasoning by innumerable facts from history; but the following quotation from Bellarmine, the great champion of the Popish cause, is worth many facts, because it is a plain testimony of the actual state of things in the Church, as known to himself; and he speaks as if the same were known to all:—"We cannot deny," says he, "but that some are bound by the penitential canons to some thousands of years' penance; for, if to every deadly sin there be due by the canons so many years' penance, as to some three, to some seven, &c. then he that hath accustomed himself to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment, and most frequently commits murders, thefts, sacrileges, adulteries, without doubt the Popes had respect to such as these, when they gave indulgences for ten or twenty thousand years." *Bellar. de Indulg. lib. I. cap. 9. p. 25, as quoted in Morning Exercise, p.* 491.

Thus we see, in point of fact, on the testimony of Bellarmine, that the greatest criminals, who were guilty of perjury and blasphemy every moment of their lives, yet received pardon from the Pope and his clergy, and received indulgences too for thousands of years. Is it necessary to say more to prove that the Popish practice of indulgences is the fruitful parent of all wickedness; and that it operates as an encouragement, and even as a permission, to commit sin?

Suppose it to be so that an indulgence is no more than a releasing of the temporal punishment due for sin already pardoned, its consequences must be extremely pernicious. Sinners are most impressed by sensible and visible

things. Temporal punishment is much more an object of dread than eternal punishment. From the natural atheism and unbelief of the human heart, men think very little of what shall happen after death; they do not believe that God will be strict to mark their sins against them, or that he will be so cruel as to punish them very severely for their faults and infirmities; in plain English, they do not believe what the Bible declares concerning sin, and the eternal punishment which it incurs. This appears very plainly in the case of those, for instance, who read in the third commandment, that "the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain," and who will yet rather take their chance of standing as guilty before God, and suffering all the consequences, than deny themselves the trifling gratification of mouthing or even mincing an oath. We cannot wonder, therefore, that those who are under the influence of uncontrollable passion, should seek to gratify that passion, fearless of consequences in the other world, if they can escape that which is very painful in the present. Any thing like the misery of the other world they have never seen; of its nature they have no distinct ideas; of its reality they have no abiding conviction. This has, therefore, little influence in deterring them from the commission of sin. But the subject of present suffering they do understand. They can comprehend the misery of being immured for years in a dungeon; they can imagine how painful it would be to tear the flesh from their bones, by a whip judiciously applied by their own hands; they could even shrink from the idea of being obliged to subsist on bread and water for six months together; and I doubt not they could have a very lively feeling of the hardship of being obliged to stand before a large congregation, in a white sheet, confessing their sins. Now, by an indulgence, the fear of incurring all, or any of these, is effectually removed. The only thing, therefore, that can operate with any degree of force upon the mind of an abandoned sinner, as a preventive of crime, is taken out of the way; and he is encouraged by the Church to indulge himself in all manner of wickedness.

In short, men may speculate as they please about the moral influence of any religious system; but, while human nature remains as it is, it will be found by experience, that the doctrine which holds out to men the certainty of obtaining pardon, and an indulgence whenever they please to ask and pay for it, must operate, and will operate, as an encouragement to commit sin.

I am aware that an objection like this is urged against the gospel itself, by unbelievers of the Protestant name, and of every other name. We are told that the doctrine which holds out the prospect of pardon and salvation to the chief of sinners, through the merits of Christ, without any merits of their own, opens a door to all manner of licentiousness, and that it operates as an indulgence to commit sin. I claim this objection against the gospel of Christ as an auxiliary to my argument. It declares that the natural feeling, and the experience of mankind, are in my favour. I am speaking of men in their natural state, but who possess a portion of what is called common sense, and who know something of human nature. They speak what they know and what they feel Ignorant of the divine influence which accompanies the belief of the gospel, and which renews the sinner to holiness, they cannot but come to the conclusion, that the doctrine which holds out salvation to the vilest of the human race, without merit on their part, must operate as an encouragement to sin. Now, the Popish mode of granting pardon and indulgence possesses no such divine influence; nor makes provision for renewing the sinner to holiness; with them there is no regeneration but that which is effected by baptism; the pardoned and indulged sinner remains as great a sinner as ever; and his pardon and indulgence, so easily obtained, must without doubt operate as an encouragement, and have all the effect of a permission to commit sin.

Amicus Veritatis alludes to the pardon of sin which the Almighty promises in Scripture; and takes advantage of this in order to justify the Popish practice of granting indulgences even though they were to extend to the plenary remission of all the crimes of the sinner, and of all the punishment which they deserve. "Now," says he, (Page 30) "surely your correspondent would not be impious enough to assert, that when the Almighty, in the sacred Scripture, promises to give the truly penitent a plenary remission of his sins, and of all the punishment which they deserve, he means to grant him permission or indulgence to commit sin." Indeed, I would not hesitate to assert, that this would operate as a permission to commit sin, if the Almighty promised and granted pardon as the Papists do. If the Almighty were to promise and grant pardon of sin, without reference to the great atonement, and without making adequate provision for the future holy life of the sinner, it would appear to the whole universe that he thought lightly of the evil of sin; and such is the depravity of human nature, that such procedure would be considered as a connivance at sin, and an encouragement to live in all manner of wickedness. Nay, such is the depravity of human nature, that could we suppose it possible that a man were truly penitent to-day, and that he had received the full pardon of all his sins, if he did not receive at the same time a new heart and a right spirit, he would before to-morrow be plunged as deep in the mire of iniquity as ever.

Now, when a Popish priest pardons sin by the sacrament of penance, according to the

Douay Catechism, there is no reference whatever to the great atonement, or satisfaction for sin by the death of Christ. In answer to the question, "What is satisfaction?" we have for answer, "A faithful performance of the prayers or good works enjoined us by the priest to whom we confess." And, as for any radical change of heart and character, any provision for the future holy life of the pardoned sinner, Popery knows nothing of the matter: it would be held heretical to speak of any regeneration but what takes place at baptism. Without doubt, then, the Popish system of pardon and indulgence is in effect nothing less than an indulgence to commit sin.

The matter comes shortly to this issue;—Popery professes to grant pardon of sin, and to release from the punishment which it deserves, while men are yet in love with sin, and thirsting for the commission of it; while they are, as Bellarmine says, accustomed to perjury and blasphemy almost every moment of their lives, and in the practice of committing every crime. Pardons and indulgences granted to such, and while they continue such, must be an encouragement to wickedness. But the gospel of Christ professes to grant pardon to the chief of sinners along with a new heart—along with a hatred of sin, and a love of righteousness, with the continual presence of the Holy Spirit to lead them in the way of holiness. This cannot be an indulgence to commit sin; it is a doctrine according to godliness. The grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously in this present evil world. (See Titus ii. 11, 12.) The gospel performs all that it promises. It produces therefore real holiness of life. He that receives it is created after Christ Jesus unto good works, (Eph. ii. 10.) Let not Papists therefore lay the pernicious consequences of their own errors at the door of divine mercy. The salvation of the gospel is salvation *from sin* as well as from punishment: this is worthy of God. The indulgence of the Papist professes to release from punishment men who are full of all iniquity, and who cannot cease from sin: this is the delusion of the devil.

The language of divine mercy to sinners is—and it is verified in all who believe in Christ,—"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them."—"I will save you from all your uncleannesses."—"Then shall ye remember your own evil ways, and your doings that were not good, and shall loathe yourselves in your own sight, for your iniquities, and for your abominations." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25—31.) "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days saith the Lord; I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least even to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more." (Heb. viii. 10—12.)

In these divine promises it is provided that he whose sins are pardoned shall be truly penitent. He shall loathe himself in his own sight: that he shall be cleansed from the pollution, as well as saved from the guilt, of sin. —He shall be sprinkled with clean water, and shall be clean; that is, he shall enjoy the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit: that the law of God shall be written in his heart, and he shall be enabled in some measure to keep it: that, in short, a new heart and a right spirit being given to him, he shall live the rest of his life in the fear of God. Such a dispensation of grace and holiness can never operate as an indulgence to commit sin.

But the popish system possesses none of these qualities. Let my popish readers, therefore, who seek no other pardon than that which their priests can give, seriously consider, whether it will be such as will acquit them before the Judge of the whole world, when none will be accepted but those who have fled for refuge to the blood of atonement, and who have been born again,—born of water and of the Spirit; that is, made subjects of the gracious sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost.

Indulgences which were not merely remissions of sin for the living, but releases from purgatory for the dead, were, it seems, devised by Urban II. as recompenses for crusaders to the holy land. They were afterwards granted to all who gave money for other popish purposes. The sums so got, however, were often applied to other uses than those avowed. John XXII. reduced this traffic into a system, Leo. X. tried it on a still larger scale as the means of replenishing his treasury.

Leo published that general sale of indulgences, which more immediately led to such important consequences. The papal briefs for this purpose were expedited in 1514 and 1515; but the sale did not commence till 1516 and 1517.

"Leo," says Guicciardini, "following the advice of Cardinal Pucci, had spread throughout the world the amplest indulgences, not only for the benefit of the living, but also with power to loose the souls of the dead from purgatory: which things having in themselves neither probability nor authority, (it being

notorious that they were granted solely to extort money from those who had more simplicity than prudence,) and being, besides, exercised most impudently by the commissioners deputed to this exaction, (the greatest part of whom purchased from the court the power of exercising them,) had excited in many places great indignation and scandal, especially in Germany, where *faculties for liberating the souls of the dead* from purgatory were *sold at a trifling price,* or made *the stakes of gambling in taverns.* On this occasion, the reason avowed was the expense of the war against the Turks, and of finishing the church of St Peter. "The money, however," says Mr Bower, in his life of Luther, "went to neither purpose, but was lavished in gratifying the luxury of the court of Rome, and of its dependents." A more productive scheme of fraud never was devised. Throughout Europe, these indulgences were so eagerly sought for by the previously blinded and bigoted people, that even popish kings and governments complained bitterly that the popes drained their kingdoms of money.

No. XIX.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21ST, 1818.

IN my last Number I endeavoured to show that the doctrine of indulgences, as taught by the Douay Catechism, has a natural tendency to encourage the commission of sin. I proceed now to answer the question of AMICUS VERITATIS, with regard to indulgences, which, he says, are granted by Protestant Churches, and particularly by the Church of Scotland, as I understand him to mean in the following passage:—"I shall next ask your Correspondent, did not the Protestant Church exercise the power of granting indulgences? If he would deny this, I would recall his recollection to the notorious *cutty stool,* whereon, if a person was condemned to stand for a certain great crime, he might be, and often was, exempted from undergoing that punishment, by paying a certain sum of money. Is not this an indulgence? Is not this a remission of the temporal punishment due to sin?"

If I were to argue like a Papist, I would say, that it never was a doctrine of the Church of Scotland, that a sum of money should be received from a sinner as a commutation for the necessary discipline of the Church. It is certain that I have not been able to find such a doctrine in any of her public standards. I might, therefore, dismiss the subject with a broad denial; and maintain that there was no such thing. But I could not conceal from myself, or from the world, the plain fact, that facts are against me; and my popish opponents might bring, perhaps, five hundred credible witnesses to testify that their pockets had suffered, that their persons might escape the shame of a public exposure. Now, whatever a Papist, who does not value his reputation, might say on such an occasion, I frankly confess that I could not endure the shame of denying what is well known to be true; and though the same could not be a doctrine of the Church of Scotland, if it has become a pretty general practice, I must hold it as good as a doctrine; and whether the thing be right or wrong, its existence will not be denied.

I admit, therefore, that of late years, a a practice has crept into this church which *resembles* that of the Church of Rome; or which at least resembles that in which indulgences originated. Up to the twelfth century, it appears from Dupin, that public penance was enjoined for public sins. During this century it became rare, because the remission of sins was to be obtained by other ways, chiefly by the crusade and pilgrimages: and writing of the fifteenth century, he says indulgences granted by the Pope were more common than ever,—they had become a kind of traffic, meaning that they could be had for money. The reader will observe it is the *remission of sins* of which Dupin speaks, and not the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven, as the Douay Catechism has it; and Dupin, a Popish historian of great note, must have known the doctrine of his church, at least as well as the Douay doctors. Now, in this respect, there is nothing in the practice of the Church of Scotland which in the least resembles that of Rome. The former never professed to forgive sins for money, though they do hold and declare the evangelical doctrine of forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Christ, to all who really repent, and absolve from church censures those who have come under them, and have given evidence of their repentance. It is on the point of public penance, as it is called, and of releasing the sinner from this, in consideration of something else, that I think there is a resemblance of that in which the Popish indulgences originated. The mode of censure enjoined for a certain sin in Scotland, is to be rebuked by the minister, in the presence of the congregation; but I believe, in most cases, the sinner is now exempted from this on paying a sum of money to the poor.

I do not know whence it comes, that only one species of sin is generally understood to incur the above sentence. In former times, any gross immorality subjected the sinner to the same discipline. In the early days of the Church of Scotland, to give countenance to Popery was considered a gross immorality and incurred the public censure of the church. "The Countess of Argyle," for instance, "being cited to appear before the (General)

Assembly, for assisting at the baptism of the king, (James VI.) and giving her presence at the Papistical rites then used, did submit herself to censure, and was ordained to make public satisfaction in the chapel of Stirling, where the offence was committed, upon a Sunday after sermon, in such manner, and at such time, as the superintendent of Lothian should appoint." *Spotswood, Page* 214.

I should like to see such members of the Church of Scotland, in the present day, as have given countenance to Popish worship in Clyde Street, brought to a state of mind like that of the worthy Countess; and make public satisfaction before their respective congregations.

But to return to the proper subject of this Number; admitting it to be as AMICUS VERITATIS asserts, I am not accountable for it. My work was not undertaken with the view of defending the Church of Scotland, or any other church. I took my stand upon the true Protestant doctrine of the Bible, and the *Bible alone,* as the foundation of my religion; and what I find not authorised by the Bible, if it should be in the church of which I am a member, or any other, I am ready to disavow it as antichristian. Popery had taken so fast a hold of the human mind throughout all Europe; it had insinuated itself so much into all the feelings, and principles, and practices, of the people; its influence has so descended from one generation to another; and it has become so interwoven with our modes of thinking, and speaking, and acting, that I question if there be any visible organized church in the world that does not possess less or more of the antichristian leaven. When the cry shall be made, "Babylon the great is fallen! is fallen!" there will be found, perhaps, some in every church, "crying, Alas! alas!" for something that they have lost.

But with regard to the point in hand, I am not guilty of self-commendation when I say, that I consider the Church of Scotland to be, in constitution and doctrine, nearer the divine pattern exhibited in the Bible, than any other established church in the world. And, perhaps, I may say it to the praise of this church, that I am sure I give no offence to any of her members when I say, that I do not look upon her as perfect or infallible. Neither will it be offensive to the candid and enlightened part of that body, that I give my opinion against that part of her practice, the commuting of public censure for a pecuniary mulct; that I consider this antichristian; that, in short, it came from Rome, and the sooner it is sent back the better.

I do not object to the imposition of a fine. The sin to which this discussion refers, is a crime against the state, as it is subversive of the good order and happiness of civil society. It is, therefore, a proper subject of punishment by the civil magistrate, either by fine or otherwise. It seems to have been so understood, in the reign of James VI., when the following severe law was made against it:—

"All persons who commit the filthy vice of fornication, and are convicted thereof, shall be punished in manner following: For the first fault, the man, as well as the woman, shall pay the sum of forty pounds (Scots, I suppose), otherwise both shall be imprisoned for the space of eight days, and be fed on bread and small drink, and afterwards shall be presented at the market-place of the town or parish bare-headed, and there stand fastened for the space of two hours: For the second fault, they shall pay the sum of an hundred merks, otherwise the days of their imprisonment shall be doubled, and their food shall be bread and water allenarly; and in the end they shall be presented at the market-place, and the heads of both shall be shaven: For the third fault, they shall pay an hundred pounds, or else their imprisonment shall be tripled, and their food be bread and water allenarly; and in the end they shall be taken to the deepest and foulest pool of water of the town or parish, and be there thrice dowked, and afterwards banished the town or parish for ever. The pecunial pains which shall be received, shall be keeped in a close box, and converted *ad pios usus* in the parts where the crime was committed."—James VI. 1567, 1649-12.

"All laws and acts of Parliament against fornication and uncleanness renewed and confirmed."—W. and M. 1690.

"All laws and acts of Parliament against fornication and profaneness again revived and ratified, and persons guilty of it ordained to be prosecuted, and the fines imposed to be instantly paid to the parish collectors for the poor, or the party to be imprisoned till sufficient caution be found for the payment of them; and no pretence of different persuasions in matters of religion, shall screen the delinquent from being censured and punished for such immoralities."—W. 1696, Oct. 9th.—*Purdivan,* p. 224; edit. 1802.

Thus the crime was viewed in a civil light, and civil pains and penalties were imposed. Whether the penalties were in all instances worthy of the dignity of legal enactment, is another question. By sundry Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, as referred to by Purdivan, especially those of 1707, I find that swearing, cursing, profaning the Lord's day, and drunkenness, are mentioned, as well as fornication, as incurring church censures. Persons guilty of such crimes were to be publicly rebuked. It was not absolutely necessary that the guilty person should be advanced to a seat of peculiar eminence, though in most churches there was a seat for the purpose, and, perhaps, in most instances, it was occupied on such occasions; yet it was declared to be sufficient, if there

were satisfactory evidences of repentance, that the persons should profess the same, and receive the rebuke, in the seat in which he ordinarily heard the word preached.—*Purd.* p. 191.

Now so far as the church was concerned in dealing with sinners on account of scandal, I can find nothing that authorises the modern practice of accepting a fine in lieu of public rebuke. The doctrine of the church is founded on the words of the apostle, "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear," (1 Tim. v. 20.) Neither the Church of Scotland, nor the apostle, on whose authority they proceeded, thought of restricting this rule to one species of sin: and I believe as little did they think that a profession of repentance, on account of any sin, should be dispensed with for money. *

A Popish indulgence releases the temporal punishment due to sin, and it is granted for money. A Papist now accuses the Church of Scotland of doing the same, because for money persons are released from public censure, which is understood to be a temporal punishment for sin; and I am sorry, that Papists should see any thing in Protestant churches, that bears the smallest resemblance to their own corruptions.

As I am afraid great mistakes prevail on this subject, among various denominations of Christians, I shall take the liberty of stating what I think may be gathered from the word of God, in relation to it. I am, of course, as liable to be mistaken as any body else, and I wish to speak with diffidence. The subject is important, and I shall not have written in vain, if I shall be the means of drawing to it the attention of enlightened Protestants.

I think the church of Christ has nothing to do with the punishment of any man whatever. I use the word *punishment*, in the sense of Dr Johnson,—"Any infliction or pain imposed in vengeance of a crime:" and such at least is its meaning among Papists, in relation to indulgences. The reign of Christ in his church, is the reign of grace and mercy. He has, indeed, in his hand a rod of iron; but that is to rule in the midst of his enemies, and he will break them in pieces like a potter's vessel, (Ps. ii.) But his reign in the church possesses a character of benignity and loving kindness. No such thing, as punishment properly so called, can emanate from the throne of mercy.

Christ has appointed a government, or rule in his church, to be administered by his servants in his name. The character of this government must correspond with that of the reign of grace, for it is virtually the government of Christ himself by his word. Those who rule in the church according to this word, must exhibit the compassion and the gentleness of Christ. While they maintain great firmness, and even boldness, in opposing the enemies of truth and godliness, not for their hurt or punishment, but for their good also, they must be particularly careful that they administer nothing of the nature of punishment to those whom they acknowledge as their Master's friends.

Through infirmity and temptation, Christians often fall into sin, and thereby dishonour the cause of truth which they maintain. If it be a sin which is followed by scandal, or by occasion of which true religion suffers reproach, Christ has ordained that the sinner should be told his fault faithfully and plainly. If it be known only to a few, these few are authorised to forgive him, if they see such evidences of repentance as make them believe that God has forgiven him. If the sin be known to the church or congregation, then the evidence of the sinner's repentance ought also to be known to the church,—he ought to be admonished or reproved by the minister in their presence, and exhorted to beware, in future, lest he fall into sin, which is his own greatest enemy. If he does not profess sorrow for his sin,—if he gives no evidence of repentance after repeated admonition, and exhortation, and prayer on his behalf, the church has nothing farther to do but to put him away.

In this there is nothing of the nature of punishment. It is a process of kindness and brotherly love. It is a precept as old as the law of Moses, "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy brother, and not suffer sin upon him."—(Lev. xix. 17.) The Psalmist speaks of such discipline as an excellent oil that would not hurt him. He calls it even a kindness done to him; and such it truly is to all who need it, and to whom it is affectionately administered. It is the ordinance of Christ intended for the gracious purpose of showing his people the great evil of sin, and deterring them from the commission of it. Like every other divine ordinance, it is profitable for the purpose intended by it. How many have had occasion to thank God for such expressions of his kindness, and the kindness of his people to themselves, or to others of whose penitence and restoration they have been witnesses! That there is nothing of *punishment* in this, is decidedly the opinion of the Church of Scotland, as her discipline is expounded by Stuart of Purdivan. "A public rebuke," says he, "ought to be so managed, that there be no ground given for constructing it a *penance, punishment*, or mark of reproach, but the minister is to carry therein, as one much affected and afflicted with the sin."—In short, the whole process, if conducted according to the word of God, and the mind of the Church of Scotland as above declared, is an expression of the kindness of the Head of the church towards his people, in

* The General Assembly, August, 1573, decreed that great or rich men, being guilty of crimes, should be censured even alike as poor men; and that no dispensation should be granted them for money, though *ad pios usus*." —*Petries' Ch. Hist.* part 3d.

order to recover them from sin, and preserve them from falling into it. But to dispense with this, and make a man pay for the dispensation, is to injure him, not so much by the fine, as by depriving him of the merciful discipline which Christ appointed for his spiritual benefit.

If it be objected, that most persons would rather pay the fine than submit to the discipline and reproof, I answer, this indicates a bad state of mind in such persons. I should doubt that they had not repented of their sin. I should be afraid that they did not really belong to the kingdom of Him, of whose gracious reign I have been speaking. It would then serve no good purpose to deal with them according to the laws of that kingdom, farther than to set before them plainly and faithfully their guilt and danger; and if after all, they did not repent, to put them away from the communion of the church of which they show themselves to be unworthy.

Most people would conceive this to be punishment; but in reality it is no such thing. Excommunication in the Church of Rome is indeed a dreadful engine employed for the punishment of those who offend the holy see; and I am afraid that many Protestants have derived their ideas of excommunication from Rome. I do not say, it is not a dreadful thing, as administered according to the word of God, because it really is so; but all that is dreadful in it arises from the state of mind of the individual who incurs the sentence, not from the sentence itself. It is never lawfully executed, but in cases of obstinate perseverance in wickedness, and refusing to repent. Nothing can be imagined more dreadful than this. Such rebellion against the authority of God, shows that one is not fit for the kingdom of God; and putting him out of the church is doing him no injury; it is no punishment; it is indeed all the benefit which the church can confer upon him; it is calculated to convince him of his sin, and it prevents him from committing greater sin, by continuing to profane divine ordinances. In short, there is nothing in it that affects the person or the property of the individual. His personal and civil rights remain untouched. He is deprived of nothing but the fellowship of saints, a thing for which he has no value, a thing which, indeed, he despises, else he would not prefer the pleasures of sin.

I am aware that on this subject the apostle Paul uses strong language. He speaks of excommunication as a delivering over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh (1 Cor. v. 5.); from which there is a vulgar idea prevalent, that the church claims the power of delivering individuals into the hands of the devil, to be tormented; but the words really mean no more than turning persons over to that society or class of men to which they belong. There are only two kingdoms on earth;—the kingdom of Christ, and the kingdom of Satan. The former is the church, the latter is the world. The members of the former are gathered out of the latter; they are separated from the world, and added to the Church by the faith of the gospel. Many, by false pretences, have been joined to the Church; but when this is discovered, as it is by their committing sin, and obstinately refusing to repent, then, by the authority of Christ, declared by his apostle, such persons are to be delivered over to that kingdom from which they came, from which they were never truly separated, and to which they are still cordially attached, as is evident by their love of sin: this is giving them over to Satan, their own master, the god of this world, who ruleth in the children of disobedience. This is precisely the view of the passage entertained by the Church of Scotland, as appears by the following extract from Purdivan. *Art. Excom.* 6. 10. "Why the apostle (1 Cor. v. 5.) expresses excommunication by delivering unto Satan, may be for this, among other reasons, that Satan is called the god of this world, as world is taken in opposition to the church of God; so that delivering to him, implies no more than that (Mat. xviii. 17.) "if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and publican," thereby letting us know how dreadful a thing it is to be shut out from the ordinary means of grace and salvation, and exposed to the temptations of our grand adversary the devil." Still there is nothing here of the nature of punishment properly so called,—nothing done in vengeance of a crime; and one cannot be said to be shut out from the ordinary means of grace and salvation, unless he shall voluntarily withdraw from hearing the gospel preached, from which he is by no means excluded by excommunication.

I am aware, also, that the word punishment is used by our translators in reference to excommunication, 2 Cor. ii. 6. but it is used only in that limited sense which signifies rebuke or chastisement. It does not mean any thing that is *penal*, or inflicted in *vengeance* of a crime. The original word επιτιμια is indeed rendered *rebuke* in all the other English translations to which at present I have access. The authorised version of Queen Elizabeth is,—"It is sufficient unto the same man that he was *rebuked* of many." The Rhemish translation is,—"To him that is such a one, this *rebuke* sufficeth that is given of many."

No. XX.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 28TH, 1818.

AN indulgence, according to the Douay Catechism, is a releasing of the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven. From this it is evident that the Church of Rome

claims the power of inflicting temporal punishment; and that she has often done so is proved by her history. In my last Number I endeavoured to show that the Church of Christ has nothing to do with the punishment of any man whatever; and that there is nothing of the nature of punishment in any part of her administration, even with regard to offenders. I believe I might even take higher ground and maintain that in days of primitive purity, the discipline of the church, and public rebuke, when the occasion required it, were considered privileges. When a person had been left to fall into sin, and to give offence to his brethren, he had no peace in his own mind till the offence was removed. He came, therefore, to the church begging that he might be allowed, by public profession of his sorrow, to do away, as much as possible, the offence which he had given; and to have refused him this favour, not the granting of it, would have been a punishment. In short, the whole discipline of the church, even when it extends to the excommunication of a member, is a process of mercy and kindness to the individual and to the church. If this be a fair exhibition of the law of Christ, as I think it will be found to be on a careful examination of the New Testament, then whatever is opposed to this must be antichristian, and of this I am again about to convict the Church of Rome.

Excommunication is simply to separate from communion. The members of the Church of Christ have a mutual participation of certain privileges which are common to them all, as Christians, and of which none but Christians can participate. I use the word Christian in the New Testament sense, as denoting separation from the world, and union to Christ by the faith of the gospel. Such persons only can have communion with Christ, and with one another, in a spiritual sense, as members of his body. When one has professed to be a Christian, and has been admitted to the communion of Christians, but afterwards makes it evident, by sinful conduct, and refusing to be reclaimed, that he is not what he professed to be, he is put away, as one who cannot possibly enjoy Christian communion, but who under the semblance of it, must injure himself, and mar the comfort of the church. This I take to be all that is meant by excommunication.

But the Church of Rome makes use of this as an engine of cruelty and oppression, and for the purpose of extending and maintaining her dominion over the kings and kingdoms of this world. This of itself is antichristian. Christ, when on earth, did not claim authority in temporal matters. He gave no commission to his apostles to do so; nay, he positively forbade them; and told them that his kingdom was not of this world. But the Church of Rome, or rather the Pope as her head, claims dominion over the whole earth, and all things in it. Though this authority were exercised ever so mildly, and ever so much for the good of the human race, the very claim is antichristian, because it is opposed to the plain command of Christ.

I do not suppose it possible that an authority usurped contrary to the will of God, can be exercised for the glory of God or the good of men; but as a mere speculation, let us suppose for a moment that it were so. Let us imagine to ourselves the head of the Romish Church deeply interested for the happiness of the human race, and exercising his unlimited powers to promote good order, and peace, and civilization, throughout the world; and that the only instrument he made use of for this purpose was excommunication. We should then find him restraining ambition, regulating the government of princes, and compelling them to rule for the good of their subjects. No one would dare to oppress the weak, to make war upon his neighbour, or shed the blood of his own subjects, under pain of being excommunicated, and overwhelmed by the anathemas which the Pope held in his hand for the correction and destruction of his rebellious children.

Now, the very reverse of this has been the practice of the holy father of Rome, as is demonstrated by the history of Europe for more than a thousand years. He professed to have the keys of heaven and hell in his own hands, to open and shut at his pleasure. But when was it known that he shut the gates of heaven, or opened those of hell, to any individual however wicked, though stained with every crime that man could commit, if he were but submissive to the holy see? The fact is, men might murder their nearest relatives,—might lay waste whole provinces of unoffending neighbours by fire and sword, and live in the habitual practice of all possible wickedness, and yet enjoy full communion with the Church of Rome in all her sacraments, in all her privileges and honours, and in all her prospects of future happiness. But if any man called in question one iota of the Pope's authority, he was visited by all the terrors of excommunication;—and if the offender was a king, the whole nation suffered with him.

I might fill a volume with examples, but at present I shall give only that of England, in the reign of John, in the thirteenth century, as related by Hume, vol. 2d. chap. 4th. A king more wicked than John perhaps never sat on the throne of England. He disgusted the whole nation by his cruelties and debaucheries. It was not the least of his crimes, and perhaps not the greatest, that he murdered his nephew, Arthur, Duke of Brittany, with his own hand, for which he was detested by his subjects. There was, however, nothing in this, or in his other crimes, which gave any offence to the holy see,—nothing that rendered him unworthy

of her communion, or called forth the disapprobation of the Pope.

But on the occasion of a disputed election to the see of Canterbury, the Pope thought proper to nominate a creature of his own to that high office; and because the king would not consent to this, he let loose upon him, and upon the kingdom, all the terrors of an interdict and excommunication. It is amusing to observe how the Pope tried to cajole the king into compliance before he threatened him; he tried the cunning of the serpent before he had recourse to the roaring of the lion. "Innocent," for such was the name of the Pope, "sensible that this flagrant usurpation would be highly resented by the court of England, wrote John a mollifying letter; sent him four golden rings, set with precious stones; and endeavoured to enhance the value of the present by informing him of the many mysteries implied in it. He begged him to consider seriously the *form* of the rings, their *number*, their *matter*, and their *colour*. Their form, he said, being round, shadowed out eternity, which had neither beginning nor end; and he ought thence to learn his duty of aspiring from earthly objects to heavenly, from things temporal to things eternal. The number four, being a square, denoted steadiness of mind, not to be subverted either by adversity or prosperity, fixed for ever on the firm basis of the four cardinal virtues. Gold, which is the matter, being the most precious of metals, signified wisdom, which is the most valuable of all accomplishments, and justly preferred by Solomon to riches, power, and all exterior attainments. The blue colour of the sapphire represented Faith; the verdure of the emerald, Hope; the redness of the ruby, Charity; and the splendour of the topaz, Good Works. By these conceits, Innocent endeavoured to repay John for one of the most important prerogatives of his crown which he had ravished from him."

John, instead of being mollified, was transported with rage; and refusing to yield to the will of his ghostly father, the dreadful sentence was pronounced against him. "The sentence of interdict was at that time the great instrument of vengeance and policy employed by the court of Rome; was denounced against sovereigns for the lightest offences; and made the guilt of one person involve the ruin of millions, even in their spiritual and eternal welfare. The execution of it was calculated, in the highest degree, to strike the senses, and to operate with irresistible force on the minds of the people. The nation was of a sudden deprived of all exterior exercise of its religion. The altars were despoiled of their ornaments: the crosses, the relics, the images, the statues of the saints, were laid on the ground; and as if the air itself were profaned, and might pollute them by its contact, the priests carefully covered them up, even from their own approach and veneration. The use of bells entirely ceased in all the churches: the bells themselves were removed from the steeples, and laid on the ground, with other sacred utensils. Mass was celebrated with shut doors, and none but the priests were admitted to that holy institution. The laity partook of no religious rite, except baptism to new-born infants, and the communion of the dying. The dead were not interred in consecrated ground: they were thrown into ditches, or buried in common fields; and their obsequies were not attended with prayers or any hallowed ceremony. Marriage was celebrated in the churchyards; and that every action in life might bear the marks of this dreadful situation, the people were prohibited the use of meat, as in Lent, or times of the highest penance; were debarred from all pleasures and entertainments; and were forbidden even to salute each other, or so much as to shave their beards, and give any decent attention to their person and apparel. Every circumstance carried symptoms of the deepest distress, and of the most immediate apprehension of divine vengeance and indignation.

"The king that he might oppose *his* temporal to *their* spiritual terrors, immediately, from his own authority, confiscated the estates of all the clergy who obeyed the interdict."—"And, in order to distress the clergy in the tenderest point, and at the same time expose them to reproach and ridicule, he threw into prison all their concubines, and required high fines as the price of their liberty."

This state of things continued for some years; for though the people hated their king, it does not appear that they were in love with the Pope, or that they wished his plans of ambition to succeed so as to enslave their country. The interdict, therefore, not producing the desired effect upon England, the Pope at last issued the sentence of excommunication. Then, indeed, John began to feel the misery of his situation. No civil or military officer would serve under an excommunicated king. Bishops and barons left the kingdom; and the wretched monarch was left without support. Still, however, he kept his place; and the Pope had recourse to the next step in the gradation of papal penances, "which was to absolve his subjects from their oaths of fidelity and allegiance, and to declare every one excommunicated who had any commerce with him in public or in private, at his table, in his council, or even in private conversation. And this sentence was accordingly, with all imaginable solemnity, pronounced against him." Here is a striking instance of the Pope not only granting permission to commit sin, but actually commanding it. He required the people of England to violate their oaths of allegiance, not because the king had violated

his oath to them, but because he refused to surrender his independence to the Pope, who had no just right to such a surrender.

"But as John still persevered in his contumacy, there remained nothing but the sentence of deposition; which, though intimately connected with the former, had been distinguished from it by the artifice of the court of Rome; and Innocent determined to dart this last thunderbolt against the refractory monarch. But as a sentence of this kind required an armed force to execute it, the Pontiff, casting his eyes around, fixed at last on Philip, king of France, as the person into whose powerful hand he could most properly intrust that weapon, the ultimate resource of his ghostly authority. And he offered the monarch, besides the remission of all his sins, and endless spiritual benefits, the property and possession of the kingdom of England as the reward of his labours."

And, truly, these fine promises were all the reward that Philip got; for after raising a great army, and collecting 1700 vessels, at a monstrous expense, for the invasion of England, John, reduced to despair, was moved at last to make his submission, and to deliver up his kingdom into the hands of his ghostly father, to be for ever after at his disposal. Then the Pope by his legate, told Philip to dismiss his army, and let England alone, because John "had now come to a just sense of his guilt; had returned to obedience under the apostolic see, and even consented to do homage to the Pope for his dominions; and having thus made his kingdom a part of St Peter's patrimony had rendered it impossible for any Christian prince, without the most manifest and most flagrant impiety, to attack him." Thus the Pope swindled kings out of their wealth, and kingdoms out of their independence, by means of his sentence of excommunication.

The following is the form of this sentence, as used on ordinary occasions. The original Latin may be seen in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Art. *Excom.* "In name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of our blessed and most holy Lady Mary; also by the power of the Angels, Archangels, &c. We separate M. and N. from the bosom of the holy mother church, and condemn them with the anathema of a perpetual malediction. And may they be cursed in the city, cursed in the field, cursed be their barn, and cursed be their store, cursed be the fruit of their womb and the fruit of their land, cursed be their coming in and going out. Let them be cursed in the house, and fugitives in the field: and let all the curses come upon them which the Lord by Moses threatened to bring on the people who forsook the divine law; and let them be anathema maranatha, that is, let them perish at the second coming of the Lord. Let no Christian say an *Ave* to them. Let no priest presume to celebrate mass with them, or give them the holy communion. Let them be buried with the burial of an ass, and be dung upon the face of the earth. And as these lights are this day cast out of our hands and extinguished, so let their light be put out for ever, unless they repent, and by amendment and condign penance, make satisfaction to the church of God which they have injured."

There were, however, extraordinary occasions, and extraordinary offenders, who required extraordinary forms of cursing. I believe the most masterly piece of the kind extant, is that which is given in my fifth Number. Queen Elizabeth of England was a great eyesore to the Pope, insomuch that he made a special act of cursing and excommunication on her account, which is as follows:—

"The damnation and excommunication of Elizabeth, queen of England, and her adherents, with an addition of other punishments. Pius, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam.*

"He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, committed one holy catholic and apostolic church (out of which there is no salvation) to one alone upon earth, namely, to Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to Peter's successor, the bishop of Rome, to be governed in fulness of power. Him alone he made prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, to destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build, that he may contain the faithful that are knit together with the band of charity in the unity of the Spirit, and present them spotless and unblameable to their Saviour.

"§ 1. In discharge of which function, we, which are by God's goodness called to the government of the said church, do spare no pains, labouring with all earnestness, that unity, and the catholic religion (which the author thereof hath, for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be punished with so great afflictions), might be preserved uncorrupt. But the number of the ungodly hath gotten such power, there is now no place left in the whole world which they have not essayed to corrupt with their most wicked doctrines: amongst others, Elizabeth, the pretended queen of England, a slave of wickedness, lending thereunto her helping hand, with whom, as in a sanctuary, the most pernicious of all men have found a refuge. This very woman, having seized on the kingdom, and monstrously usurping the place of supreme head of the church in all England, and the chief authority and jurisdiction thereof, hath again brought back the said kingdom into miserable destruction, which was then newly reduced to the Catholic faith and good fruits.

"§ 2. For having by strong hand inhibited the exercise of the true religion, which Mary, lawful queen, of famous memory, had by the

help of this see restored, after it had been formerly overthrown by Henry VIII. a revolter therefrom; and following and embracing the errors of heretics, she hath removed the royal council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men being heretics; oppressed the embracers of the Catholic faith; placed unpious preachers, ministers of iniquity; abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, choice of meats, unmarried life, and the Catholic rites and ceremonies; commanded books to be read in the whole realm, containing manifest heresy; and impious mysteries and institutions by herself entertained, and observed according to the prescript of Calvin, to be likewise observed by her subjects; presuming to throw bishops, parsons of churches, and other Catholic priests, out of their churches and benefices, and to bestow them and other church livings upon heretics, and to determine of church causes; prohibited the prelates, clergy, and people to acknowledge the Church of Rome, or obey the precepts and canonical sanctions thereof; compelled most of them to condescend to her wicked laws, and to abjure the authority and obedience of the bishop of Rome, and to acknowledge her to be sole lady in temporal and spiritual matters, and this by oath; imposed penalties and punishments upon those who obeyed not, and exacted them of those who persevered in the unity of the faith and obedience aforesaid; cast the Catholic prelates and rectors of churches in prison, where many of them being spent with long languishing and sorrow miserably ended their lives. All which things, seeing they are manifest and notorious to all nations, and by the gravest testimony of very many so substantially proved, that there is no place at all left for excuse, defence, or evasion.

"§ 3. We, seeing that impieties and wicked actions are multiplied one upon another; and moreover, that the persecution of the faithful, and affliction for religion, groweth every day heavier and heavier, through the instigation and means of the said Elizabeth; because we understand her mind to be so hardened and indurate, that she hath not only condemned the godly requests and admonitions of Catholic princes, concerning her healing and conversion, but also hath not so much as permitted the nuncios of this see, to cross the seas unto England; are strained of necessity to betake ourselves to the weapons of justice against her, not being able to mitigate our sorrow, that we are drawn to take punishment upon one, to whose ancestors the whole state of Christendom hath been so much bounden. Being therefore supported by his authority, whose pleasure it was to place US, (though unable for so great a burden) in this supreme throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the foresaid Elizabeth, being a heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ.

"§ 4. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever.

"§ 5. And also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others, who have in any sort sworn unto her, to be for ever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do, by authority of these presents, absolve them, and to deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things abovesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her monitions, mandates, and laws: And those who do the contrary, we do innodate with the like sentence of anathema."

§ 6. Regards merely the publication of this Bull, for which I have not room. It is dated at Rome, at St Peter's, May 5th, 1570, and the fifth year of Pope Pius V. The Bull itself in Latin and English, with a commentary by Bishop Barlow, forms a quarto volume, entitled "Brutum Fulmen, 4to, London, 1681. See also Mendham's Life of St Pius V. where the Bull is likewise given in the original."

No. XXI.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 5TH, 1818.

MY last Number concluded with the "Damnation and Excommunication" of queen Elizabeth, by Pope Pius V. One of the first things that will strike the reader, on perusing this document, is the unparalleled insolence of the ghostly father. Elizabeth and her kingdom did not choose to have any thing to do with him; and what right had he to issue his anathemas against them? King John had, indeed, made a gift of the kingdom to the Pope about two hundred and fifty years before. But as John had presumed to give away what was not his own, (for even, at that early period, the people of England understood and maintained the principle, that the king was made for the people, not the people for the king;) and as the Pope had obtained the gift by means of imposition, it was in course of time lawfully wrested from him. In short, Pius V. had no more right to curse queen Elizabeth, than Pius VII. has to curse king George III.

The enlightened part of the English population were, in a great measure, prepared for a change in the public profession of religion, before king Henry VIII. was prepared to lead the way. The doctrines of the word of God,

as taught by Wickliffe and the Lollards, a century before, were extensively propagated, and many thousands in England believed them; so that when Henry himself became Reformer, he found little difficulty, except with some of the clergy and nobility, in getting the people to go along with him. Indeed, his chief difficulty arose from the forwardness of the people, who were disposed to reform faster, and more thoroughly, than he chose to allow them, and to go farther from Rome than he chose to go. He did, however, go far enough to incur the anger of the Pope, whose predecessor had created him Defender of the Faith; not being able, with all his infallibility, to foresee that Henry would soon renounce the faith, and that this fine title should be borne for three hundred years by a race of heretical princes; and the Pope, whose misfortune it was to hear of the defection of Henry, assailed him with all the terrors of the holy see, by means of a Bull which is before me, and which fills fifteen quarto pages of closely printed Latin, under the title of *Damnatio et Excommunicatio Henrici* VIII. *Regis Angliæ.* The Pope was evidently very angry with the king. He declared him, by this Bull, to be a heretic, and his crime was greatly aggravated by the consideration of his having been styled Defender of the Faith. He excommunicated and deposed him. He commanded all Christian princes to take up arms against him. He gave the soldiers who should engage in so godly a work, all the goods of the heretics, wherever they could find them. The king, notwithstanding, maintained his ground, and maintained the Reformation too, so far as he chose to carry it; and had he carried it a great deal farther, he should have had not only the support but the gratitude of the people.

By Elizabeth's time, it was carried a little farther forward; and the great bulk of the nation were decidedly Protestants, that is, decided in their separation from Rome, and in attachment to Elizabeth and her government. The interference of the Pope, therefore, was no better than the attempt of an incendiary to sow discord, and excite war and bloodshed, in a great and prosperous nation. He persevered in such attempts for many years, both openly and secretly, and employed numerous agents for carrying into effect his insidious and cruel designs. In short, it is difficult to imagine a fiend of darkness more obstinately set upon promoting measures of wickedness and cruelty than this holy father of the Romish church; and yet I believe he was not worse than the average of Popes for a thousand years.

He took other measures, besides denouncing the Queen, for subverting the government of England. He wrote a letter to the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, exciting them to rebellion against their sovereign. This letter, of which an English translation is given in "Free Thoughts," page 401, is written in the most insidious and flattering style. He addresses the two earls as "men dear to us and eminent, as well by the study of catholic piety, as by nobleness of birth." He praises them for having determined "to renew and confirm the ancient union of the Roman church with that kingdom,"—"delivered from the vile servitude of a woman's lust, to the ancient obedience of the holy Roman see." He assures them "that the omnipotent God, whose works are perfect, and who hath excited you to deserve well of the Catholic faith in that kingdom, will be assisting to you. But if, in asserting the Catholic faith, and the authority of this holy see, you should suffer death, and your blood be spilt, it would be much better, for the confession of God, to fly, by the compendium of a glorious death, to life eternal, than, living basely and ignominiously, to serve the lust of an impotent woman, with the loss of your souls." It is worthy of remark, that this letter is dated Feb. 20th, 1570, that is, about three months previous to the issuing of the Bull against the Queen. This was giving the rebel earls time to collect their forces, that they might be ready to strike the blow, and dethrone the Queen, when the Bull should arrive, and when all the superstitious and Popish part of the nation should be afraid to serve an excommunicated sovereign. The rebellion, however, had broken out prematurely, perhaps before the Pope's Bull arrived, and it was soon suppressed.

Some years after, the Pope excited Sir Thomas Stuckley to raise rebellion in Ireland. Stuckley engaged to conquer this kingdom for the Pope; and the holy father furnished him with a number of crucifixes, by selling which he was to make his own fortune. The following indulgences were granted to these crucifixes, which were evidently meant to excite the subjects of Elizabeth to rebel against her.

"1st. Whoso beholdeth, with reverence and devotion, one of these crosses, as oft as he doth it getteth fifty days of indulgence. As oft as he prayeth upon or before it, for the good and prosperous state of the holy Catholic church, and for the increase and exaltation of the holy Catholic faith, and for the preservation and delivery of Mary queen of Scotland, and for the extirpation of heretics, he shall have fifty days of indulgence, and, upon festival days, one hundred.

"2d. In going to any conflict or feat of arms, against the enemies of our holy faith, he shall obtain seven years and seven quarantains of indulgence. And if he die there, at least being confessed and houseled at the beginning of the war, with contrition of his sins, and calling upon the name of Jesus with mouth or heart, he shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

"3d. As oft as he shall be confessed and

houseled, making his prayers by word or mind, before the most holy crucifix, and praying for the prosperous state of the holy church, and for the chief bishop; and for the delivery and preservation of the aforesaid Mary Queen of Scots, and for reducing of the aforesaid realms of England and Scotland, he shall obtain all the indulgences that are granted for visiting all the holy places that are both within and without the gates of Rome.

"4th. Any night or evening that he shall examine his own conscience, with repentance of sins, and intend to amend the same, saying the general confession, and bowing or kneeling before the holy crucifix, saying three times Jesus, obtains a year and a quarantain of indulgence.

"5th. Whoso shall use and accustom to behold it with devotion to the cross, saying five Paternosters, five Aves, and some other prayers to our Saviour, or to our Lady, for the exaltation of the holy church, for the preservation of Mary Queen of Scotland, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, he shall obtain once in his life full indulgence of all his sins, besides the other indulgence of fifty days for each time that he prayeth.

"6th. Moreover, in the pain and peril of death, what person soever being confessed and contrite, or giving signs of contrition, and shall kiss the feet of the most blessed crucifix, saying, Jesu with heart, not being able to say it with mouth, shall obtain full indulgence and remission of all his sins.

"7th. *Item.* One day in the year, named and appointed by them that shall have one of the said crucifixes, with the license of the ordinary of the place, it may be put in any church, or chapel, or oratory; and whosoever shall come to visit with devotion the said holy crucifix, in the said church, chapel, or oratory, saying five Paternosters, and five Aves, praying for the prosperous state of our church, and for the preservation of Mary Queen of Scots, and for the reducing of the aforesaid realms, shall obtain free indulgence of all their sins, being confessed, or having the mind and purpose to be confessed in due time or place, and to amend their former lives and sins.

"8th. *Item.* That every Friday that mass is said, or caused to be said, upon any altar where one of these crucifixes is set, one soul shall be released out of purgatory.

"*Item.* That those indulgences cannot be revoked by any high bishop, except express mention be made of the same."—*Stripe's Annals,* Vol. II. 1724. page 535.

Such were the artifices of the see of Rome for subverting the English government. The Pope excommunicated and deposed the queen; relieved her subjects from their oaths of allegiance; stirred up the disaffected by flattering promises; and sent a number of little idols in the form of crucifixes throughout Ireland, to cherish among the people the superstitious belief, that if they should die in so good a cause as attempting to dethrone a heretical queen, and deliver a Popish one, they should receive the free pardon of all their sins. These efforts were powerfully seconded by a host of Jesuit priests, who spread themselves all over the kingdom, and who never ceased to plot the destruction of the queen, insomuch that it is truly astonishing that she escaped the fate of some other monarchs of that age, from the hands of these incendiaries.

"The reign of Elizabeth," says the Reviewer of 'A Brief Account of the Jesuits,' in the Christian Observer for March, 1815, "displays a rapid succession of plots against her life, either designed or executed by Jesuits, and from which nothing but the peculiar protection of Providence could have delivered the Queen and the country." The following is an extract from the Brief Account:—"Elizabeth wrote with her own hand to Henry III. of France, after the conspiracy against her life, informing him that the Jesuits had contrived it, 'who,' says she, 'hold it meritorious to kill a sovereign whom the Pope has deposed; and she then warns him against them; and he would have done well if he had observed her caution. In 1591, the Queen published a declaration against the society; in which, after describing at length the designs of Spain and Rome, she says, that she has the most undoubted information, that the Jesuits form the nests and lurking-places of those who are in rebellion against her person and government; that their general had himself been to Spain, and armed its king against her; that Parsons, who taught among them, and was the general of the English seminary at Rome, had done the same; and that the Jesuits, as a society, had been the life and soul of the armies which had been raised against England." *p.* 22.

Now, let the reader reflect what sort of a religion that must be which has been uniformly employed for purposes of mischief; and which has scarcely ever made itself known in the world, but as the instrument of promoting some mischievous design. The religion of Jesus Christ has a direct tendency to promote the true happiness of the human race in this world as well as in the next. His appearing in this world was announced by an angel from heaven, as the commencement of a dispensation which should, in an eminent degree, produce glory to God in the highest; and on earth peace, and good will to men. This religion, wherever cordially embraced, has produced the promised effects. It brings peace to the conscience and heart of every sinner who believes it; and it teaches such a one to live in peace with all his neighbours. Congregations of such men are churches of Christ; and, while they are studying to edify and pro-

mote the happiness of one another, they look with a benign aspect upon the whole human race. Every such society creates around it a moral atmosphere, which ameliorates the condition of all who are within its reach, and brings into operation the spirit of that religion which is divinely destined to banish discord and war from the earth, and promote the reign of universal peace.

Every thing that has an opposite tendency must be antichristian, that is, contrary to the religion of Christ. On this principle alone, I am willing to meet any advocate of the Romish church; and I engage to prove that her whole administration, as related in history, for twelve centuries, has been subversive of the peace and comfort of mankind; that, in fact, all the cunning, and artifice, and power, and wealth, and learning of those who conducted the affairs of the Church of Rome, have been devoted to purposes of deceit, and cruelty, and wholesale murder, either in the way of exciting princes to make war upon one another, or to exterminate heretics, or in the way of sowing the seeds of sedition and rebellion among people, against such princes as the Pope chose to denounce and excommunicate. He who believes this to be the true religion cannot have learned of Him who was meek and lowly in heart, and who came to proclaim peace on earth, and good will to men; but must have been brought up at the feet of some demon who delights in the misery of men, and whose altars are ever stained with the blood of human sacrifices.

Papists of the present day assume airs of humanity and moderation, and affect an abhorrence of such scenes as I have been describing; but they do so with a very ill grace, when they do it at the expense of denying almost every historical fact, and by asserting downright falsehood, as is done by the editor of their Orthodox Journal, when he says that persecution was scarcely known in any Christian country, till Protestants set the example; and when he maintains, as he does in his Number for October last, that Popery is more conducive to civil liberty than Protestantism, for which purpose he distorts, and turns upside down many facts of history, to impose upon his credulous readers. If modern Papists would honestly confess the truth, and deplore, and condemn, the conduct of the Church of Rome in former times, when she made it her business to excite war and massacre throughout all Europe, I should give them credit for possessing more humane and generous sentiments than their forefathers did; but while they rest the defence of their church upon the denial of well known facts, I must take them for liars as their fathers were; and I cannot help coming to the conclusion, that they would do just as their fathers did, if they were in similar circumstances, and possessed the same power.

I have before me a list of about sixty emperors, kings, and princes, who have been excommunicated, deposed, &c. by about forty different Popes. (See *Free Thoughts, p.* 51.) What an inconceivable mass of misery must have been occasioned by this, and by the wars which ensued, to the millions of subjects, who were all less or more affected by the fate of their superiors! Why is it that the present Pope does not excommunicate and denounce the king of Great Britain and the Prince Regent? It is simply because he knows that it would not serve any profitable purpose; and that it might be attended by some inconvenience to himself, if he were to denounce them *by name*. But, if ever the time shall come when the subjects of the Pope shall have the ascendency here, the ghostly father will feel little reluctance in serving British princes as he did their predecessors. And, in fact, they are excommunicated already, though not by name, but by their well known designation of *heretics*. This is done annually at Rome, on holy Thursday, as by the following account in Hurd's History, p. 217:—"The next ceremony is that of excommunicating and giving over to the devil, all Protestants throughout the world, who, at Rome, and among Roman Catholics, are known by the name of heretics. The Pope is then clothed in red, and stands upon a high throne, the better to be seen by the people. The sub-deacons, who stand at the left hand of his Holiness, read the Bull, and, in the mean time, the candles are lighted, and each of them takes one in his hand. When the excommunication is pronounced, the Pope and Cardinals put out their candles, and throw them among the crowd, after which, the black cloth that covered the pulpit is taken away."

I have deviated a great way from the straight road through the Letters of AMICUS VERITATIS, for the purpose of contrasting the discipline and excommunication appointed by Christ in his church, with that exercised in the Church of Rome, by the Pope and his clergy; and I hope it will appear from what I have written on this subject alone, that the Church of Rome is antichrist,—that malignant power that maintains a perpetual opposition to the kingdom of Christ in the world.

I shall conclude this Number with another example of excommunication, as it is practised in the Church of Rome. It is difficult to understand what sort of communion the Church held with vermin; but certainly some sort of relation must have subsisted between them and the church, seeing they were liable to be excommunicated.

"But the Church of Rome does not confine her excommunications, or censures, entirely to men and women: for even animals and reptiles must be subject in their turn. When it happens that much of the fruits of the earth are damaged by rats, mice, locusts, or cater-

pillars, then the church censures become necessary. The priest is obliged to transmit to the bishop an account of the damage done by these creatures, and then the bishop orders the priest to repair to an eminence in his parish, where he is to put on his surplice, and sprinkle himself and his clerks with holy water. Having repeated some prayers prescribed by the bishop, the priest walks over the adjacent fields, and sprinkles them with holy water, in form of a cross. He commands the caterpillars, locusts, &c. to depart from the place immediately, otherwise they are to be excommunicated and accursed.

"Of this species of superstition we have a most striking instance in the Miscellanies of the Marquis D'Argens, who tells us, that, in the year 1738, Provence, in France, was much infested with locusts. Application was made to the Pope, who sent his bull to the bishop, ordering them to be all excommunicated. The bishop obeyed the order, but the locusts refused to comply, which gave no small uneasiness to the farmers; it surprised them much to find that the locusts refused to comply with the apostolical order; but one more sagacious than the others observed, that the bishop was a Jansenist.

"An account of this was transmitted to the Pope, who, from the whole of his conduct, seems not to have been a fool, for he sent an injunction to a bishop, who was orthodox in the faith, (a Jesuit perhaps) to let the locusts alone till the beginning of November, and then to go out with his priests and excommunicate them. Here the Pope acted a very wise part, for locusts seldom survive the first week in November; whereas, had he excommunicated them sooner, the ceremony would not have had its proper effect. This, however, was considered as a miracle, because it served to point out that the Jansenists are not to expect the divine blessing upon their works; whereas all those who are orthodox, are certain that God will hear them whenever they call upon him, and that he will in the most signal manner grant their requests."—*Hurd's History, p.* 229.

No. XXII.

SATURDAY, December 12th, 1818.

I HAVE been endeavouring, in some of my late Numbers, to represent the church of Christ and the Church of Rome, by way of contrast, particularly in the matters of discipline and excommunication. These, in the church of Christ, are a process of kindness and mercy; —in the Church of Rome, a system of cruelty and oppression. The utmost that the church of Christ can do with an offending and irreclaimable member, is to put him away; but this, even when represented by the apostle Paul, under the strong language of delivering unto Satan, is a process of mercy: it is declared to be "for the destruction of the flesh." This last expression, "the flesh," signifies the evil propensities of the human heart, the corrupt desires and passions, which, in a man, are the source of all his misery in this world; and which, if not destroyed, must issue in misery everlasting. That which effects such destruction is a process of mercy. It was effectual in the instance of the person of whom the apostle speaks, 1 Cor. v. and 2 Cor. ii. His being turned over to the world, which is the kingdom of Satan, and thus declared to be unworthy of the fellowship of the church, made him reflect on his own character and condition. Finding himself an outcast from the kingdom of Christ on earth, because of his wickedness, he could have no hope of seeing the kingdom of Christ in heaven, but must have been overwhelmed by a fearful apprehension of being sent away into everlasting punishment with the devil and his angels. This effected the destruction of his flesh; he was brought to genuine repentance, restored to the fellowship of the church; and, persevering to the end, his spirit would be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

The same apostle, 1 Tim. i. 19, 20, speaks of some who had made shipwreck of the faith and of a good conscience; they had abandoned some important truth, and embraced some fatal error. This, in view of the apostle and the church, so far as regarded Christian fellowship, was as bad as gross immorality. The apostle, therefore, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, delivered such persons to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme. Though not favoured with the personal presence of the apostle, any church, by authority of his writings, is warranted to do the same thing; that is, to excommunicate blasphemers and persons who deny the faith of the gospel. But this is not to punish them. Every society has a right to see that its members be agreed about the fundamental principles of their association. If there be any who reject such fundamental principles they have no right to be in it; and putting them away is doing them no wrong. It is, indeed, doing them a favour; for, if error and blasphemy be ruinous to their souls, the measure of putting them away, as unworthy of Christian fellowship, is calculated to impress them with a sense of their sin and danger, and by this means to save their souls.

Now, there is reason to expect that the laws of Christ, faithfully administered for the correction of immorality or error, will produce the effect intended by them; for he has promised to be with his people always to the end of the world; to give efficacy to his word, and bless the administration of his laws. The design of Christ, by all that is done in the

church in his name, is to promote the salvation of lost sinners:—By the preaching of the gospel, to turn them from the power of Satan unto God; and, by the same means, together with the discipline of his church, to recover those who, after professing the faith, have fallen into sin. It is this that makes the whole a process of mercy; and which manifests the discipline of the church to be a privilege rather than a punishment.

This reasoning might be corroborated by the history of every church in which discipline has been faithfully administered. I shall mention only one fact, which is of recent occurrence, which has been certified to me by the reverend gentleman under whose administration it happened; and which shows the good effects which result from an honest adherence to the divine rule of letting a sinner know explicitly the condition in which sin places him, with regard to the church; and that he cannot enjoy her fellowship without repentance.

A woman who had once and again been guilty of a sin which incurred the censure of the church, in the way of public rebuke, presented herself before the parish session, that she might be taken under discipline, expecting as a thing of course, that she would have to stand in the church, and that then she would be restored to church privileges. But appearing to the minister and elders to be a person who had no just sense of the evil of her sin, and exhibiting no signs of repentance, she was told that she could not be admitted to the privilege of the discipline and censure, which could be properly applied only to the penitent, and could be of no use to the hardened and insensible, such as she appeared to be. She went away greatly disappointed, because she was not to be rebuked as she expected. She was in effect, though not in form, excommunicated.

But the matter did not rest here. The sinner could find no peace in her own conscience. The idea haunted her by night and by day. She began to reflect on her own character and conduct. She thought she must be a wicked creature indeed, seeing she was not reckoned worthy, so much as to give public satisfaction for her sin. She was, in short, brought to serious consideration, and deep repentance: on evidence of which, she was restored to church communion; and she maintained a good character all the rest of her life. When she applied to the session, she was very ignorant, and could not read, but when awakened to a sense of her guilt, she immediately learned to read, so as to be able to peruse her Bible, and made it appear that she had profited by the merciful discipline of the church.

The contrast which I have been endeavouring to draw, may be expressed in one sentence, —the design and tendency of Christianity is not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; the design and tendency of Popery is not to save men's lives, but to destroy them.

When I speak of the *design* of Popery, I must be understood as looking beyond human agents; for I am taught by the word of God, that this system originated with the enemy of all righteousness; and I have no doubt his design by it was to oppose the benign influence of the gospel; and, by presenting to the world a counterfeit, instead of real Christianity, to prevent the salvation, and actually to destroy and ruin the souls of men. The apostle Paul gives a lively description of the system, 2 Thess. ii. 3—12, and tells us that its "coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." As for Papists themselves, I cannot allow myself to doubt that they believe their religion to be the only true one, and the only safe one; and I believe they are not aware of the design of its author. We are told by the apostle, in the passage above referred to, that when men did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved, God sent them strong delusion that they should believe a lie. What was foretold of this system has been awfully verified. It was from not liking the simple truth of the gospel, that many who professed to receive it, began to corrupt it by human inventions. They were, in righteous judgment, abandoned to believe their own errors. Thence arose that monstrous fabric of superstition, and spiritual domination, which has oppressed Europe for many hundred years.

It was the design of the Author of Christianity to save men's lives, that is, to save their souls; the Son of man came to seek and save that which was lost. But it was the design of the author of Popery to ruin the souls of men by a system of error and delusion; and he has carried his plan into effect, by enticing men to become the dupes, and the agents, and then the victims of that delusion.

That the tendency of Popery corresponds with its design, is evident by its whole history, and by the principles which it inculcates. We learn from the word of God, that there is no salvation for a sinner, but in the way of depending solely and entirely upon the finished work of Jesus Christ, but Popery rejects this as the sole ground of dependence, and directs its deluded adherents to depend less or more upon their own merit, and the merits of some whom they call saints; who are, however, mere creatures like themselves, and many of them of very doubtful character. This part of the system does not make such a figure in history as the wars and bloody persecutions which Popery has excited, because from the very nature of the thing, it is not capable of being made the subject of history. It is the subject of individual experience in that most

important hour, to every man, when he must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ: and if it be true, as it most certainly is, that only he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned, then that system of religion which flatters men with the idea of being saved by some other way than believing on Christ, stands chargeable with this unavoidable consequence,—it tends not to save men's souls but to destroy them. With regard to the destruction of men's bodies, we know from history that Popery has slain its thousands and ten thousands; but with regard to the ruin of souls from this fatal error, no man can tell the millions who have been by Popery deceived to their everlasting destruction.

I am aware that I am here treading on delicate ground, and that many who take themselves for Protestants, will accuse me of uncharitableness, but I care not while I know that I am upon *sure* ground, as I consider myself to be, while I proceed upon the plain declarations of the word of God. There is no name under heaven, given among men, by which a sinner can be saved, but that of Jesus Christ, and there is no way of being saved, even by him, but in the divinely appointed way of believing on him. Popery holds out another way, namely, that of believing in the Church,—receiving implicitly the dogmas of fallible men; praying to, and trusting in saints and angels; and doing whatever the Church prescribes. Now, without pretending to ascertain the condition of individuals of ancient or modern times, I am guilty of no uncharitableness, and no presumption, when I say, that this is the direct road to everlasting perdition, and that he who travels in it to the end must perish, and that for ever.

I shall, however, be better understood by some of my readers, and I shall perhaps make a deeper impression on their minds, by returning to the tendency of Popery, with regard to the bodies and the property of men. Here, most evidently, its tendency is not to save but to destroy. I have partly proved this already, by showing its insidious and incessant interference with the affairs of kings and kingdoms, and exciting war and persecution. I shall now give some instances of a more private nature, but which are well calculated to show the spirit of the system, and its tendency to destroy men's lives as well as to rob them of their property.

The Popish sentence of excommunication was used as an instrument of oppression and destruction against private and obscure individuals, as well as against princes; and this use of it continues to the present day. The following is the form of "excommunication pronounced by Philip Dunn, a Popish bishop in Ireland, against Francis Freeman, who embraced the Protestant religion in 1765;—found among the bishop's papers, in his house in the county of Wicklow:

"By the authority of God the Father Almighty, and the Blessed virgin Mary, and St Peter and St Paul, and all the holy saints, we excommunicate Francis Freeman late of the county of Dublin, but now of Tuck-mill, in the county of Wicklow, that, in spite of God and St Peter, and in spite of all the holy saints, and in spite of our most holy father the Pope, (God's vicar on earth), and in spite of our right reverend father in God, Philip Dunn, our diocesan, and worshipful canons, who serve God daily, hath apostatized to a most damnable religion, full of heresy and blasphemy; excommunicated let him be, and delivered over to the devil, as a perpetual malefactor, and schismatic; accursed let him be, in all cities, and in all towns, in fields, in ways, in yards, in houses, and in all other places, whether lying or rising, walking or running, leaning or standing, waking or sleeping, eating or drinking, or whatsoever thing he does; besides, we separate him from the threshold and all good prayers of the church; from the participation of the holy Jesus; from all sacraments, chapels, and altars; from the holy bread, and holy water; from all the merit of God's holy priests and religious men, and from their cloysters, and all pardons, privileges, grants, and immunities, which all the holy Popes have granted them; and we give him over utterly to the fiend; and let him quench his soul, when dead, in the pains of hell fire, as this candle is quenched and put out. And let us pray to God, our Lady, and St Peter, and St Paul, that all the senses of his body may fail, as now the light of this candle is gone; except he come, on sight hereof, and openly confess his damnable heresy and blasphemy, and, by repentance, make amends, as much as in him lies, to God, our Lady, St Peter, and the worshipful company of this church; and as the staff of this holy cross now falls down, so may he, except he recants and repents. Signed, Philip Dunn." *Free Thoughts, p.* 422.

This is in the true spirit of Popery. Here there is nothing of mercy; of course, nothing like the discipline of the church of Christ. All is vengeance, fire, and fury, against the man, whose only crime is, that he has presumed to think for himself on the subject of religion, and become a Protestant. When a member of the church of Christ falls into sin or error, and if it is even necessary to excommunicate him, he has still the benefit of the church's prayers for his recovery; but, in the Church of Rome, the excommunicated person is declared to be separated from all good prayers of the Church; and, with a fiendlike malice, he is utterly given over to the fiend, that he may quench his soul, when dead, in the pains of hell fire. Among a superstitious people, such a sentence must unavoidably affect the

property and even the life of the person subjected to it, so that the tendency of Popish excommunication is to destroy men's lives.

This will appear farther from the following fact of still more recent occurrence;—It was a case tried, a few years ago, before the Hon. Mr Justice Day, and a special Jury, at the Cork Assizes. "A baker of the name of Donovan brought an action against the Rev. Mr O'Brien, vicar general to Dr Coppinger, titular Bishop of Cork, and Roman Catholic parish priest of Clonakilty. The damages were laid at £500. It appeared on the trial, that a subscription had been set on foot by the priest, for the purpose of building a Roman Catholic chapel. Donovan was ordered to pay, as his affixed quota, the sum of 16*s.* 3*d.*, which he accordingly did. He was afterwards called upon to pay 9*s.*, this sum he likewise paid; but observed, that he was very poor, and that he could not afford it. A third demand was made of him, by the priest, of 16*s.*, which Donovan refused to comply with. On Donovan's going to mass, the following Sunday, he was asked by the priest, whether he would pay the 16*s.* or not? He answered, that he was not able. The priest rejoined, 'I will settle you.' Terrified at this observation, Donovan sent, by his wife, 16*s.* to the house of the priest, who refused then to take less than two guineas. On the following Sunday, the priest cursed from the altar all those who had not paid their demands towards building the Chapel. Donovan went, on next holiday, to mass, and was formally excommunicated, and the people denounced as cursed and contaminated, if they should deal or hold any communication with him. This threat was so effectual, that no one of the country people would sell a sod of turf to Donovan to heat his oven; and he could not even sell, in his own name, such flour or stock as lay on his hands. Reduced almost to despair, the baker went, in a white sheet, to the Chapel, as a voluntary penance, and asked pardon of God and the priest for his disobedience; and was there, by the priest, desired to attend him to his house, where he again demanded from him the two guineas, which Donovan assured him he could not possibly make up. The excommunication was, therefore, continued in full force against him, and he was consequently obliged to shut up his house. The above facts were incontrovertibly proved by two unwilling witnesses. The Jury, after a very able charge from the learned Judge, found a verdict for the plaintiff of £50 damages."

Many of my readers will recollect having read the above in the public papers about four years ago; and I believe it is as authentic as any reported law case which we find in the newspapers. It shows the cruel and vengeful spirit of the Popish religion, which grinds the faces of the poor, and would wring the very blood from their veins. It shows also in what way the spiritual authority of the priests is used for the destruction of men's lives, or, which tends to the same thing, depriving them of their means of subsistence.

Candour, however, requires me to say, that the Editor of the Orthodox Journal endeavours to palliate, and almost to deny the fact, though it must have been proved in open Court. He says, "I was well convinced that the *whole* of the account was a complete tissue of falsehood, except the fact that such a case was tried." I believe he knows also the other fact, that the priest was convicted, by a verdict of a Jury, and ordained to pay £50 in name of damages. He gives a long letter from Mr O'Brien, addressed to the Editor of the Times, and complains grievously of the partiality of that gentleman, for declining to publish it in his paper; though it would certainly be hard upon Editors, if they were obliged to print all that convicted persons might please to write against the juries who convicted them.

But, from the priest's own showing, I am convinced that the facts were proved against him. He admits that money was levied of the people to build his chapel; the better sort were expected to pay a guinea; the second three crowns, which is 16*s.* 3*d.* Irish; and the third class, half-a-guinea: from the poor, he says, nothing was expected. He maintains, indeed, that the payment was voluntary; but I know the same thing is pleaded on behalf of the priest in Glasgow, while I can prove that, in some cases at least, it was so much otherwise, that he made application to masters to retain in their own hands, for the use of his chapel, part of the wages of servants, which he thought they would not pay voluntarily. O'Brien admits, that, after the chapel was erected, considerable debts remained to be liquidated; that he had threatened with an ecclesiastical censure, those who did not pay their quota: that "Donovan was the only one who contumaciously resisted the regulations of the subscribers, and the authority of his pastor. The congregation witnessed his audacity, and resented it, by withdrawing themselves, in some measure, from his communion." He rests his defence partly on the bad character of one of the witnesses, who, he says, was suborned to swear that he had excommunicated the baker, and every one that should deal with him; but there was another witness against whom he states no objection. In short, his whole letter is a piece of downright Popish shuffling, and can have no weight with any impartial man, in opposition to the verdict of a jury. He says, the deluded woman, on whose testimony this decision was founded, died soon after, a deplorable victim of remorse and despair; but he knows that the decision was not founded on her testimony alone; and he does not deny the fact, that the poor man

was utterly ruined in his business, by means of an ecclesiastical censure, threatened or inflicted by him. Now, this was the only fact with which the jury had to do,—a fact which was clearly proved, and which, notwithstanding all his quibbling, the priest does not deny.

I should not have troubled my readers with this defence which the priest makes for himself, had I not thought it but fair, since I was giving the story, to give also the fact that a vindication had been attempted. Besides, the style and manner of this defence afford another evidence that there can be no dependence upon a Popish representation of any fact, not even with regard to what takes place in our own times, much less with regard to any fact of ancient history. The above trial is stated, by the priest, to have taken place as far back as 1805; and, for any thing I know, this part of his statement is true.

No. XXIII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19TH, 1818.

I AM afraid that AMICUS VERITATIS will think that I have lost sight of him altogether; and perhaps he will think that I consider the remaining parts of his letters unanswerable, seeing I have taken so little notice of them in my three last Numbers. He may keep himself easy on that score. I have no intention of slurring over any part of the controversy; and I shall pay all due respect to the subjects which he has brought into view in my own time, and in my own way.

His charge against the Church of Scotland, on the matter of indulgences, has led me to digress farther than I at first intended, on the subject of church discipline in general, and excommunication in particular. In the course of this digression, I stated some strong facts with regard to excommunication in Ireland, even in the present day, and as I have fallen upon some more matter relative to clerical management, and the oppression of our fellow subjects in the sister island, I shall lay it before my readers before I proceed to any thing else.

The Reverend Charles Bourke, a Romish priest in Ireland, has lately published a pamphlet, entitled, "Popish Episcopal Tyranny exposed," which makes such an exposure as I did not expect to see in the present day. Mr Bourke, it seems, had somehow fallen under the displeasure of his bishop, the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron of Killala; and his *Lordship*, without rhyme or reason, so far as appears, proceeded to deprive, depose, and excommunicate the unhappy priest, notwithstanding the following strong testimonies on his behalf.

Copy of a memorial that accompanied a letter from Mr Bourke to his Lordship, dated May 12th, 1815. "To the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron. The memorial of the clergy of this diocese of Killala, humbly exposes to your Lordship, that we, the under mentioned parish priests and dignitaries of this diocese, do express our sorrowful feelings for the Rev. Charles Bourke being deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the diocese, and from the exercise of any ecclesiastical function, by your *Lordship*. These sorrowful sentiments press the harder on us, as we know him to be a good priest; and a virtuous, amiable, moral, learned one. We hope from your Lordship's goodness, that you will be pleased to revoke the verbal sentence of suspension you passed on him; or at least give him leave to say mass; or, in fine, his *exeat* for some other diocese. The different flocks, or parishes, that he attended, speak highly in his behalf; and the gentlemen of the country, the most respectable, give him a fair character.

(Signed,)

JAMES HARAN, *Castleconor*,	THOMAS MAGEE, *Ardagh*,
DAN. M'NAMARA, *Easky*,	PAT. FLANEGAN, *Kilbride*,
JOHN BURNE, *Templeboy*,	THOMAS MONELLY, *Dunfeeny*,
JOHN KELLY, *Drumard*,	JAMES KILBOY, *Muigaunagh*,
WILLIAM KELLY, *Screen*,	JOHN MAGEE, *Lackin*."

"Copy of a Memorial of the Parishioners of the Parish of Kilbelfad, to the Right Reverend Doctor Waldron. We, the under-mentioned Parishioners of the Parish of Kilbelfad, unanimously complained of the want of the administration of the sacraments, neglect of duty, oppression and extortion of the Rev. Francis Mangan; who, after many applications, permitted several to die without the extreme unction, and others without baptism. It was a common practice with him, to charge, even the poorest person, the price of a bottle of wine, when he called on duty. He kept a chaplain, who charged tenpence to each family; and, after he collected his oats himself, the chaplain made a second collection. This done, he used to discharge the chaplain, and bring in a third to make his collection also. There was no use in expostulations; his WHIP was the only law for our conduct; and God only knows how we felt his severity! We made repeated complaints to Doctor Bellew, and latterly to the Rev. James Haran, who sent us the Rev. Charles Bourke, the only clergyman who gave us any spiritual consolation these fifteen years back.—We hope, in your Lordship's goodness, that you will keep Mr Mangan from us; and that your Lordship will continue Mr Bourke to us, for he is an exemplary good priest, who feeds his flock in the sweetest pastures. And, as in duty bound, we will ever pray," &c. —P. 8.

Here, with great simplicity, we are told in what manner some priests rule over, and oppress the poor people in Ireland. Let it be

remembered, this is the testimony of the parishioners, in a memorial to their bishop. I suppose they did not expect it was to appear in print; and that it was destined to grace the pages of "THE PROTESTANT." Had they thought of this, perhaps the fear of the Rev. Mr Mangan's WHIP would have deterred them from speaking so plainly.

It seems his "*illustrious*" Lordship did not like to have so good a priest within his jurisdiction. He accuses him of several immoralities, particularly of drunkenness, but he does not trouble himself with evidence; and Mr Bourke seems very triumphantly to repel the charge; and he more than insinuates, that the bishop's dislike to him, arose from his not being a man who could be content with things as they are; and wink at gross negligence and immorality on the part of his clerical brethren. He appealed to the Pope against the sentence of his diocesan; and there, I suppose, the appeal lies to this day, for he is too poor to go to Rome to prosecute his cause; and the bishop has refused to answer the appeal, or give the reasons of his conduct, till he receive an extract from Rome.

Bourke very feelingly describes the effect of the excommunication upon himself. His ghostly father, that is, the bishop, meant, he says, "to kill his son, both temporally and spiritually; temporally, as far as he has endeavoured to starve him to death by means of a major excommunication; and this excommunication was to be read in all the chapels of the diocese, by each priest to his respective flock; —that no means of support, consolation, or sustenance should be left him, but to die like a dog in a ditch, if the priest or man, on whom the attack was made, should be so weak as to become the dupe of such ill-timed fulminations.

"By a major excommunication, one is deprived of all the goods of the church, and even of Christian burial, of assisting at mass, or divine service, or office of any kind, at the prayers of the church!! It deprives a man of receiving the sacraments, of the functions of holy orders, of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and of all the suffrages of the church; in such manner that those who have incurred the censure, have no part in the affairs of the church, unless they may have a legitimate excuse. For a greater clearing of this matter, I will reduce to five classes, the goods of which a man is deprived by a major excommunication. They are contained in this verse:—

Os, orare, vale, communio, mensa negatur.

"The word *Os*, signifies that the faithful should not speak to an excommunicated person. *Orare*, that they should not pray in his company. *Vale*, that they should not bid him the time of day, nor show him any mark of civility or respect. *Communio*, shows that they should not live in the same house, nor under the same roof, negotiate, work, nor have any intercourse with him. *Mensa negatur*, signifies, that the faithful should not eat, or drink, or sleep, with an excommunicated person. When denounced, all the faithful are forbidden, under pain of a minor excommunication, to commune, in any respect, with an excommunicated person; but before this denunciation, the faithful may commune with them, and give them what is not forbidden in the divine, or natural law.

"By the above we see, that, after the denunciation, the faithful are obliged to avoid the excommunicated person, under pain of incurring a minor excommunication; which, even they do not incur, if any of the five following reasons may be alleged to excuse them:—

"*Utile, lex, humile, res ignorata, necesse.*"

Mr Bourke illustrates these five reasons at length. The substance of them is;—that a person, by intercourse with one excommunicated, does not incur minor excommunication, if he can plead manifest utility; the marriage relation; the connection of children, or domestics; ignorance of the case; or urgent necessity.

"Though the above motives," says he, "excuse the excommunicated person as well as the faithful, from a major excommunication, or from incurring a minor excommunication; yet few there are who know it, except those who have had a long course of theological studies. Besides, the clergy never explain to their flocks the reasons that excuse from a major excommunication; it is not their interest to do it. They only instil into them, that by an excommunication they are on the brink of destruction, and just ready to fall into the fiery furnace of hell!! This they do to keep them in awe, and to spread the veil of ignorance over their eyes, in order that they may be subject to themselves; and to themselves *alone*, upon all occasions!!!

"Many, besides, of the clergy never had a regular course of studies, and therefore are insufficient to instruct, or do away the cloud of ignorance that hangs over the poor. In this manner, the poor, (God help them,) are kept in the dark; and this is the interest of their clergy, who tyrannize over them more than the Indian chiefs do over the savages who inhabit the most uncultivated regions of the earth. It is but too well known that it is the want of preaching the gospel, and inculcating its evangelical principles, in imitation of the maxims taught by Christ, by example and word, that make Roman Catholics so stupid and lukewarm in their duty to God and their neighbour: and when they see their instructors give a bad example themselves, in the violation of the principles that bind and link society together, what wonder that they, the lower orders, should be led out of the path, and commit the excesses we see daily by woful experience, which too frequently bring them to condign punishment? And all this, owing to their clergy keeping them in ignorance, with the

oppression, extortion, and the tyranny of their curses and excommunications; which are always ready, even on the most insignificant and trivial occasions."—P. 38.

Let it be remembered that this account of the character and conduct of the Popish priests in Ireland is given by one of themselves, and one who knows them well. The following shows how much some of the Papists in Ireland are opposed to the instruction of the people; and with what a jealous eye they regard the operation of the Hibernian Society, whose object it is to teach the Irish to read:—

"His Lordship, (Bishop Waldron,) in opposition to the London Hibernian Society, said, he would establish Catholic Schools in the two parishes, and appoint schoolmasters for that purpose, with salaries of twenty pounds per annum. Full of this expectation, John Tympany (who had a wife and a houseful of very helpless children, and was in possession of twenty guineas a-year by teaching one of the charity schools established for the benefit of the poor,) was deprived of the means of supporting his wife and helpless family. Relying on the veracity of his Lordship's word of honour, he was drawn from his allegiance to the society, and lost a year's salary of twenty guineas. This poor man now has no alternative but that of going to beg! It is true the Bishop gave him a black suit of clothes; and so transformed him from *Shane-bane* to *Shane-dough*. The poor man was known by the name of *Shane-bane*, which signifies White John. *Shane-dough*, is Black John, into which he was transformed by wearing the Bishop's black suit of second-hand clothes; which stands the poor man in twenty guineas, but reduces him to the extremity of going to beg! He is indeed an honest, well-meaning man, who knows the Irish language well, and whose instructions to the Irish youth would be of great utility. I have seen very few who know the Irish better."—P. 42.

This man, it seems, was seduced by the bishop, under false promises, to give up the service of the Hibernian Society; and was reduced to poverty, because it was the desire of his Lordship that his people should not learn to read their own language. The following gives a farther development of the manner in which religious matters are at this day conducted by the Romish clergy in Ireland:—

"Dr Waldron, on his arrival to his diocese of Killala, to prove his firmness in discharge of his apostolic mission, assembled all his clergy, and preached the necessity of holding fast the principles of the most ancient religion from the time of Christ and his apostles, down to the present epoch; that, to hold fast to it, and not be turned about with every wind of doctrine, it would be necessary to begin and fix the bishop on a permanent footing: that this could only be done by paying in to him all the money collected by all and each of his clergy, since the decease of the Right Rev. Dr Bellew, to his commencement of assuming the reins of his Episcopal government. By giving him this money, extorted from the poor without pity or remorse, to be employed in defraying the exorbitant expenses, indispensably (he said) annexed to the bringing the Archbishop of Dublin to Tuam, in order to impose hands on Dr Waldron, and also to defray that of assembling troops to keep peace in Tuam during the august ceremony of consecration, the gift would become laudable! it would be a most pious work of charity to dignify the Episcopal character, by the oppression of many, and the extortion from several who had not perhaps salt to eat with their potatoes. That no one may be at a loss to know where this extortion lies,—it is the Bishop's exacting half-a-guinea, instead of half-a-crown, for the dispensation of banns,—making, at a very moderate average, of this merchantable commodity, from five to six hundred pounds a-year, by allowing from twenty to forty marriages in each parish. Formerly, the dispensation of banns was but half-a-crown: now it is half-a-guinea; having no right, authority, or law, for this augmentation. Baptism is raised from an English shilling to an English half-crown: legacy, on every corpse, from an English crown to ten shillings; which, if the priest does not get immediately, he will take away the pot, the wheel, or the blanket. I have known a certain priest, where the above furniture was wanting, to take the hens from the roost! This legacy they must get, (though they were sure the miserable individual who survives, had not a bit to put in his mouth that night,) or some article proportionable in value. The distribution of the holy oils is raised. The priests are allowed to get, and force, a large measure of oats annually from the poorest creature in the parish; the poorest widow not excepted! This collection the priest is allowed to make, provided that, of the collected oats, he sends a sack to the Bishop annually."—P. 42, 43.

"At Christmas and Easter, it is the rule with every parish priest, on Sunday, to publish his weekly stations through the villages; on Monday, for example, at such a man's house, all the villagers are to attend, men, women, married, and unmarried. Should, however, any one absent himself, this day, for the want of money, or any other cause, however legitimate, the priest sends the vestments to his house, the following day, as a punishment upon the miserable man. The poor individual is then obliged, should he pawn his blanket, to prepare a dinner for the priest,—with tea and sugar, bread, beef, mutton, fowl, hay, and oats, and plenty of whisky; although it may be for the want of a shilling to pay the priest's dues that the unfortunate wretch absented himself the day before, which he could not pay at the periodical season of the priest's dues!!!

"On Tuesday, the same at some other man's house, in some other village; and so on, until all the confessions are heard in all the parishes of this diocese. Easter comes on, and the same line of conduct is observed by the priest as at Christmas.

"At a moderate average, one or two guineas in bread, tea, and sugar, beef, mutton, fowl, and whisky, hay, and oats, will not defray the expense of the priest, who has a right to invite all his friends to the feast! Any one who wishes to be exempt from these heavy charges, must be on the alert, and very cautious to send butter, eggs, chickens; in a word, he must ingratiate himself well by means of these little perquisites into the priest's favour, a little before the return of these periodical seasons of Christmas and Easter.

"Now, before these confessions begin, the priest tells them it is intended to do penance for their sins, which is best done by fasting and prayer; but which is quite opposite to the grand feast that the priest not only expects, but must necessarily have, though he was sure the miserable creature should go and beg the next day. I leave the world to judge what kind of penance this is! Some priests will not drink whisky: they must have rum, brandy, or wine, by which they get basely drunk, before they leave the poor man's house; and, in return for his civilities, they insult him with the most gross and ignominious language.

"The good usage which the priest has got, and the extravagant expenses which he has occasioned, are no protection to the poor man against abuse and insult. I have known a priest, (Mr M.——— at Backs) to charge the man of the house for a bottle of wine, when he did not, on these occasions, get it to drink, though the man had a bottle of rum for him. In Templeboy parish, through vengeance and an old grudge, a certain priest, Mr B———, went to a poor widow's house to hear confessions. This poor widow had but a small cock of hay for the use of a little heifer. The hay she sold to be able to procure a dinner for the priest. Her means did not allow her to buy any whisky. The priest told her she owed him half-a-crown for confessions. This half-crown she retained off the price of the hay to pay the priest. Accordingly, when dinner was served up, she said to the priest, I have no spirits for you, nor any means to get it but this half-crown you say I owe you, and which I retained off the price of my little cock of hay; will you take it in lieu of the debt, or shall I send it for spirits? The priest took the half-crown, put it in his pocket, drank water at that dinner, and replied, he might soon have a call to some other place where he would get enough to drink.

"I could make up a volume, were I to recapitulate all the abuses of this nature I know; but, for brevity's sake, I omit them for the present. Every head of a family must pay an English shilling at Christmas and Easter, and every woman a hank of yarn: the unmarried sixpence halfpenny. No exceptions of widows, orphans, servants, male or female; and, if any remittance is made, it is to the rich. It is made to those who are not real objects of charity. Innumerable are the examples of extortions that I could detail."—P. 44, 45.

Mr Bourke proceeds to state some shameful abuses in the manner of hearing confession, which the priests, in that diocese, are in the habit of hearing in private rooms, instead of doing so in the church as the law requires. He says, indeed, in his preface, "that the lives of the Roman Catholic clergy, at this day, in Ireland, as well as on the Continent, are not much more correct than those of the clergy at the time of the Reformation, when Luther inveighed against them, is a melancholy truth, which cannot be denied." When the Editor of the Orthodox Journal spoke of the spotless purity of the character of the Irish priests, (See No. XV. page 90.) I suspected there was something wrong; but I did not know they were so bad as is here represented by one of themselves:—

"The mistresses and children of Rev. Gentlemen can be shown, whenever they may choose to put it to the trial. Many inducements occur to me to mention their names, but I restrain myself for a more seasonable opportunity. They themselves know that I can prove this assertion incontestibly."—P. 45. "They have the care of souls, and, like the blind leading the blind, they will both inevitably fall into the ditch. These are they of whom I can enumerate eleven (nearly one-half of the number in the diocese,) who, with uncontrollable dominion, tyrannize over the imbecility and weakness of their poor adherents; and whom the Bishop is said to hold in great esteem, and high honour for his own private views. Is not this the strongest reason, motive, and incentive, to make them, with so much obstinacy, resist the *veto*, for fear that, in any respect whatever, their clerical dominion should suffer the smallest diminution."—P. 46.

No. XXIV.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 26TH, 1818.

I RETURN now to the letter of AMICUS VERITATIS, who writes as follows: (Page 24.) "But, Sir, I will not content myself with barely stating the doctrine of the Catholic Church. I will go farther. I shall recall to your recollection, that Catholics abjure, as antichristian, those principles imputed to them by your correspondent, especially with regard to a liberty of committing sin, or that the Pope is infallible.

That I may be found correct, I shall refer to Act 33. Geo. III. cap. 44. This is a document which is approved by the Pope and all the Catholic bishops, in the three kingdoms; it is also received and accredited by the British government, as containing the principles of Catholics. Here, then, I take my stand; and now again boldly repeat, 'that it *never* was the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or a Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin.' With what a face of effrontery can your correspondent come forward and declare to the public, that such are the principles of a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue; and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths*, the abominable principles imputed to them."

One should imagine, from the above strong assertions, that the statute referred to contained a very ample exposition of the Romish faith, "especially with regard to the liberty of committing sin," and the infallibility of the Pope; that the principles of the Romish Church were fixed by an act of the British legislature; and that "*never*" any thing was a doctrine of the Church of Rome but what is contained in the Act 33. Geo. III. cap. 44. Now, it will perhaps surprise some of my readers, to be informed of the simple truth, with regard to this matter:—the Act does not contain a word about indulgence to commit sin, or the infallibility of the Pope; and as little does it declare, concerning any point whatever, that it *never* was a "doctrine of the Catholic Church." In short, as an answer to what I had written on the subject of indulgences, and the Pope's infallibility, AMICUS VERITATIS might as well have referred to the Alcoran of Mahomet.

If I had accused my Popish neighbours of disloyalty to king George III. or of maintaining that faith is not to be kept with heretics; or that they believed the Pope could release *them* from their oaths of allegiance; then, so far as an Act of Parliament, and their own solemn oaths, could refute such accusations, they should have been refuted. But these were not the subjects of which I had been treating, and which AMICUS VERITATIS was professing to answer. I did, indeed, say (Page 13.) "that the Pope claimed and exercised the power of dispensing with the law of God, and granting permission to commit sin." I say so still; and the Act of Parliament says nothing to the contrary. I said further, in the same sentence,—"he professed to relieve individuals and whole nations from the obligation of an oath," and I say so still; notwithstanding the Act of Parliament, which does not say a word about what the Pope professed to do, but merely ordains that Papists in this country, who wish the benefit of that Act, must swear that they do not allow the Pope to have such power over them. In short, the Act prescribes an oath of allegiance, expressed in very strong language; but, instead of defining the principles of the Romish Church, it expressly repeals an Act of king William, in which the leading principles of Popery were expressed, and Papists, under certain pains, were required upon oath to renounce them. With regard to the matter of not keeping faith with heretics, though Papists in this country choose to disavow it on their solemn oaths, there is perhaps no peculiar doctrine of the Romish Church which rests upon higher authority, as I hope to show in my next Number; and those who disavow this doctrine, and yet adhere to the Church of Rome, only contradict themselves.

I intend, in this Number, to give the form of the oath which Papists are now by law required to take; but, for the information of such of my readers as have not access to many books on the subject, I shall give the forms which were prescribed by law, in former times. The following is "The oath of allegiance appointed by king James I. of England." It is said to have been drawn up with great care by the king himself; and it seems to have furnished a model for all that have followed. "It was, (says the author of Free Thoughts, p. 234,) such a favourite measure of his, that he laboured mightily, with his royal pen, to promote its success; thinking the Gordian knot so fast tied, that no wit of man could loose it, and that if Roman Catholics could be once caught herein, they must be for ever tied firmly to his throne."

"I, A. B. do truly and sincerely acknowlege, profess, testify, and declare in my conscience, before God and the world, that our Sovereigne, Lord King James is lawful and rightful King in this realme, and of all others his Majesty's dominions, and countreyes, and that the Pope, neither of himself, or by any authority by the Church and See of Rome, or by any other meanes, with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the King, or to dispose of any of his Majesty's dominions or kingdoms, or to authorize any foreigne prince to invade or annoy him or his countreyes, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his Majesty, or to give license, or leave, to any of them to bear arms, raise tumults, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Majesty's royal person, state, or government, or to any of his Majesty's subjects within his Majesty's dominions.

"Also I do swear from my heart, that, notwithstanding any declaration or sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or granted, or to be made or granted, by the Pope or his successors, or by any authority derived, or pretended to be derived, from him or his See, against the said King, his aires or successors, or any absolution of the said subjects from their obedience; I will bear faith and true allegiance to his Majesty, his aires and successors, and him and them will defend to the uttermost of my power, against

all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his, or their persones, their crowne and dignity, be reason, or colour of any such sentence, and declaration, or otherwise; and will do my best endeavour to disclose and make known unto his Majesty, his aires and successors, all treasons, or traitours, or conspiracies, which I shall know or hear of, to be against him or any of them. And I do further swear, that I do from my heart abhore, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable position and doctrine, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsomever. And I do believe, and in conscience am resolved, that neither the Pope, nor any person whatsomever, hath power to absolve me of this oath, or any part thereof, which I acknowledge, by good and lawful authority, to be lawfully ministered to me; and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge, and swear according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And I do make this recognition and acknowledgement heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian. So help me God."

The latter part of this oath is founded upon the well known casuistry of Papists, countenanced by some of their high doctrinal authorities, that it was lawful to say one thing and think another, even when upon oath, if it was to serve any important purpose; * and the whole shows the great jealousy with which Papists were regarded. It did not, however, serve the purpose intended by it. "How egregiously was the king deceived, not considering the persons and the religion he had to do with? His boasted *Kingcraft* was overmatched and outwitted by Jesuitical priestcraft. If they had not art enough to untie the knot, they had a spiritual sword ready to cut it. Accordingly, they derided his folly (and not altogether unjustly) for imagining that the consciences of Catholics were to be bound with such ropes of straw, or caught and held by such cobwebs. Let us hear the words of Paschenius, who, as well as Bellarmine, wrote against the king, and in condemnation of the oath; and they are words which deserve the particular attention of our present legislators:—'*Sed vide in tanta astutia, quanta sit simplicitas!* &c. See, in so great craft, what great simplicity doth bewray itself. When he had placed all his security in that oath, he thought he had found such a manner of oath, knit with so many circumstances, that it could not, with safety of conscience, by any means, be dissolved by any man. But he could not see, that, if the Pope did dissolve that oath, all the tyings of it, whether of performing fidelity to the king, or of admitting no dispensation, would be dissolved together. Yea, I will say another thing which is more admirable. You know, I suppose, that an unjust oath, if it be evidently known, or openly declared to be such, bindeth no man, but is *ipso facto* null. That the king's oath is unjust, hath been sufficiently declared by the pastor of the Church himself (*i. e.* the Pope). You see, therefore, that the obligation of it is vanished into smoke: so that the bond, which by so many wise men, was thought to be of iron, is become less than straw." *Free Thoughts, p.* 234. The author refers to B. P. Epist. J. R. Bishop Usher's Sermon before the Commons, 1620.

So, it seems, if the Pope should declare an oath which has been taken by a Papist to a Protestant sovereign, to be unlawful, it is *ipso facto* null, and of no obligation. Such is the doctrine of a grave Popish writer; so far as appears it was the popular doctrine of the day; and the Pope acted upon it when he relieved subjects from their oaths of allegiance.

The following is the oath imposed by the Act of king William, which is more severe than that of king James, as it implies an express renunciation of many of the doctrinal tenets of the Church of Rome.

"The formula, or oath of purgation, appointed by the Act of king William to be taken by Papists in Scotland.

"I, A. B. do sincerely from my heart profess, and declare before God, who searcheth the heart, That I do deny, disown, and abhore these tenets and doctrines of the Papal Romish Church, *viz.* the supremacy of the Pope and Bishop of Rome over all Pastors of the Catholic Church; His power and authority over Kings, Princes, and States; The infallibility that he pretends to, either without, or with a general council; His power of dispensing and pardoning; The doctrine of transubstantiation, and the corporeal presence, with the communion without the cup in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; The adoration and sacrifice professed and practised by the Popish Church in the mass; The invocation of angels and saints; The worshipping of images, crosses, and relicks; The doctrine of supererogation, indulgences, and purgatory; and the service and worship in an unknown tongue: All which tenets and doctrines of the said Church, I believe to be contrary to, and inconsistent with the written word of God. And I do from my heart deny, disown, and disclaim the said doctrines and

* "One may swear that he has not done a thing, although in fact he may have done it, by understanding, in his own mind, that he did not do it *on a certain day*, or *before he was born*, or any similar circumstance, without the words which he uses having any sense that would let it be known. And this is very convenient in many situations, and is always *very just*, when it is necessary, or useful for health, honour, or property." *Sanchez*, Op. Mor. as quoted from Pascal's Provincial Letters by Mr. Carlisle of Dublin.

tenets of the Church of Rome, as in the presence of God, without any equivocation, or mental reservation, but according to the plain meaning of the words as to me offered and proposed. So help me God." *Free Thoughts, p.* 388.

The above was required under an Act intituled, An Act to prevent the growth of Popery, which imposed certain penalties and disabilities on those who should refuse to make a solemn renunciation of Popery in the above terms. This Act is repealed by "An Act for requiring a certain form of oath or abjuration, from his majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, in that part of Great Britain called Scotland, 3d June, 1793."

In the preamble of this Act, it is declared that, "the foresaid formula, (that of king William,) contains only a renunciation of speculative and dogmatical opinions, but imports no positive assurance of the submission and attachment of persons making the same to the laws and constitution of the realm, or to the person of his most sacred majesty." It is then enacted, "that from henceforth, all persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, within that part of Great Britain called Scotland, who shall take and subscribe the oath, abjuration, and declaration hereinafter expressed, and in the manner hereby directed and required, shall be exempted and relieved from all the pains, penalties, and disabilities imposed, enacted, revived, ratified, and confirmed by the before mentioned Act of the eighth and ninth session of the first parliament of king William III. as fully and effectually, to all intents and purposes whatsoever, as if such persons had actually made the renunciation of Popery thereby ordained, according to the formula thereunto subjoined.

"II. And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the Oath, Abjuration, and Declaration to be so taken and subscribed, shall be in the words following, (that is to say)

"I, A. B. do hereby declare, That I do profess the Roman Catholic Religion: I, A. B. do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to his Majesty, King George III., and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose, and make known to his Majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons, and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them: And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown, which succession, by an Act, (intituled, An Act for the further limitation of the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subjects) is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person, claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms: And I do swear, that I do reject and detest, as an unchristian and impious position, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for, or under pretence of their being heretics or infidels; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics or infidels: And I further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or any authority of the See of Rome, or by any other authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any person whatsoever: And I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain, or abet any such opinion, or any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this Declaration: And I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, or any person whatever, and without thinking that I am, or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this Declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with, or annul the same, and declare that it was null or void. So help me God."

"This document," according to Amicus Veritatis, "is approved by the Pope, and all the Catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms; it is also received, and accredited by the British Government, as containing the principles of Catholics." It is certainly very natural that the British Government should receive and accredit one of its own statutes for all the purposes expressed by it; but the statute referred to, does not declare the principles of Catholics, as any one may see that reads it. It calls these principles "speculative and dogmatical opinions," with which it professes to have nothing to do, farther than to repeal an act, which made it a crime to hold such opinions. That it is approved by "the Pope, and all the Catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms," is a matter of very little importance,—it is the manner of such dignitaries, to approve of any thing that serves their present purpose. We know that the Pope approved of the usurpation of Bonaparte, so far as to crown him, and bless

him as his dear son in the faith, because he could not help it. Neither can he help his adherents in Britain, or procure for them the privileges which they desire, without their taking the oath of allegiance, which the law requires; he therefore approves of their taking it. But as he has never by any public act that I know of, renounced his right to dispense with the oaths of his adherents, we have no security that he will not do what was often done by his predecessors, whenever he shall think proper; especially when he finds that it will promote the interest of the holy see.

On this Act, AMICUS VERITATIS takes his stand; and he may stand there long enough before he will get the act to speak what he ascribes to it,—that it *never* was a doctrine of the Catholic Church, that a Pope or a Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin.

In addition to several documents which I have produced on this subject in former Numbers, I shall subjoin one which speaks plainly to the point. It is "AN INDULGENCE, granted by Pope Clement VI. to John and Joan, King and Queen of France, and to their successors for ever.

"Clement, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear son and daughter in Christ, the illustrious John and Joan, King and Queen of France, greeting, and our apostolic benediction. Your desires we willingly approve of, and especially those, wherein may God graciously give you that peace and repose of soul you piously seek after; hence it is, that we, ready to answer your humble request, do, by our apostolic authority, grant by these presents, an indulgence for ever hereafter, to you and your successors, that for the time being, shall be Kings and Queens of France; and to every of you and them: That such confessor, regular or secular, you and they shall choose, may *commute,* for such vows as you may have already made; or which by you or your successors may be hereafter made; (vows touching the holy land, the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of chastity and continence only excepted) and also such oaths by you taken, and by you and them to be taken, in all times coming, that you and they cannot *profitably keep:* By other works of piety, as to him shall seem expedient towards God, and for the peace of your and their souls. Be it, therefore, utterly unlawful to any upon earth, to annul this our grant, or by any act of temerity to controvert the same. And be it known to any one, that presumptuously attempts so to do, that he forthwith incurs the wrath of Almighty God, and of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul. Given at Avignon, 12 Calend. Maii, ann. 1347." See Dacherius, Spicileg. miscell. Epistolar, Tom. 4. p. 275, quoted in Protestant Catechism, Glasgow, 1779.

No. XXV.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 2D, 1819.

"WITH what a face of effrontery," says AMICUS VERITATIS, "can your correspondent come forward and declare to the public, that such are the principles of a body of men, who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue, and who publicly abjure, upon their most *solemn oaths,* the abominable principles imputed to them!" In my last Number, I gave the words of the solemn oath, or abjuration, which Papists in this country are required by law to make, from which my readers will see that they abjure none of the principles which I had imputed to them; that it is merely an oath of civil allegiance, an abjuration of any *claim of civil* authority which the Pope, or any foreign prince, may claim in this country, and a disavowal of one speculative, or rather practical principle of their church,—that faith is not to be kept with heretics. I had not, in any of the letters which my opponent was answering, brought this charge against his church; but I bring it now.

I am aware that I am entering upon an odious part of my subject, the very mention of which will excite displeasure in the minds of my Popish readers. It is, however, by no means my intention to displease them; and if they should feel themselves hurt by what follows, they ought to ascribe it to the subject, and not to the author, whose duty it is to expose all that he knows to be antichristian, and inimical to the happiness of society, in that church which ruled long over the kings of the earth; which is again assuming an imposing attitude in our own country; and which can gain the ascendency only upon the ruins of civil and religious liberty.

In argument, Papists sustain many disadvantages; but they are disadvantages of their own choosing, and from which they might free themselves, if they would occupy the independent ground which belongs to them as rational and accountable creatures,—that of forming their own judgment on all matters of faith and religious practice, without respect to the opinions of any man, or class of men, of ancient or modern times. I should find it impossible to defend the Protestant religion, if I were not at full liberty to form and express my own opinion of whatever was done by individuals or councils in the reformed churches. I do not know of one individual since the apostles' days, or of one ecclesiastical council, to whose acts and canons I would implicitly subscribe. I am as free to form an opinion, and have as good a right to publish it, as Luther or Calvin, or as the synods of Dort or Westminster. If I have the happiness to agree with these in matters of Christian doctrine, it is not from any authority which I acknowledge in

them, but because I see such doctrine taught in the word of God.

I am, therefore, not under the necessity of concealing or denying any thing which I believe to have been wrong in the doctrine or discipline of any reformed church. If, for instance, a Papist should tell me, that Protestant churches maintained intolerant principles, I am not obliged, for the sake of consistency, to tell a falsehood, and say, it *never* was so. I can readily acknowledge that the subject of religious liberty was ill understood by most of the reformed churches for more than a century after the Reformation; I can join in condemning persecution, for conscience sake, by whomsoever practised, and rejoice that it is now disapproved of by Protestants in general.

But when I say to a Papist, Your church maintains the principle that faith is not to be kept with heretics, he is not at liberty to admit the truth of this, or of any thing that is dishonourable to his church at any period of her existence. He dares not say, I am sorry to acknowledge that it was so at one period, but such a doctrine is now disavowed; because this would be to admit that his church had been wrong, which he considers impossible. He is driven, therefore, to the miserable expedient of denying the fact, however well attested, and of boldly asserting that it *never* was so; and the only argument which he has to oppose to the evidence of history is, that he and his brethren abjure upon their most solemn oaths the abominable principle imputed to them.

It is true that Papists in Britain declare upon their solemn oaths, that they do not hold the doctrine that faith is not to be kept with heretics. This is well so far as regards them; and it would be utterly unwarrantable to accuse them of believing what they swear they do not believe; but then they ought to be candid, and confess that in so far they are dissenters from the faith of their church; or that the church herself has departed from the faith explicitly avowed by many of her divines, and confirmed by the highest ecclesiastical authority. This they will not do, for the church was never wrong, and can never change. They are placed in the most pitiable condition imaginable,—between the well known fact that such a doctrine was held by their church, their own abjuration of it, and the principle that the church is infallible and unchangeable.

I believe the doctrine in question is generally disavowed by the Church of Rome, in the present day; because it is one that cannot bear the light of the age.

The late Mr Pitt, while directing his mind to the subject of what is called Catholic emancipation, addressed certain queries to six of the principal universities belonging to the Church of Rome, viz., Louvain, Doway, Alcala, Valladolid, Salamanca, and Paris. His object was to obtain accurate knowledge of the principles professed by these bodies, with regard to the power which the Pope is understood to have over civil governors, and the subjects of states; and how far he has a right to influence the conduct of subjects towards their governors. All these bodies, of course, reply in a conciliating style. Their religion was always a very harmless thing, and it never interfered with the civil government of any country; in proof of which, one quotes the authority of Christ, to give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and the doctrine of Paul, Romans xiiith chapter, on submission to the powers that be.

One of the questions addressed to them all, is as follows:—"Is there any principle in the articles of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in breaking faith with heretics, or others, who differ from them in religious opinions?" The universities, with one voice, answer in the negative. Some content themselves by declaring there *is* no such principle maintained by the church; others declare that it *never* was a doctrine of the Catholic church; and one of the universities, (Louvain) is struck with astonishment that such a question should, at the end of the 18th century, be proposed to any learned body by the inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives. Proceeding to a more direct answer to the above question, they say, "The said faculty of divinity (in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to her) most positively and unequivocally answers, that there is not, and that there never has been, among Catholics, or in the doctrines of the Church of Rome, any law, or principle, which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion from themselves, in matters of religion, either in public or private concerns."

Perhaps some of my readers will be "struck with astonishment," and "perfect wonder," at the effrontery of this learned body of divines. I cannot suppose them ignorant of the fact, that the principle which they disavow was publicly maintained and acted upon in numerous instances, by those who directed the affairs of their church; and therefore their affected astonishment at the proposal of the question, is only a piece of artifice to give the more effect to their declaration, and for commending their religion, and those who profess it, to the good opinion of the British government.

In my last Number, I gave the bull, or indulgence, granted by Pope Clement VI. to the king and queen of France, by which he gave them liberty to break any vow, with certain exceptions, which they might have made, and which they did not find it profitable to keep, provided their confessor was willing to commute it for something else. This privilege was granted not to the king and queen only, but to all their successors, and is in full force at the present day; and as none of the excep-

tions regard vows or oaths to heretics, the sovereigns of France have full liberty to break faith with heretics, though bound by oath, whenever they shall find it not profitable to keep such oaths. I do not say that his Most Christian Majesty will ever do any such thing; but I do say he has the leave of the head of the church to do so whenever he pleases. In short, it is declared to be lawful for him to break faith with heretics, or any body else, provided he has the consent of his confessor, who is authorised to prescribe some good work as a compensation for the violation of his vow.

Gregory VII. made a decree prohibiting all to keep faith with excommunicated persons, until they made satisfaction. Martin V. in an epistle to Alexander, Duke of Lithuania, says, "Be assured thou sinnest mortally if thou keep thy faith with heretics." This is more than making it lawful to break faith with heretics, —it is making it sinful to keep faith with them. Gregory IX. makes the following law: "Be it known to all who are under the jurisdiction of those who have openly fallen into heresy, that they are free from the obligation of fidelity, dominion, and every kind of obedience to them, by whatever means or bond they are tied to them, and how securely soever they may be bound." On which, bishop Simanca gives this comment: "Governors of forts, and all kinds of vassals, are, by this constitution, freed from the bond of the oath whereby they had promised fidelity to their lords and masters. Moreover, a Catholic wife is not obliged to perform the marriage contract with a heretical husband. If faith is not to be kept with tyrants, pirates, and other public robbers who kill the body, much less with obstinate heretics who kill the soul. Aye, but it is a sad thing to break faith. But, as saith Merius Salomonius, faith promised against Christ, if kept, is verily perfidy. Justly, therefore, were some heretics burnt by the most solemn judgment of the council of Constance, although they had been promised security. And St Thomas also is of opinion, that a Catholic might deliver over an intractable heretic to the judges, notwithstanding he had pledged his faith to him, and even confirmed it by the solemnity of an oath." —*Free Thoughts*, p. 119, with the authorities.

"Contracts," saith Bonacina, "made against the canon law are invalid, though confirmed by oath: and a man is not bound to stand to his promise, though he had sworn to it." Pope Innocent, in his bull against the Waldenses in 1487, by his apostolical authority declares, that "all those who had been bound and obliged by contract, or any way whatever, to grant or pay any thing to them, should not be under any manner of obligation to do so, for the time to come." Pope Pius V. by his legate, Commendone, endeavoured to persuade the Emperor, *nec fidem aut sacramentum infideli esse servandum;* that "no faith nor oaths were to be kept with an infidel." And through his persuasion, Maximilian was induced to revoke the permission he had granted for the Lutherans to preach in Austria. Charles V. having given his promise and safe conduct to Luther to prevail on him to come to Worms, was afterwards urged to violate it, by arresting Luther, on this ground, that "he was a man of that character to whom he was not obliged to keep his word:" to which he replied, "When good faith may be banished from all the earth, it ought to be found with an emperor." *Ibid.*

But that I may not rest on the authority of individual divines, however high in estimation, or the decrees of mere Popes, though generally considered infallible by their adherents; I shall go to the highest possible authority in the Church of Rome, that of a general council, and one of the very greatest general councils,—that of Constance; at which were assembled from all quarters, 346 archbishops and bishops, 564 abbots and doctors, and 450 prostitutes, with a sufficient number of barbers, musicians, cooks, jesters, &c. &c. of which a very particular account is given by Fox, the Martyrologist. The council has at least as good a title to infallibility as any general council that ever assembled. It met to judge, and did judge and depose a Pope, and appoint another. It established, as an unalterable law of the church, that the laity should not partake of the cup of the Lord's supper; and this law has been universally obeyed in the Church of Rome to the present day. The same council established and exemplified this other tenet, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, which never having been repealed, remains to this day as much a law of the church, as communion without the cup; though it is too odious to be openly avowed in the present state of society. The following is the council's doctrine on this subject:—

"The holy synod of Constance declares concerning every safe conduct granted by the emperor, kings and other temporal princes, to heretics, or persons accused of heresy, in hopes of reclaiming them, that it ought not to be of any prejudice to the Catholic faith, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor to hinder but that such persons may and ought to be examined, judged, and punished, according as justice shall require, if those heretics shall refuse to revoke their errors, although they shall have come to the place of judgment relying on their safe conduct, and without which they would not have come thither: and the person who shall have promised them security, *shall not, in this case, be obliged to keep his promise, by whatever tie he may have been engaged*, when he has done all that is in his power to do." *Ibid.* p. 120.

The council having established this as a doctrine of the church, proceeded to practise it with savage and ostentatious triumph in the face of all Europe. The case is well known. John Huss, of Bohemia, was summoned to the

council to answer a charge of heresy. His friends, fearing something like what actually took place, procured for him, from the highest secular authority, the emperor Sigismund, letters of *safe conduct* to the seat of the council, and back to the place of his residence. These letters were given with due solemnity; and the emperor, in effect, pledged his honour for the safety of the Bohemian. He came to the council,—was soon led to speak on matters of faith; and being found a heretic, was, as a thing of course, condemned to the stake. The emperor (at whose request the council had been called) interposed, pleaded his safe conduct to Huss, and plighted faith to transmit him home in safety: but the ghostly fathers taught him that faith plighted to heretics was not binding to the detriment of ecclesiastical discipline. Sigismund yielded; and Huss was committed to the flames.

Now, I challenge all the universities in Europe to produce higher authority for any doctrine or principle of the Church of Rome; and this must be the doctrine of the church still, notwithstanding the solemn abjuration of British Papists, unless she has undergone a change, which, in their opinion, is impossible.

The last general council was that of Trent. This body distinctly recognised the canon of Constance with regard to not keeping faith with heretics; and as there has been no general council since, it is impossible that such a doctrine can have been struck out of the Popish creed by any competent authority. The universities may declare what they please; and they may deceive the British ministry by a false representation of their principles; but the universities are not the church. Papists will not be bound by their canons or declarations, while every Popish priest is bound by a solemn oath to adhere to all the canons of a general council, particularly that of Trent.*

This council was held subsequent to the Reformation, and partly with the design of discussing certain points at issue between the Church of Rome and the Reformers, and for healing the great schism. Protestants were invited to come to the council to answer for themselves, and give their reasons for leaving the church; but they, knowing what had taken place at Constance more than a hundred years before, and that it had been declared by that council that faith was not to be kept with heretics, did not choose to venture their lives in the hands of the ghostly fathers at Trent. This was the time to have disavowed the obnoxious doctrine, if it had not really been a doctrine of the church; and if it had not been a doctrine which the holy fathers of Trent approved, they might, by the high authority with which they were invested, have expunged it from their creed. But they did no such thing; and since that time there has been no authority in the church that could do it. So far from declaring that the Protestants were mistaken, and that there was no such principle of their church, as that faith plighted to heretics might lawfully be violated, they virtually admitted the principle; and by a solemn act, after long discussion, they agreed to exempt the Protestants *on that occasion* from the application of it; which they did in the following terms. "Moreover, all fraud and guile apart, the synod faithfully and truly promises, that she will neither openly nor secretly search for any pretence, nor use, nor suffer any person to make use of any authority, power, law, statute, privilege of laws, or canons, or of councils, particularly that of *Constance* or *Siena*, in whatever form of words expressed, to the prejudice of *this public faith*, full security, public and free audience, which is granted by the synod, from all which it derogates in *this instance*." (*Free Thoughts*, p. 120, with the authorities.) The reader will observe, that the council passed from the law or canon (call it what you will) of Constance in *this instance;* but of course reserved the power of applying it in every other instance as it might be agreeable to themselves, or those who should execute the laws of the church in all time coming.

I shall probably pursue this subject farther in my next Number. In the mean time I shall give an example of the practical influence of the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, in our own city, in humble life, in the present day. A Papist who lived in one of the wynds, had a wife who is a Protestant. He used every effort to persuade her to change her religion; but she remaining inflexible in her heresy, he did not think it necessary to keep faith with her; and for the violation of the marriage contract, he had no less an authority than that of Pope Gregory IX., which is given in a preceding page of this Number. He left her with a view to go to Ireland, for no other reason, as he himself declared, than because she refused to renounce her heresy. He was immediately taken ill, and died in a few days. His wife, notwithstanding his cruel and unjust behaviour, brought his body home, and had it decently interred. On his person was found the following letter, the original of which is before me. "Glasgow, December 5th, 1818. Dear Margaret, this comes to let you know

* The following is the form of the Declaration, which every Popish priest is required to make upon oath.—"I do acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, the successor of St Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the vicar of Jesus Christ. I do undoubtedly receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons, and œcumenical councils, and especially by the holy synod of Trent; and all things contrary thereunto, and all heresies condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church; I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize." *Free Thoughts*, p. 220.

that I am left this place, and gone to Ireland. You have yourself to blame in this, for if ever I was determined to go to the devil for any woman living, I would do it for your sake. Dear Margaret, I am very sorry you stand so much in your own light, as not till agree to my principles, for you said you would not never turn from your ways of thinking, so by that means you and I shall never agree. So therefore I bid you adieu, dear Margaret, for evermore across the main you need never look for me in Scotland again. As I said before, I will never send my soul to the devil for you or any other woman. I sincerely give my blessing to your son James. No more at present, but farewell for ever." The letter appears to have been unfinished. Perhaps he intended to add something to it, and send it from Ireland; but he was arrested by death while following out his wicked design of abandoning his wife and child. I hope this will be a warning to Protestant women to beware how they connect themselves with Papists.

No. XXVI.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 9TH, 1819.

I AM about to discuss a little farther that doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. This seems to have been for ages undisputed by the doctors of the church. Heretics were considered such a race of beings, as to have no title to be dealt with as fellow-creatures; and all the laws of a state were understood to be lawfully dispensed with, so far as regarded those who were convicted, or even suspected, of heretical pravity. We have many high authorities for this, in Limborch's History of the Inquisition; and these authorities are chiefly or entirely Romish, as the author did not choose to rest upon the testimony of Protestant writers, but rather to convict and condemn Papists out of their own mouths.

Thus it is laid down as a rule which was universally understood, that "Subjects, when a prince or magistrate is a heretic, are freed from their obedience." This is proved by a reference to history; and no one acquainted with history will deny that the fact is established. "Thus," says the author, "it has often happened, that kings pronounced heretics by the Pope, have with all their posterity, been deprived of all their dignities, jurisdictions, and rights, their subjects absolved from their oaths of allegiance and fidelity, and their dominions given as a prey to others.

"And, finally, they are deprived of that power, which is introduced by the law of nations, whereby they lose all property in every thing they have. *Cap. cum secundum leges de Hæret. l.* 6. insomuch, that every one is at once wholly freed from every obligation he can be under, to persons fallen into manifest heresy. *Cap. absolutos de Hæret. Let all know that they are freed from the debt of fidelity, dominion, and all service, to manifest heretics, how strong soever the obligations may be which they are under.* These things are thus inferred: First, if a heretic deposits any of his effects with any person, such person is not obliged to restore them to the heretic, after his heresy is manifest, but to the treasury. Farther, a Catholic wife is not obliged to any duty to her heretical husband, because by the husband's heresy she is freed from her duty. In like manner, a catholic husband is freed from all duty to his wife, if she be a heretic. Nevertheless, they cannot marry with others, because the bond of matrimony is not dissolved. A husband cannot be forced to cohabit with his wife, if she is fallen into heresy, even though she is reconciled; nor is he bound to maintain her, because her dowry is confiscated by heresy; and as she is stripped of her dowry by her own fault, the husband is not obliged to maintain an unendowed wife. Zanchinus Ugolinus explains this matter more largely. The very children, brothers, and sisters, ought to forsake them. Yea the very bond of matrimony with such, is dissolved. For, if one departs from the orthodox faith, and falls into heresy, his wife is not obliged to cohabit with him, but may seek to be separated from him by the judgment of the church; such separation from the bed being as reasonable on account of spiritual fornication, as for carnal."—"Finally, all vassals whatsoever are, *ipso jure*, freed from every obligation to their lords, though such obligation shall have been confirmed by an oath."—These are maxims taught by several high authorities in the Church of Rome, whose names are given by Limborch on the margin of his work, vol. II. pp. 21, 22; and they point out what was understood to be the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as plainly as any divine of the present day, in this country, can point out any doctrine of the Church of Scotland.

"Hence," continues the author, "proceeds the maxim, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, which some are not afraid openly to teach, (that is, as lately as 1692, when the work was published;) although those who are more wise, in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, endeavour to wipe off this spot from their church. But the Spaniards, though they cannot be duly charged with this perfidiousness, because they have none whom they call heretics living amongst them, yet assert it in plain and open words, without dissembling, and are not ashamed to defend and confirm it, by the practice of the Council of Constance. See amongst others, *Simanca's Cathol. Instit. Tit.* 46. § 52, 53, 54." *

* This work was printed in folio, Vallisoleti, 1552: complete, 1569; and in 4to, Roma, 1575. See Antonio's Biblioth. Hispana nova, vol. I. p. 316, edit. 1785.

Thus it appears, that little more than a hundred years ago, the doctrine—that faith is not to be kept with heretics,—was taught openly, and in plain words, without dissembling, by reverend doctors in Spain, who had none whom they called heretics living amongst them; and they maintained the doctrine upon the authority of the Council of Constance; though in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, in which there were many heretics, the Papists began to wipe off this spot from their church, merely, I suppose, because they were ashamed of it, and could not decently maintain it, in the presence of those heretics, who had, by this time, made it manifest that they were of some use in the world, and not unworthy of having faith kept with them.

It is a curious fact, that though the doctrine in question was publicly maintained in Spain, in plain words, after other Popish nations began to be ashamed of it, it is now more indignantly disavowed by one of the Spanish Universities, than by most of the others; and this University (that of Alcala) condescends to enter into a long discussion of the subject, in which they attempt to vindicate the Council of Constance, with regard to their treatment of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. For the amusement of my readers, I shall give the whole passage, which affords as fine a specimen of Jesuitical reasoning as is any where to be found:—

"Answers to the third Question; (Among the articles of the Catholic faith, is there any which teaches, that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics, or with persons of any other description, who dissent from them in matters of religion?) So persuaded is the university, that a doctrine which would exempt Catholics from the obligation of keeping faith with heretics, or any other persons who may dissent from them in matters of religion, instead of being an article of the Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets; that she could not have believed it possible there should exist any person who should dare to impute to Catholics any thing so iniquitous, had she not learnt, from the things which are written in the sacred Scriptures for our instruction, that the same pharisees who had openly heard our Lord deliver this injunction, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," —afterwards laid this crime to his charge,— "We have found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Cæsar." But the devil who had put this into their hearts, and moved their tongues to the uttering of such falsehoods, as could induce the Jewish multitude, who considered Christ a prophet, to cry out with a loud voice, "Crucify him, crucify him," has never since desisted from perverting others, in like manner.

"It was alleged every where against the apostles, that they were seditious men, introducers of innovations, and both by their doctrine and conduct, aiming at the subversion of all legal authority. On this account, as St John Chrysostom observes, the apostle of the Gentiles treats so often of keeping faith with princes, masters, friends, enemies, just and unjust; and frequently inculcates, that we must give them no cause of offence, but must do them every friendly office; and the same has been perpetually taught by the Catholic Church, in her writings, by her words, and her actions.

"Still the father of lies has persisted in the same attempt. England is not ignorant of the calumnies vented against Catholics by the apostate Oats. The assertions likewise are well known, which maintained, with so much industry and art, the art of deceiving and lying, in which he so much excels. He was crafty enough to persuade some persons, that a canon was framed, in the sixth general council, by which Catholics are freed from any obligation to keep faith with heretics, or any other persons who may dissent from their religious tenets; and that a similar canon was published by the Council of Constance, by virtue of which, he affirmed, that faith was not kept with John Huss and Jerome of Prague.

"But the first of these canons is not of the sixth general council, nor is it of any authority; on the contrary, it has been condemned by the church. As to the Council of Constance, nothing was there defined concerning breach of faith. If we were to determine the question from the acts of that synod, we should be forced to draw a contrary conclusion. For the fathers of the council declared, that therefore they were at liberty to examine the doctrines of Huss, because *they* had not granted him a safe conduct.

"A safe conduct had, indeed, been granted him, by the Emperor Sigismund, who nevertheless, afterwards, ordered him to be burnt, but still without any breach of faith. For he had given him safe conduct only in the ordinary form, *viz.* against lawless violence, and with the condition annexed to it, that if he fled he should forfeit his life. Huss fled, in violation of his engagement.

"To Jerome of Prague, a safe conduct was granted by the council itself, not including any special immunities, not authorizing any daring attempts which he should afterwards make, but upon this condition, that the course of justice should not be impeded. He was present in the council, abjured his heresies, and was exposed to no molestation. But when afterwards, contrary to his promises, he had taken himself to flight, and began to spread abroad among the vulgar, that he had consented to falsehood, in agreeing to the condemnation of Wickliff and John Huss; that he could find no errors in their doctrine; that Wickliff was an evangelical preacher; and when at length

he obstinately maintained these assertions before the fathers of the council, Sigismund judged that such behaviour was not to be tolerated in one who had broken his faith; and surely, what man in his senses would assert, that any one ought to be suffered, with impunity, to utter against God and man absurdities and blasphemies like the following: 1st. God ought to obey the devil. 2nd. No man is a civil ruler, no man is a prelate, no man is a bishop, while he is in a state of mortal sin. 3d. That the multitude have a right to punish, at their pleasure, the crimes of the rulers. 4th. Oaths which are taken to confirm contracts, or civil negociations, are unlawful. So much for those canons by which they have endeavoured to spirit up envy and odium against Catholics.

"Catholics have been taught by St James, the apostle, that their speech must be Yea, yea; No, no: Guided by this wisdom, the Catholic church has ever reprobated falsehood. But to swear or promise any thing, without performing it, is falsehood. The Catholic church is not so devoid of judgment as to have enacted a law, or promulgated a decree, which would banish from the Catholic world excellent virtues, truth, fidelity, and justice, without which, there could be no happiness for individuals, no civil societies, nor intercourse among men. What Catholic ever taught that it was lawful to lie, to deceive, or to violate any natural right? Our religion, on the contrary, teaches that faith must be kept with all men, whatever be their religion, or though they be of no religion, without a single exception, in every promise, which of its own nature is lawful and valid, whether in peace or in war, in the concerns of religion, in matrimony, in safe conducts, in civil commerce with friends, with enemies.

"These being our sentiments, as may be evinced likewise by what has been said relative to the first and second questions, that the doctrine of the Catholic church may be clearly and distinctly understood by all the world; we shall only add, that no obligation arising from the laws of nature, or of nations, or of men, which is founded in natural reason, has been altered or weakened by our Redeemer; but that every such obligation has been rather heightened and exalted to greater perfection; has been strengthened by his doctrine and example; and by the addition of other moral precepts and councils; that the order of nature might be preserved in all human things, and that his grace might assist men to discharge their natural duties. This is the excellent philosophy which he brought from heaven, and introduced into the world, that he might form men to be useful and beneficial one to another, and obedient to the commands of the Divine Being.

"These are the unanimous decisions of this University, after a mature deliberation, in a full assembly of the doctors, the 17th day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1789."—*Parliamentary Reports*, vol. II. p. 529—531.

I have thus given the answer of the University of Alcala at full length, because it enters more into the merits of the question than any of the others; and because, I suppose, their answer embraces the substance of all that Papists have to say for their church, on the subject of not keeping faith with heretics.

It is not doubted that the apostle of the Gentiles taught that Christians ought to maintain good faith with all men. It is not denied that the apostle James taught, "Let your conversation be Yea, yea, and Nay, nay;" and nobody teaches, so far as I know, that any law of nature, for the good of civil society, has been weakened by our Redeemer. All these things are irrelevant. The question proposed by Mr Pitt was not, what Christ and his apostles taught. He had no occasion to send to Spain for information on that subject. It was, what has the Church of Rome taught or practised? Is there among the articles of the Romish faith, any which teaches that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics? This was the point; and the grave doctors should have kept by it. In dealing with a Protestant government, they had no right to assume, or take for granted, that their principles were the very same that the apostles taught; yet this is what is done by them, and some of the other universities, who seem to think they have given a sufficient answer to the questions, when they cite passages from Scripture, which require the maintaining of good faith, and obedience to rulers and magistrates. If their principles and practices were founded upon the word of God, and regulated by it, we should have no dispute with them. It is because the Church of Rome was known to have professed and acted upon very different principles that the universities were called upon to give an account of what they really held. These bodies were, doubtless, competent to declare what was their own faith and practice; but when they take upon them to declare for the whole church, what *never has been*, we do them no injustice when we bring them to the test of history, to the writings of doctors, and the canons of councils, which are as accessible to us as to them; and had Mr Pitt gone to these sources of information, instead of trusting to the representations of men, who were interested in making their religion appear to advantage in the eyes of the British government, he should not have been so liable to be deceived.

But to return to the Alcalian doctors,—they do not content themselves with giving a simple answer in the negative, like some of their brethren, but condescend to argue the point; and they endeavour to make it appear, that

the people of England are under the influence of the devil, and the father of lies, as the Pharisees were of old, because they believe that Papists hold the doctrine that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. They do not, however, condescend to prove any thing that they assert, with regard to historical facts. They refer to no authority either Popish or Protestant. All must be taken on the credit of their own bare assertion; and I have learned enough of Papists, to credit not what they assert, but what they prove.

Oats, it seems, had said, that "a canon was framed in the sixth general council, by which Catholics are freed from any obligation to keep faith with heretics." The doctors reply, that this canon is not of the *sixth* general council, —that it is of no authority, and that it has been condemned by the church. This is pretty plainly admitting that something of the kind had been publicly taught, if not decreed, by *some* council, though not the sixth; and to say merely, it has been condemned by the church, is extremely vague. It is certain, the principle was maintained and practised by the Council of Constance. Let the doctors of Alcala, or somebody for them in Britain, say when, and by what competent authority, it was condemned. Though an infallible and unchangeable church has no right to such a concession, let it be proved, that the doctrine maintained at Constance has since been condemned by equal authority, and I shall give up the point. I shall then do the Church of Rome more honour than any Papist will do. I will say she is better than she was.

The assertions of these grave doctors, with regard to the council of Constance and John Huss, are so clumsily put together, and so easily seen through, that I have the charity to think the authors had not been accustomed to deal in falsehood. It is said to be an honourable thing to be awkward at making a lie; and this honour I cheerfully yield to the Faculty of Alcala. At Constance, they say, nothing was defined concerning breach of faith; and "if we were to determine the question from the Acts of that Synod, we should be forced to draw a contrary conclusion." The Acts of that Synod were to condemn Huss as a heretic,—to move the emperor to break faith with him, and to burn him to death, notwithstanding they knew that he had promised him protection. The fathers declared that they were at liberty to examine the doctrines of Huss, because *they* had not given him a safe conduct, though the emperor had. Most certainly they had a right to examine his doctrines; but what right had they to burn his person, when he came before them, trusting in a solemn promise that no ill should befall him? The doctors admit that the emperor had granted him a safe conduct; that is, had *promised him protection;* and yet he ordered him to be burnt to death *without any breach of faith!* Surely this is the language of the beast that *is not,* and yet *is.*

It is pretended that the emperor's safe conduct was only against "lawless violence." But from whom was this dreaded? Not surely from the grave fathers of the council. If it was from robbers by the way, a guard of soldiers would have been more likely to serve the purpose, than a slip of paper, or even parchment. It is absurd to speak of protection against lawless violence, in any other way than by force; for men in a lawless state would pay no regard to the signature of the emperor, or any body else in lawful authority.

In short, it was not danger from banditti that Huss and his friends were thinking of; it was danger from the council, not lawless, but under form of law; and it was for security against this that they got the solemn promise of the emperor, who pledged himself for the safety of Huss to Constance, *while there,* and and back to his home. "*Aller s'arreter, demeurer, et retourner,*" says L'Enfant. And Dupin, a Popish historian, asserts, that Huss had liberty promised, not only in going to the council, but also in returning from it, which must imply safety while there.—"*Venir librement, et d'en revenir,*" are his words.

It is added, by the doctors of Alcala, that there was a condition annexed, that if he fled, he should forfeit his life; and that he fled, in violation of his engagement. There is, however, no such condition in the document itself; and I take the whole allegation to be a fabrication of the learned fathers, or of their fathers before them.

With regard to Jerome of Prague, it is admitted that he had a safe conduct from the council itself; and he also was burnt to death.

He did not, at first, possess the firmness of Huss. He was induced to make a recantation; but he did not long continue in this state of defection. Confessing his sin in denying the truth, and making an open profession of those doctrines which were afterwards the basis of the Reformation, he was, as a thing of course, ordered to the flames, which he endured with great fortitude. The doctors accuse him of holding some monstrous opinions, and they seem to think this was a sufficient reason why he should not be suffered to live; but if he did hold all the opinions which they ascribe to him, he was more fit for bedlam than the stake. Here, however, we have the authority of the renowned university of Alcala for burning persons to death for mere opinions; and while they hold this doctrine, it is not worth their while to disavow the kindred one, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics.

More of this subject in my next.

No. XXVII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 16TH, 1819.

I KNOW that my two last Numbers have given great offence to my Popish neighbours; and I must again declare, that it was not my intention to offend them, but to expose the wickedness of the church to which they obstinately adhere. They do not like to be accused of maintaining the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. I have the charity to believe, that some of them are not conscious of maintaining it: nay, suppose I were to take them one by one, and examine them judicially upon oath, I should find them all disavowing the abominable principle imputed to them. "Why, then," it will be asked, "do you persist in fixing such a stigma upon them?" I do so, because it is the doctrine of their church: I have shown it to be so by the most indubitable evidence, notwithstanding the disavowal of six universities; and because no Papist is at liberty to form an opinion of his own, but must receive implicitly whatever his church has decreed. It rests, therefore, with them to reconcile the doctrine of the church with their own solemn oaths. If they will adhere to their church, their oaths will prove them schismatics;—if they believe what they swear, they have abandoned the faith of the church, and have become separatists. Let them make their election. It will be well for them, if their choice shall fall upon the latter, and if they will, in reality, separate themselves from the kingdom of Antichrist, and, by believing in Christ, join themselves to the church of God.

It is, I think, a hopeful circumstance, that modern Papists are ashamed of the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. I have hope, however, only of those who are unacquainted with the controversy, and ignorant of their church history; for if there be any who are acquainted with these matters, and who yet maintain that such is not, and never was a doctrine of the Church of Rome, I hold them guilty of much worse than a mere error in judgment. I cannot acquit them of wilful misrepresentation and perversion of the truth. I am persuaded that the great body of Papists in Scotland are really ignorant of the facts recorded in history, some of which I have brought into view. For the sake of such, as well as for the sake of Protestants, I shall proceed to narrate the practice of the Church of Rome, agreeably to the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, as exemplified by the Inquisition,—a court which is established upon the pure principles of Popery, and whose sentences all proceed upon the supreme authority of the holy church.

It is the grand object of this tribunal to find out and to punish heresy. Persons suspected of this worst of all crimes, when brought before the court, were usually tempted to accuse themselves, by promises that if they made a candid confession, they should be kindly or mercifully dealt with. The faith of the holy office was thus pledged to every merely suspected person who was brought before the court: and if such person was really a heretic; if he had really learned to believe as he was taught by the word of God; and if he honestly confessed what he believed,—the plighted faith of the court was broken as a thing of course: if he would not renounce his opinions, he was condemned to torture and death; and if he even did renounce them, he was condemned to suffer shame, and imprisonment, and penance, the remotest possible from the mercy and kindness which he had been promised.

When a person suspected of heresy is brought before the Inquisitor,—"Sometimes he speaks kindly to him; pretends that he pities his misfortune; advises him to speak the truth, which he gives him to understand he is acquainted with; and intimates to him some hope of favour and freedom if he confesses: because the holy office of the Inquisition uses to show mercy to such who voluntarily confess their crimes, how grievous and heinous soever they may be, and, in a friendly manner, speaks to him thus:—'Don't be afraid openly to confess, if you did happen to believe these sort of persons, who taught such and such things, to be good men. You believed them, and willingly heard them, and gave them somewhat of your substance, or received them sometimes into your house, or made confession to them; because you were a simple man, and loved them, thinking them to be good men, and knowing no evil of them. The same thing might have happened to persons much wiser than you, and so they might have been deceived. I have pity on you, and see your own simplicity hath deceived you, and though you are in some measure faulty, yet they are more so who have instructed you. Tell me, therefore, the truth, for you see I know the whole matter, that I may immediately free you, and show you favour.'" After this he interrogates him, not so much concerning the fact, as the circumstances of it, that the person may believe he knows the fact already.

In this manner, the Inquisitor endeavours to persuade persons to tell him all that is in their hearts. Those who are simple, and who cannot believe that there is so much wickedness concealed under the mask of kindness, are in general prevailed upon to tell all they know, if it should be against themselves,—if it should be even that they have given a piece of bread, or a cup of water, to a person suspected of heresy. "If the person accused by this means, prays for favour, and confesses his error, the Inquisitor answers, You shall have much greater favour than you asked; but promises it only in general terms, for he thinks he fulfils his promise, in showing the least kindness to him

afterwards. And when they promise to show favour, it is understood only of those punishments which are left to their own power, viz., several penitential punishments, because they cannot remit those which are appointed by law. They farther teach, that notwithstanding the promise of such grace, they may inflict penitential and arbitrary punishments; because, if after a long time, continual admonitions, and sometimes after the torture, criminals confess their offence upon the promise of such grace, the Inquisitors may legally and justly inflict more grievous penitential punishments, if they omit the lesser; for if one or other be remitted, they think they abundantly satisfy their promise.

"And by these flattering *assurances* they sometimes overcome the minds of more unwary persons, and when they have obtained the designed end, *immediately forget them all.* Of this Gonsalvius gives us a remarkable instance. In the first fire that was blown up at Seville, anno 1558 or 1559, (I suppose he means the first burning for heresy in that city) amongst many others who were taken up, there was a certain pious matron, with her two virgin daughters, and her niece by her sister, who was married. As they endured those tortures, of all kinds, with a truly manly constancy, by which they endeavoured to make them perfidiously betray their brethren in Christ, and especially to accuse one another, the Inquisitor at length commanded one of the daughters to be sent for to audience. There he discoursed with her alone for a considerable time, in order to comfort her, as indeed she needed it. When the discourse was ended, the girl was remanded to prison. Some days after he acted the same part again, causing her to be brought before him several days toward the evening, detaining her for a considerable while, sometimes telling her how much he was grieved for her afflictions, and then intermixing, familiarly enough, other pleasant and agreeable things. All this, as the event showed, had only this tendency, that after he had persuaded the poor simple girl, that he was really, and with a fatherly affection, concerned for her calamity, and would consult as a father what might be for her benefit and salvation, and that of her mother and sisters, she might wholly throw herself into his protection. After some days spent in such familiar discourses, during which he pretended to mourn with her over her calamity, and to show himself affected with her miseries, and to give her all the proofs of his good will, in order, as far as he could, to remove them; when he knew that he had deceived the girl, he begins to persuade her to discover what she knew of herself, her mother, sisters, and aunts, who were not yet apprehended, promising, *upon oath*, that if she would faithfully discover to him all that she knew of that affair, he would find out a method to relieve her from all her misfortunes, and to send them all back again to their houses. The girl, who had no great penetration, being thus allured by the promises and persuasions of the father of the faith, begins to tell him some things relating to the holy doctrine she had been taught, and about which they used to confer with one another. When the Inquisitor had now got hold of the thread, he dexterously endeavoured to find his way throughout the whole labyrinth, oftentimes calling the girl to audience, that what she had deposed might be taken down in a legal manner, always persuading her this would be the only just means to put an end to all her evils. In the last audience, he renews to her all his promises, by which he had before assured her of her liberty, and the like. But when the poor girl expected the performance of them, the said Inquisitor, with his followers, finding the success of his craftiness, by which he had in part drawn out of the girl, what before they could not extort from her by torments, determined to put her to the torture again, to force out of her what they thought she had yet concealed. Accordingly, she was made to suffer the most cruel part of it, even the rack, and the torture by water; till at last they had squeezed out of her, as with a press, both the heresies and accusations of persons they had been hunting after. For, through the extremity of her torture, she accused her mother and sisters, and several others, who were afterwards taken up and tortured, and burnt alive in the same fire with the girl."—*Limborch's History of the Inquisition*, vol. II. pp. 156—158.

The above is given as a specimen, taken almost at random, of the manner in which those who were suspected of heresy were treated by the Inquisition. It would be easy to fill a volume with such cases. The Inquisition, wherever established, was the constitutional organ of the Church of Rome. It acted under the sanction of the highest authority, and its acts are therefore those of the church herself; for, during the interval of general councils, the administration of the affairs of the church was vested entirely in the Pope; and he, by his supreme and infallible authority, invested the Inquisition with all its powers over the consciences and the persons of men. The systematical deception practised by the holy office, upon those who were so unhappy as to be brought before it, shows, in the clearest light, the doctrine of the church, that it was not only lawful, but even laudable, to break faith with heretics. It was the usual practice of Inquisitors to promise mercy to their prisoners, and to confirm these promises by their solemn oaths, in order to extort something that should militate against the prisoners themselves or against their friends, and then to violate these oaths and promises in the most open manner. This was not the fault of an individual or two, who

might be accused of having exceeded their commission, and whose crimes cannot be laid to the door of the church. It was the general practice of the whole body; and as the church has never condemned such practice, that I have heard of, she herself must bear the whole burden, and be content to have it fixed upon her, that she holds it lawful, if not meritorious, to break faith with heretics.

There is nothing in this that ought to surprise any one who knows the character of the Romish Church. Popery is a domineering and exclusive system. The Pope claims to have his authority from Jesus Christ, and all his priests derive their authority from the same source, through the medium of the Pope. What they are pleased to teach, therefore, they hold to be infallible and incontrovertible. Should a few individuals rise up in any country, in which their authority is generally recognized, and presume to think for themselves in matters of religion, they are immediately marked out as beings not fit to breathe the vital air. They are held in much greater abhorrence than thieves and robbers; and it is judged lawful to cut them off by all means, or by any means. Cutting them off is considered a most acceptable service done to the church, and of course to Christ. If one has given a promise or an oath to such miscreants, it is considered a promise against Christ, which may lawfully be broken; nay, which it is unlawful to keep. This was precisely the state of public feeling in the Romish Church at the time of the Council of Constance, and for two hundred years after. By and by, as Protestants began to multiply, and as whole states and kingdoms professed the Reformed faith, and were able to make a bold stand against Rome, and all her vassal states, Papists began to find that it was necessary to enter into negociations and treaties with heretics, upon equal terms. It would not now have been prudent to avow the doctrine, that it was lawful to break faith with such persons or states, because Protestants were able to compel them to stand to their treaties, and keep their faith, whether it was agreeable to them or not. Accordingly, we find the doctrine was first disavowed in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, where it was most necessary to stand on good terms with Protestants; and was longest maintained in Spain, where there was not so much intercourse with them.

This doctrine was nearly connected with that of the lawfulness of putting heretics to death; and, like it, was understood to be lawfully put in practice where heretics were few, but might be suspended where they were numerous. "They are so far from being guilty of murder," saith Urban III. "that kill any who are excommunicate, that they are bound to exterminate heretics, as they would be esteemed Christians themselves." And the learned Cardinal Bellarmine, one of the greatest oracles of the Church of Rome, teaches, "that heretics are to be destroyed, root and branch, if it can possibly be done; but if it appear that the Catholics are so few, that they cannot conveniently * with their own safety, attempt such a thing, then it is best, in such a case, to be quiet, lest, upon opposition made by the heretics, the Catholics should be worsted."—*De Laicis, lib. 3. cap.* 22. quoted by John Smith, in his Narrative relating to the Popish Plot, p. 3.

The same doctrine was maintained by a Popish bishop in Scotland, in our own day. After attempting to justify the practice of the Church of Rome in the excommunication of heretics, and the laws which exist in Popish countries for the punishment of such, he says, "Here we must carefully remark, that these very laws subsist only where the Roman Catholic religion is the universally received religion of the country, and when a new heresy appears among them, and has not yet taken root; for when, through the disposition of Divine Providence, any new system of religion prevails, and is established, these laws have no more place: the Roman Catholics cease to exert even their spiritual jurisdiction against it, and by their principles, in order to restore religion, are obliged to return to preaching and sufferings." *Letter of G. H.* (Bishop Hay of Edinburgh) *to W. A. D.* p. 40. In reply to this singular passage, W. A. D. (Bishop Drummond of the Scotch Episcopal Church in Edinburgh) remarks:—"This, I think, amounts just to this, that Papists will persecute, or violate their faith to heretics, as long as they *dare*, that is, while they have the upper hand; but that whenever their adversaries get the better of them, they will graciously behave with more *discretion*. And is not this great condescension to *accursed heretics*, that Papists will not oppress them any longer than they are able?" —*Second Letter to Mr G. H.* p. 32.

The sentiments of leading men among the Papists in this country, I believe, are perfectly in unison with those of bishop Hay; and it is not concealed by those who have the candour to speak plainly out. They profess great moderation; they declare their loyalty to the present Royal Family upon their solemn oaths. As their religion is not the established one, they have been "obliged," as the Bishop says, "to return to *preaching;*" meaning, I suppose, that if they were established, they would have something else to do; they would have to hunt out and extirpate heretics. And does any one think, that if this period should arrive, —that if they should become the majority in the country, and have it in their power to establish themselves, that they would think themselves bound to keep faith with the few Protestants that might remain? That they

* I suppose the word should be *consistently*.

would not, seems very evident from the following declaration of one of themselves. It is in the words of Dr Drumgoole, in his celebrated speech at the Catholic Board, on the 8th December, 1813; the only man among them who had the courage and sincerity to speak the truth. Let this man's words be engraven on our hearts; for they unquestionably contain the genuine sentiments of every Roman Catholic in the kingdom. Speaking of our Protestant establishment, civil and religious, he says:—"In vain shall statesmen put their heads together,—in vain shall parliaments, in mockery of omnipotence, declare that it is permanent and inviolate,—in vain shall the lazy churchman cry from the sanctuary to the watchman on the tower, that danger is at hand,—it shall fall, for it is human; and nothing but the memory of the mischiefs it has created shall survive! Already the marks of approaching ruin are upon it; it has had its time upon the earth, a date nearly as long as any other novelty; and, *when the time arrives*, shall Catholics be called, by the sacred bond of an oath, to uphold a system which they believe will be one day rejected by the whole earth? Can they be induced to swear that they would oppose even the present Protestants in England, if, ceasing to be truants, they thought fit to return to their ancient worship, and have a *Catholic King* and a *Catholic Parliament?*"—*A British Protestant's Letter to the Inhabitants of Belfast, Dec.* 2d, 1818.

I shall leave it to Papists to point out, at their leisure, the mischiefs which have been created by our civil and religious establishment; while I believe that greater social and domestic happiness has been enjoyed under it, than under any other government in the world. I shall not dispute the doctrine, that every thing human shall have an end; but woe to our country, if things *human* shall give way to things *diabolical*, as will be the case, if our Protestant establishment shall be superseded by a Popish one!

I intend to return to the same subject in my next Number; and, in the meantime, I shall mention a species of breaking faith with heretics, which is very common among Papists in the present day. I allude to their practice of distorting and misrepresenting facts of history, for which their writers are most notorious, and particularly the Editor of the Orthodox Journal. If a person shall profess to give facts, and if, instead of these, he shall give falsehoods, he breaks faith with his readers; and the said Editor must know, that now some of his readers are what he will call heretics. I said in my Twenty-first Number, page 112, that in order to make it appear that Popery was more favourable to civil liberty than Protestantism, he had distorted and turned upside down a number of historical facts. I come now to establish this by one instance, which I give merely as a specimen:

"Next," says he, "came a lady, who is best known by the name of *Bloody Queen Mary*, from her attachment to Popery, and the sacrifice she made of some Protestant traitors and rebels, who wore the garb of prelates and parsons, in the latter part of her reign." *Volume for* 1818, *page* 366. Who would not suppose from this statement, that very few persons suffered under the government of this Queen, and that these few suffered for treason and rebellion, and not for religion? No man could assert this without presuming greatly upon the ignorance and credulity of his readers, because there are few subjects of history, with regard to which it is so easy to detect his misrepresentation. No fewer than 277 suffered during the short reign of that cruel and superstitious princess; and they were neither tried nor punished as traitors. Nay, indeed, two of the number, who might have been brought to trial on that charge, were, on the contrary, examined only respecting the *real presence*, and other Popish absurdities. To many pardon was offered, not upon discovery of their accomplices, or acknowledgment of guilt, but if they would *recant*,—if they would go to mass. Besides, not one of these 277 suffered the death of a traitor, which is to be hung, drawn, and quartered. They were all burnt alive, which is the regular punishment of heretics in the Church of Rome. Nor were these *some* prelates and parsons only. There were five bishops, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, Ferar, and Cranmer; twenty-one clergymen; and the remainder, two hundred and fifty-one, were private persons, men, women, and children. It indeed becomes necessary, ever and anon, to repeat these truths,—these tremendous proofs of Popish intolerance,—and the cruel dispositions of idolaters, lest the hardy assertions of equivocating Jesuits, and their disciples, being uncontradicted, should, at last, be admitted as fact. We will, therefore, detail one or two instances of this persecution. On the 15th of May, 1556, Laverock, a cripple, aged 68, and J. Apprice, a blind man, were burnt at Stratford together; and in the same month, another blind man was burnt at Gloucester. Was the Queen afraid of a rebellion conducted by the blind and the lame? On the 27th of June, at Stratford, just over Bow Bridge, were eleven men, and two women, burnt all together. Sixteen were intended, but Cardinal Pool contrived to save three. In July the same year, at Guernsey, were burnt in the same fire, a mother and her two daughters, one of whom being pregnant, was prematurely delivered in the midst of the flames of a boy, which some of the spectators endeavoured to save, but by the Popish dean and the executioner, it was thrown back into the flames to the wretched mother.—Enough,

surely, of these horrible details. See *Antijacobin Review for Nov. last, page* 274.

No. XXVIII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 23RD, 1819.

My three last Numbers have been occupied with that doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. This is a subject on which Papists feel themselves more hurt than on almost any other which can be mentioned; and I have given it more attention than I have bestowed upon some other matters, which appear to me of less importance. The doctrine has been disavowed with so much confidence by Papists in this country, even upon their solemn oaths, that I believe the opinion began to prevail, that it was not a doctrine of the Church of Rome; and that those who brought this accusation against her, were guilty of uncharitableness and injustice. It is, indeed, a doctrine that cannot bear the light. Those who maintain it, are not worthy of being trusted, with regard to any thing in which persons whom they call heretics, are interested. I think however, it will appear, from the evidence which I have adduced, that such was the doctrine of the church, as established by the Council of Constance; as expounded by several of her great canonical authorities; and as exemplified by the fathers of the Inquisition: and if it *was* the doctrine of the Church of Rome, it *is* the doctrine of that Church, for she is unchangeable and infallible.

Yet the very mention of it will put modern Papists out of temper. They have not the wisdom or discretion to admit what is undeniable; to ascribe it to the ignorance or error of the dark ages; and to plead that they are now under the influence of more enlightened principles. If they did so, we would give the same credit that we give to other sects, who acknowledge and disavow the errors and mistakes of their forefathers, and who desire to be judged only upon the ground of what they themselves profess. But Papists will not admit that there ever was a dark age in their church. That which we look upon as a period of great darkness and ignorance, was actually their golden age: it was the period of their church's glory, when she reigned over the kings of the earth, and when sovereign princes, even emperors, were obliged to execute her decrees. It is clearly established, that in that state of glory she maintained the doctrine in question; and from the acknowledged principle of her infallibility, it is no less clear, that it is, and must be her doctrine still.

About forty years ago, this controversy was agitated, and conducted with great warmth in our Scottish metropolis. The late Principal Campbell, of Aberdeen, a man who possessed as little of a sectarian spirit as perhaps any man of his age, in a Synod Sermon, happened to make some allusion to the Popish doctrine, "that it is not contrary to the will of Heaven, to lie, betray, or to murder, when the supposed interest of the church requires it." The then Popish priest in Edinburgh, G. H. afterwards, if not then, Bishop Hay, was pleased to come forward with a pamphlet, entitled, "A Detection of the dangerous tendency of Dr Campbell's Sermon." He accused the Doctor, of *diabolical calumny*, and *damnable detraction;* and challenged him, in the face of the world, "to produce any one approved divine, of the Roman Catholic communion, that either holds, approves, or even insinuates, the *damnable doctrine* which he lays to their charge." Nay, he says, he was "willing to venture the whole issue of his cause upon it, that the Doctor could produce no such authority."

This was bringing the question to a point which could easily be decided; and it showed the great confidence which the Bishop had in his cause, when he accused the worthy Principal of the Marischal College, of *diabolical calumny*, and *damnable detraction.* Let it be observed, these are the words of a reverend Bishop of the Romish Church; and I request that such of my readers as cannot endure to hear bad things called by their own names, will decide the question to whom the charge of scurrility properly belongs. The Bishop challenged the Doctor, in the face of the world, to produce one approved divine of his church, who held, approved, or even insinuated, the doctrine, that it was not contrary to the will of Heaven, to lie, &c. when the supposed interest of the church required it; that is, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics: and he ventured the whole issue of his cause upon this point.

I do not know whether Dr Campbell ever accepted the challenge; but it was accepted by a reverend gentleman in Edinburgh, Dr W. A. Drummond, afterwards a Bishop in the Scottish Episcopal Church. This gentleman addressed a letter to Bishop Hay, in which he produced the most ample evidence, that the church of Rome did maintain the doctrine, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics. He cited a number of passages from the decretals, from the works of eminent divines, &c. some of which are given in my twenty-fifth Number, and many more to the same purpose, together with the canon of the Council of Constance, in precisely the same words as I gave it from *Free Thoughts*; and, that he might put the sincerity of the Popish priest to the test, he addressed to him publicly the following challenge:—

"And to bring the matter to a speedy period, I beg you may meet me any Tuesday or Thursday you please, between the hours of

eleven and one, before dinner, in the Advocates' Library, when the College Library is also open, in case we have occasion to have recourse to it; and that you may take along with you three or four gentlemen of learning, honour, and probity, who, like pious Job, *will abhor to speak wickedly even for God, or to talk deceitfully for him*; and I shall bring as many of the same character, who, together with those on your side, may be judges between us; and the new converts to Popery in this place may be witnesses if they please.

"What I propose to prove is this, that, by the rescripts of Popes, the opinion of approved divines, and even the practice, I might say, the *decree* of one at least if not more general councils of the Romish communion, it is lawful on some occasions to break faith, especially with heretics; and consequently to lie, to betray, and even to murder too, whenever the interest of the church requires it."

One should think a public character like Bishop Hay, who had publicly challenged Dr Campbell, in the face of the whole world, to produce the evidence of any one approved divine of the Romish Church, who held the doctrine above mentioned, could not, with propriety, refuse the challenge addressed to him, to come, with three or four witnesses, to the Advocates' Library, and see, with his own eyes, the abundant evidence which that library contained, that such doctrine was indeed held and taught by approved divines of his church; nay, that it was most undoubtedly the doctrine of the church, as declared by the highest authorities. The reverend gentleman, however, did decline the challenge, though repeatedly made. He did not choose to look at the original documents, which proved his church to maintain doctrines which he declared to be "damnable" and "diabolical," and which, according to his own words, none but "execrable wretches" could maintain. He declined the interview, says Dr Drummond in his preface, "on this pretence, that he will *publish* his answer to my letter."

He did publish what was meant for an answer, in a large pamphlet of 150 pages, containing a great deal of matter a thousand miles from the point, and which seemed intended for no other purpose, than to raise such a dust about the subject, that nobody should see it distinctly. This seems to be one of the arts to which all modern Papists have recourse in their writings; and they seem to wish their readers to believe, that they have proved what they assert, when they have written a great many pages about it, or about something that is like it, in the mere sound of the words, however different in meaning.

Hay labours to show that the divines whom Drummond cites, and whose works are preserved in the Advocates' Library, were of no authority in the church; and asserts, that *he* had not so much as heard of some of their names. Of Simanca, for instance, whose words are quoted in my former Numbers, and whose exposition of the canon law contains clear proof that, in his time, it was a doctrine of the church, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, Hay asserts, "that he was not a divine at all, but an obscure Spanish pettifogger, who published his Institutions on some branches of the law, perhaps to make a penny by it, and gives it the pompous name of *Catholic Institutions*, like many other authors now-a-days, who give their silly productions a grand frontispiece, to make them pass with the better grace." *

This shows the dilemma to which Hay was reduced. He could not deny, that the words quoted by Drummond were those of Simanca; and these words point out what was the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as clearly as Erskine's Institutes, or other books of equal authority, point out what is the law of Scotland. He is reduced, therefore, to the necessity of making Simanca a poor pettifogger, who wrote books for his subsistence. But what is the fact? Let the reader judge from the following quotation from Collier's Dictionary, as given by Dr Drummond, in his second letter, page 19. "James Simanca, Bishop of Bajadox, was a Spaniard, and professed the Civil and Canon Law in the *University* of Salamanca. He was one of the *King's Council* in Valladolid, and afterwards preferred, for his merit, to the *Bishoprick of Bajadox, &c.* He was a very good divine (*fort savant dans la Theologie*, says Moreri) and lawyer, and wrote a great deal in both faculties." Among his works are the "Catholic Institutions," from which Limborch, in his History of the Inquisition, has quoted largely, as well as the author of *Free Thoughts*, and from his work the point in question is clearly established.

There are, besides, many other authorities with which I shall not trouble my readers. The above is a specimen of the manner in which Popish writers of the present day, attempt to wipe off the stain of not keeping faith, from their church; but they may as well attempt to wash the blackamoor white. Such of my readers as have access to the pamphlets on the controversy between the two Edinburgh Bishops, will find them highly interesting. For sophistry and subtlety, Hay far excels any living Popish author that I know of; but he is absolutely overwhelmed by the strong arguments, and the mass of evidence which Drummond brings against him. He had not, however, the grace to yield the point, though he had ventured the whole issue of his cause upon

* A writer of Hay's own sect, referring to Simanca, says, "*Catholicarum Institutionum opere non parum celeber.*" Antonio Biblioth. Hispana 1.316 [Not a little celebrated for his work on the Catholic Institutions.]

it. He challenged Dr Campbell to produce evidence that such was a doctrine of the Church of Rome; and his challenge implied, that if this was proved, he would give up the cause. According to his own declaration, none but "execrable wretches" could hold such a doctrine. To accuse his church of this, was "diabolical calumny, and damnable detraction." Dr Drummond accepted the challenge, and proved all this against the Church of Rome. He proved from the most explicit declarations of her own divines, and the canons of her own councils, that it was a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics; and Bishop Hay himself lent the sanction of his little name to confirm the doctrine, for instead of giving up the cause of Popery, as he had virtually promised, when this was proved, he chose to continue a Papist still.

It being thus clearly proved, that this was a doctrine of the Romish Church, it follows that it is so still. To use the language of a late divine of our own city, (Dr Porteous, in his Sermon on Toleration, 1778), "This wonderful pretence," (that of infallibility,) "gives uniformity and permanency to her doctrines; for what was infallibly true yesterday, might be equally true to-day, and for ever; no distance of time, nor change of circumstances, can produce the smallest variation, even in things not revealed. This church, according to her own principles, must continue always, and in all respects the same. As the authorities to be appealed to on this occasion have the Popish stamp of infallibility, it must no doubt add greatly to the weight of their evidence. They cannot indeed be disrespected by Papists, while their claim to infallibility subsists." P. 18.

In short, it appears clearly established that every divine who wrote on the subject during several centuries, maintained it to be a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, or to break faith with any person, when, by doing so, the interest of the holy church was promoted; and that this opinion of grave divines was founded upon the solemn decree of at least one œcumenical or general council.

Modern Papists endeavour to set aside the authority of all these divines, though their great oracle, Bellarmine, be among the number. Bishop Hay challenged Dr Campbell to produce the authority of *any* approved divine of the Romish Church, who maintained the obnoxious doctrine. Dr Drummond produces the authority of *many* such divines. Hay then attempts to depreciate their character, and to make them appear men of no account; but in point of fact, they appear to have been all, and the only divines, who wrote on the subject for hundreds of years; and surely there is no other evidence necessary to prove what was the doctrine of the church, as understood by them, and as universally understood in their time. Let modern Papists produce, if they can, the authority of other divines, or the decrees of any of their councils in opposition to the doctrine in question. If it were not the acknowledged doctrine of the church, that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, whence was it, that, for hundreds of years, nobody wrote against it, while great divines were maintaining it? The Pope was always sufficiently watchful that no heresy should obtain a footing in the church; general councils were always ready to condemn any doctrine that did not seem consistent with the honour and prosperity of the church; and even in the darkest ages, there were to be found some learned men to write in defence of the church, and who would not suffer any person to calumniate her without attempting her vindication;—if then it had been a heresy that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, and seeing this *heresy* was publicly taught by many great divines, whence was it that no divine, or canonist, or Pope, or council, should have uttered a word against it? Whence was it that Bishop Simanca, and others in expounding the doctrine of the Church of Rome, openly declared it to be a doctrine of the church, that no obligation under which one was bound to a heretic, was binding upon him? Whence, I say, was this maintained publicly and without contradiction, but from the simple fact, that it was universally acknowledged to be a doctrine of the church?

In illustration of this argument, I shall take a case from the history of our own national church. About thirty years ago, a divine in Ayrshire published a book in which he insinuated certain principles, which are known by the name Socinianism. Had this work passed unnoticed,—had other divines of the same church published similar sentiments, and had they also been unnoticed, it would appear to succeeding ages, that, notwithstanding the Calvinistic tenor of her standards, towards the close of the eighteenth century, the Church of Scotland had become Socinian in her doctrines; and it would be sufficient evidence of the fact, to adduce the works of learned divines, even doctors of divinity, who unequivocally taught Socinianism, and to have it to add, that no other divine of the church, or any author of that country, at that time, had objected to the principles taught in those books. It so happened, that legions of writers, if I may use the expression, many of them divines of great note, declared their abhorrence of the sentiments of the Socinian divine; many books were published, which are likely to live at least as long as his; and his doctrine was condemned by an ecclesiastical council, namely, the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, before which, in the town of Ayr, the said divine professed to recant his errors. While the knowledge of

these facts shall remain, it will be evident to the whole world, that, in the eighteenth century, the Church of Scotland did not approve the doctrine of Socinus; but had the Socinian Doctor, and his adherents, been suffered to pass unnoticed, while they published their sentiments to the world, those who should live two hundred years after, would be justified in fixing the charge of Socinianism on the Church of Scotland, at the period referred to; and they might challenge the whole world to prove the contrary.

This argument applies directly to the case in hand. All the divines of the Romish Church, who wrote on the subject, during several centuries, maintained that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, or with others, when the interest of the church might require such a measure; they taught this doctrine on the authority of the *Decretals* as they are called, —the standing laws of the church,—the authority of several Popes, and, lastly, on the high and infallible authority of the Council of Constance. This was so universally understood to be the doctrine of the church, that nobody controverted it. While Bishop Hay, and others, endeavoured to set aside the authority of those who publicly taught the doctrine, as being men of no consequence, they have not produced the name of any person, high or low, in the same ages, who opposed the doctrine, or so much as insinuated that it was not maintained by the church. Upon every principle of fair reasoning then, it was a doctrine of the Church of Rome, at the time of the Council of Constance, and for centuries thereafter; and if it *was* so then, it *is* so still, notwithstanding the solemn oaths of British Papists; for we must never lose sight of this fundamental principle of Popery, that it is unchangeable, and therefore incapable of improvement.

I suppose the late Mr Pitt was no great adept in religious controversy; and, I suppose, his numerous admirers will not consider this assertion as derogating from the character of that great statesman. Since, however, Providence had placed him in a situation which admitted, and even required, a certain degree of interference in matters of religion, it would have been well if he had fully understood the subject. The interference of the Pope in the affairs of independent kingdoms, and the doctrine that it was lawful to break faith with heretics, seemed an insuperable bar to the admission of Papists to the privileges of the British constitution, or of any Protestant constitution. They had the art, however, to persuade the British government that they held no such principles; they got the universities to disavow them, and to argue against them. This took place in 1789; and in 1793, the Act was passed which Papists take their stand upon, as containing the charter of their privileges. By this Act, they, taking the oath, of which the form is given in my twenty-fourth Number, are admitted to the free exercise of their religion, the same as other dissenters, and freed from the rigorous penalties of some former Acts, which, however severe and even persecuting they may appear to us, were, I doubt not, considered at the time they were passed, absolutely necessary in order to preserve the Protestant government from the incessant and insidious attempts of Jesuitical incendiaries, in whose esteem no work was so meritorious as the subversion of Protestant governments, and the dethroning of heretical princes.*

I am far from condemning the Act of 1793, or from wishing its repeal. But so far as the declaration of the Popish universities, and the representations of modern Papists, with respect to the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, had any influence upon the mind of Mr Pitt and his colleagues, in carrying that measure, I do not hesitate to say, it was produced by means of misrepresentation and imposition: for it is a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics; and let all statesmen consider, how it is possible to bind men who hold such a doctrine.

No. XXIX.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 30TH, 1819.

BEFORE I leave the subject of not keeping faith, I shall produce one document more. It is one of modern date; and it shows clearly, that, when Papists have the candour to speak their minds plainly, they hold the very same sentiments which were held by their fathers four hundred years ago. A Romish clergyman in Ireland, I believe a bishop, had promised to subscribe certain Addresses, with respect to the concession of the *veto*. Having refused to

* It is the daily practice of Popish writers to hold out the government of this country, and the Protestant establishment, as persecuting and sanguinary in their conduct towards Papists. They glory in quoting old Acts of Parliament, which certainly do bear an intolerant aspect, and which every Protestant is ready to condemn. But Popish writers take care not to inform their readers that these intolerant principles were derived from Rome; and that our Protestant ancestors brought them from thence, with some other errors. Besides they were never so conspicuous in the practice of Protestants as upon the Statute book. There were many of our reformers who maintained, as a speculative opinion, the lawfulness of putting idolaters to death, (and among idolaters they very properly included Papists) but who never imbrued their hands in the blood of a fellow-creature, or consented to the death of any man on account of his opinions. Their speculative opinion was undoubtedly wrong, but they learned it from the Church of Rome; the farther they removed from the Mother of abominations, they became less intolerant; and these persecuting laws have been repealed, though Popish writers wish to conceal this from their readers, and endeavour to make our constitution and government as odious as possible.

perform his promise, and being publicly accused of breach of faith, he published the following, in vindication of himself.—*See Liberator's Letter to an English Nobleman*, 1817, p. 302.

"An advertisement appeared in the Leinster Journal, of last Saturday, signed George Bryan, in which I am charged with the breach of a solemn promise. A public attack of this kind, necessarily calls on any man to justify his conduct, if in his power. A plain narrative of the facts, as they happened, and an explanation of the motives on which I acted, will complete this justification, I hope, in the eyes of any impartial man.

"1st, I acknowledge that I promised, to some gentlemen of the Committee, that I would sign these Addresses, when some lines, to which I objected, would be expunged;—but I utterly deny having made any *solemn* promise, if by a solemn promise, Mr Bryan means any thing more than a *serious* promise; for nothing, in actions, expressions, or writing, was superadded to the verbal declaration I made of signing the Addresses, when corrected. The nature of the case did not at all require a *solemn* promise; and the gentlemen who presented the Addresses to me, had too much sagacity and judgment to alarm my suspicions, by such a proposal; for the consequence would probably be a rejection of the Addresses on the spot.

"2dly, Some days elapsed, before the corrected Addresses were again brought to me to be signed. In this interval, many of the clergy and laity of this city came to me, and remonstrated against my signing these Addresses. They urged, that these Addresses were calculated to pass an indirect censure on the proceedings of the Prelates in Dublin, and to diminish the respect due to their late Resolutions; that they were preparatory steps to the concession of a veto to the government, in the nomination of the Catholic Prelates of Ireland; and that a general dislike and disapprobation of these Addresses prevailed, among the great majority of the priests and Catholic laity of the city. When I ascertained this last fact, I resolved not to sign the Addresses, and was, at the same time, persuaded that I was guilty of no sin or crime, by such refusal.

"I am convinced, that a serious, sincere, and voluntary promise, binds a man who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it. But I am likewise convinced, that the obligation, arising from a promise, ceases, in the following cases:—

"1st, If a man promises a thing impossible. For no one can be bound to do a thing impossible to be done.

"2dly, If a man promises to do any thing sinful or unlawful. For no promise, though confirmed by an oath, can bind a man to commit sin.

"3dly, When a person, in whose favour a promise is made, releases the promiser from the promise he has made.

"4thly, When a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made.

"5thly, When before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed, that the person promising, had he foreseen these circumstances, would never have made the promise.

"On this I rest my justification. For had I foreseen, or known, that my signing these Addresses would produce such alarm and consternation, such dislike and disapprobation, as I afterwards found they would, in the minds of the great majority of the Catholic priests and laity of this city, I would, by no means, have consented to sign them.—St Thomas saith, 'That a man is not guilty of an untruth, in such a case; because, when he promised, he intended to perform his promise: nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circumstances are changed.' This is not only the opinion of St Thomas, but is also the opinion of all the Theologians and Canonists I ever saw or read.

"JAMES LANIGAN.

"Kilkenny, Nov. 8, 1808."

I expect to be favoured with the unanimous thanks of my readers, for making them acquainted with this precious specimen of Popish morality. Here it is plainly admitted, that a man may give a promise, and a *serious* promise too, and yet lawfully break it, if it was not a *solemn* promise. And allowing it to be a promise ever so solemn, serious, sincere, and voluntary, there are yet five cases in which he is not bound to keep it.

From the first of these cases, we learn, that, if a man should give his promissory note, binding himself to pay a hundred pounds, by a certain day, if he finds it *impossible* to raise the money, he is freed from his obligation. "The obligation arising from the promise ceases," and the debt is cancelled. I admit, that no promise, or oath, can bind a man to do what is sinful; but I maintain, at the same time, that no man ought ever to make such a promise. With Papists, however, this is a light matter; they can promise and swear any thing, and get a dispensation, like the kings and queens of France, to break such oaths as they cannot profitably keep. Promises to heretics are considered sinful, and, therefore, it is not lawful to keep them. On this principle the emperor was moved to put John Huss to death, and we find the principle approved and defended by a dignified priest in Ireland, as lately as 1808.

The fifth case releases a man from the obligation of his promise, on a change of circumstances. Thus, if I order from Dublin a quantity of linen, and promise to accept my correspondent's bill, for the amount, if the linen trade in Glasgow should become dull before my goods arrive, I am freed from the

obligation of my promise,—the circumstances are changed; and because I intended to fulfil my promise, when I made it, I am guilty of no untruth, though I should now break it. This is the opinion of St Thomas, who is of almost equal authority, in the Church of Rome, with St Peter, and at least equal to St Paul. And it is not the opinion of that divine only, but the opinion of all the Theologians and Canonists that were ever seen or read by the Reverend James Lanigan.

How different is this from the morality of the Bible? The righteous man stands to his engagement, though it should be to his own hurt or disadvantage.—*Psalm* xv. 4.

The church that admits the principle of breaking faith with heretics, or with others, on any occasion, or on any account, teaches that it is lawful to falsify and deceive. And to fix this charge on the Church of Rome, nothing more is necessary than to adduce the principles and practices of the Jesuits. I have not seen any Bull of the Pope, by which he authorised this body to deceive the world, by means of cunning and falsehood, as he authorised the kings and queens of France to break any oath which they could not profitably keep; but I see, by the history of the Jesuits, that they acted as if they had had such authority; and that, instead of incurring the displeasure of the Holy Father, on that account, they became his distinguished favourites. Their principles and conduct are justly chargeable upon the Church of Rome, during the period in which they existed as an organized body; for they were never condemned by any Council of the Church, or by any Pope, till they became such an insufferable nuisance, in every country in Europe, Popish as well as Protestant, that the order was suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. who, for his many good qualities, has been called the Protestant Pope.

Still, however, the Jesuits are the favourites of the holy see. The present Pope has restored the order: and Popish writers, such as the Editor of the Orthodox Journal, labour to recommend them to the world, as examples of every thing that is great, and noble, and useful, in Christianity. But if, as I hope to show, their main instrument, in carrying on their operations, was falsehood, it will follow, that the church which contains, approves, and commends such an order, holds it lawful to falsify and deceive.

By the kindness of a friend, at a distance, I am favoured with a copy of *Secreta Monita Societatis Jesu;* or the Secret Instructions of the Jesuits, in the original Latin, with an English translation. This work was not intended ever to meet the eye of Protestants; and it was meant for only such members of their own Society as could be fully depended upon. "John Schipper, a bookseller, at Amsterdam, bought one of them at Antwerp, among other books, and afterwards reprinted it. The Jesuits, being informed that he had purchased this book, demanded it back from him; but he had then sent it to Holland. One of the Society, who lived at Amsterdam, hearing it said soon after to (by) a Catholic bookseller, by name Van Eyk, that Schipper was printing a book, which concerned the Jesuits, replied, that if it was only the *Rules of the Society,* he would not be under any concern; but desired he would inform himself what it was. Being told by the bookseller, that it was the *Secret Instructions of the Society,* the good father, shrugging up his shoulders, and knitting his brow, said, that he saw no remedy but denying that this piece came from the Society. The reverend fathers, however, thought it more advisable to purchase the whole edition, which they soon after did, some few copies excepted; from one of these it was afterwards reprinted, with this account prefixed; which is said to be taken from two Roman Catholics, men of credit."—*Adv. to the Reader.*

The preface to the work itself inculcates, "that the greatest care imaginable must be taken, that these instructions do not fall into the hands of strangers, for fear, out of envy to our order, they should give them a sinister interpretation; but if this (which God forbid!) should happen, let it be positively denied that these are the principles of the Society, and such denial be confirmed by those of our members, *which we are sure know nothing of them;* by this means, and by confronting these with our public instructions, printed or written, our credibility will be established beyond opposition. Let the superiors also carefully and warily inquire, whether discovery has been made of these instructions, by any of our members to strangers; and let none transcribe, or suffer them to be transcribed, either for himself, or others, without the consent of the General or Provincial: and if any one be suspected of incapacity to keep such important secrets, acquaint him not of your suspicion, but dismiss him."

Perhaps, at some future period, I may treat my readers with the whole of these secret instructions, which would not occupy above three or four Numbers of my work. They exhibit such a system of deceit and falsehood, that I know no word sufficiently strong to express their true character, but that of *Jesuitism.* At present I shall give only a specimen, extracted from chapters vi. and vii.

"*Of the proper method for inducing rich widows to be liberal to our Society.* I. For the managing of this affair, let such members only be chosen as are advanced in age, of a lively complexion, and agreeable conversation; let these frequently visit such widows, and the minute they begin to shew any affection towards our order, then is the time to lay before

them, the good works and merits of the Society: if they seem kindly to give ear to this, and begin to visit our churches, we must, by all means, take care to provide them confessors, by whom they may be well admonished, especially to a constant perseverance in a state of widowhood,—and this, by enumerating, and praising the advantages and felicity of a single life, and let them pawn their faiths, and themselves too, as a security, that a firm continuance, in such a pious resolution, will infallibly purchase an eternal merit, and prove a most effectual means of escaping the otherwise certain pains of purgatory.

"IV. Care must be taken to remove such servants, particularly, as do not keep a good understanding with the Society; but let this be done by little and little; and when we have managed so to work them out, let such be recommended as already are, or willingly would become our creatures; thus shall we dive into every secret, and have a finger in every affair transacted in the family.

"V. The confessor must manage his matters so that the widow may have such faith in him as not to do the least thing without his advice, and his only; which he may occasionally insinuate to be the only basis of her spiritual edification.

"VI. She must be advised to the frequent use and celebration of the sacraments, but especially that of penance, because in that she freely makes a discovery of her most secret thoughts, and every temptation.

"VIII. Discourses must be made to her concerning the advantages of a state of widowhood, the inconveniences of wedlock, especially when it is repeated, and the dangers to which mankind expose themselves by it; but above all, such as more particularly affect her.

"IX. It will be proper, every now and then, cunningly to propose to her some match; but such a one, be sure, as you know she has an aversion to: and if it be thought she has a kindness for any one, let his vices and failings be represented to her in a proper light, that she may abhor the thoughts of altering her condition with any person whatsoever.

"X. When, therefore, it is manifest that she is well disposed to continue a widow, it will then be time to recommend to her a spiritual life, but not a recluse one, the inconveniences of which must be magnified to her; but such a one as *Paula's* or *Eustochius'*, &c. and let the confessor, having as soon as possible prevailed with her to make a vow of chastity, for two or three years at least, take due care to oppose all tendencies to a second marriage; and then, all conversation with men, and diversions, even with her near relations and kinsfolk, must be forbid her, under pretence of entering into a stricter union with God. As for the ecclesiastics, who either visit the widow, or receive visits from her, if they all cannot be worked out, yet let none be admitted but what are either recommended by some of our Society, or are dependents upon them.

"XI. When we have thus far gained our point, the widow must be, by little and little, excited to the performance of good works, especially those of charity; which, however, she must by no means be suffered to do, without the direction of her ghostly father, since it is of the last importance to her soul, that her talent be laid out, with a prospect of obtaining spiritual interest; and since charity, ill-applied, often proves the cause and incitement to sins, which effaces the merit and reward that might otherwise attend it."

By such a course of persevering cunning and deceit, the Society of Jesuits have, no doubt, gained over many rich widows, to be subservient to their purpose. The title of the seventh chapter is, "*How such widows are to be secured, and in what manner their effects are to be disposed of.*" They must let "no week pass, in which they do not, of their own accord, lay somewhat apart, out of their abundance, for the honour of Christ, the blessed Virgin, or their patron saint; and let them dispose of it in relief of the poor, or in beautifying of churches: till they are entirely stript of their superfluous stores, and unnecessary riches."—"If they have made a vow of chastity, let them, according to our custom, renew it twice a year; and let the day wherein this is done, be set apart for innocent recreations, with the members of our Society."—"Let them be frequently visited, and entertained, in an agreeable manner, with spiritual stories; and also diverted with pleasant discourses, according to their particular humours and inclinations."—"They must not be treated with too much severity, in confession, lest we make them morose, and ill-tempered; unless their favour be so far engaged by others, that there is danger of not regaining it; and in this case, great discretion is to be used, in forming a judgment of the natural inconstancy of women."

"Let women that are young, and descended from rich and noble parents, be placed with those widows, that they may, by degrees, become subject to our directions, and accustomed to our mode of living."—"That the widow may dispose of what she has in favour of the Society, set, as a pattern to her, the perfect state of holy men, who have renounced the world, and forsaken their parents, and all that they had, with great resignation and cheerfulness of mind, devoted themselves to the service of God."—"Let several instances of widows be brought, who thus, in a short time, became saints, in hopes of being canonized, if they continue such to the end. And let them be apprized, that our Society will not fail to use their interest with the court of Rome, for the obtaining of such a favour."—"If a widow

does not in her lifetime, make over her whole estate to the Society, whenever opportunity offers, but especially when she is seized with sickness, or in danger of life, let some take care to represent to her the poverty of the greatest number of our colleges, whereof many, just erected, have hardly as yet any foundation; engage her by a winning behaviour, and inducing arguments, to such a liberality, as (you must persuade her) will lay a certain foundation for her eternal happiness."

Such are a few of the secret rules of that Society, which the Pope has lately restored,—which has obtained a rich establishment in the very heart of England; and which will, very probably, soon establish itself in our city. Let every lover of his country, of his friends, and fellow-creatures, consider whether it were not better for us to be invaded by a host of locusts and caterpillars, than by such incendiaries, who will insinuate themselves into our houses, and worm themselves, by fair speeches, into the confidence of the simple and unwary, until they have got the entire direction of our domestic affairs, the command of our property, and perhaps the disposal of our lives.

Before entering upon a new subject of discussion, I beg leave to congratulate my readers on the appearance of a reply to THE PROTESTANT; and that by no less a personage than Wm. Eusebius Andrews, Editor of what he calls The Orthodox Journal,—the great champion of the Popish cause for England, and now also for Scotland. I dare say his friends think I ought to have noticed his publication sooner; but I did not choose to break the connection of more important matter; and I was willing to let him have his own way for a time, without interruption. He has now published six numbers in Glasgow, under the title of The Catholic Vindicator. The work is both written and printed in London. I suppose nobody, able and willing, could be found nearer Glasgow; and the author calls for the assistance of the whole Catholic body, in his arduous undertaking.

I do not intend to enter upon a formal refutation of this writer, till I have done with AMICUS VERITATIS; but I shall simply state, for the information of my readers, that, in so far as it is my object to expose the errors of Popery, I look upon Mr Andrews rather as an auxiliary, than an adversary. He tells us plainly, and I believe honestly, what his own faith is; and he assures us, that, in the Church of Rome, the faith of one is the faith of all. For the advantage which he has thus given me, I am content to bear all his abuse; all his real or affected misapprehension of the meaning of my words, which he exhibits in numerous instances; and all his insinuations with regard to the badness of my principles and motives.

The poor man is seriously of opinion, that he must satisfy divine justice for himself. He expresses no small degree of wonder at the Protestant doctrine,—that Christ alone has made satisfaction. He is absolutely overwhelmed by astonishment, at an assertion of THE PROTESTANT, that "there is no salvation for a sinner, but in the way of depending, solely and entirely, on the finished work of Christ;" and he prints some of these words in great capitals, to show the magnitude of the mistake into which he supposes I have fallen. He knows nothing of the place which good works hold in the method of salvation, but as *meriting* salvation. In short, according to his doctrine, sinners must both satisfy divine justice for themselves, and merit their own salvation. I must do my opponent the justice to say, that this is not a corruption of Christianity. It is a totally different religion. It is as much opposed to the doctrine of Christ, as I hope to show in due time, as the worship of Juggernaut is to that of the true God.

While the "Catholic Vindicator" takes his stand upon the ground of satisfying divine justice, and meriting salvation for himself, he is not to be reasoned with as a Christian. If the faith of one be the faith of all, as he tells us, then, instead of being the most numerous and respectable body of Christians in the world, as Papists proudly assert, they are not Christians at all. To dispute about the mode and form of such a religion as theirs, is as idle as to wrangle about the colour and shape of the broad cloth that covers the shoulders of the great idol of Orissa.

As my papers are often written in great haste, amidst numerous avocations of a public and private nature, without the assistance of any other pen whatever, it would not be surprising if I had made some mistakes, with regard to the dates of facts, the names of authors, and other unimportant matters; but, hitherto, The Vindicator has detected nothing of the kind. In short, he has not invalidated a single fact in any of my statements; and has not pointed out a single sentence in "THE PROTESTANT," which I would wish to alter, if it were to be written again.

No. XXX.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6TH, 1819.

I COME now to the subject of withholding the Bible from the people, of which the Church of Rome has been accused. This subject, like that of not keeping faith with heretics, has become a little troublesome to modern Papists, especially to those who live among Protestants. About five years ago, the Rev. Andrew Scott published the following declaration in the Glasgow Newspapers: "If it really was a principle of the Roman Catholic Church to de-

prive her members of the use of the divine word, by forbidding them to read and search the Scriptures, she would indeed be cruel and unjust. But I can publicly declare (without danger of being contradicted by my brethren, or censured by my superiors,) that it is *not at present*—that it *never was*—a principle of the Catholic Church, that the Scriptures should be withheld from the laity; and there never was any law enacted by the supreme legislative authority in the Catholic Church, by which the reading of the Scriptures was prohibited." *Letter dated February 11th, 1814, in most of the Glasgow Newspapers.*

In the same month a letter appeared in the Glasgow Chronicle, under the signature of W. M. from which I extract the following. "What is it that constitutes a principle of the Catholic Church? Are the decrees of general councils, sanctioned by the Pope of Rome, recognized as such? Then I request that the Reverend Mr Scott would consider the following decision of the council of Trent: (Regula IV. list of prohibited books) seeing it is manifest, by experience, that if the Holy Bible be permitted to be read every where, without difference, in the vulgar tongue, more harm than good results thence, through the rashness of men; let it, therefore, be at the pleasure of the bishop or inquisitor, with the advice of the parish clerk or confessor, to grant the reading of the Bible, translated by Catholic authors, to those who, in their opinion, will thereby receive an increase of faith and piety. This license let them have in writing; *and whoever shall presume, without permission, to read or possess such Bibles, may not receive the absolution of his sins till he has returned them to the ordinary.*" *

* W. M. gave only an extract in English. The following are the express words of the whole canon:—"Cum experimento manifestum sit, si Sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus, inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parte judicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum concilio Parochi, vel Confessorii, Bibliorum à Catholicis Auctoribus versorum lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione, non damnum sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant. Qui autem absque tali facultate ea legere seu habere præsumpserit, nisi prius Bibliis Ordinario redditis, peccatorum absolutionem percipere non possit. Bibliopolæ verò, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti Biblia idiomate vulgari conscripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo concesserint, librorum pretium, in usos pios ab Episcopo convertendum, amittant, aliisq; pœnis, pro delicti qualitate, ejusdem Episcopi arbitrio subjaceant. Regulares verò non nisi facultate à Prælatis suis habita. ea legere, aut emere possint." *De Libris prohibitis, Regula* IV.

The following is the latter part of the canon, in English:—But all the Booksellers, who may sell, or in any other manner supply, Bibles, written in the vulgar dialect, to any person not possessed of the aforesaid license, shall forfeit the price of the books, to be applied to sacred purposes by the Bishop, and submit to other punishments at the will of the said Bishop, according to the nature and degree of their fault: but let no one buy or read these Bibles, without the permission of their Pastors.

"What is this but denying the use of the Bible to the common people? None were to read it, or have it, but those who had licence from the bishop or inquisitor; and these officers were authorized to give licence only to those who, they thought, would make a good use of it. That this was reckoned a very just limitation at the time, will appear from the speech of Richard Du Mans, in the same council. He said, 'That the Scriptures had become useless, since the schoolmen had established the truth of all doctrines; and though they were formerly read in the church, for the instruction of the people, and still read in the service, yet they ought not to be made a study, *because the Lutherans only gained those who read them.*'

"If the above does not establish it as a principle, that the Scriptures were to be withheld from the people at large, I ask again, What is it that constitutes a principle of the Catholic Church?

"Besides, was it not the uniform practice of that church, for at least a thousand years, to withhold the Scriptures from the people? Was not their religious service conducted in an unknown tongue? Was it ever known that they gave the common people, in any country, a translation of the Bible in their own language, till a long period after the Reformation? Nay, is it not well known, that all the influence of the Catholic clergy was exerted to prevent the people from reading the Scriptures after Wickliffe and Luther had given them translations?"—"Mr Scott says in his letter, 'If it really was a principle of the Roman Catholic Church to deprive her members of the use of the divine word, by forbidding them to read and search the Scriptures, she would indeed be cruel and unjust.' Well, then, by his own verdict, his church is convicted of cruelty and injustice; for they so far withheld the Scriptures from the people, that they did not give them when it was in their power; and when the people were receiving that invaluable treasure from another quarter, they did their utmost to prevent it; they not only refused to give the blessing themselves, but persecuted and murdered those who did." A sensible letter on the same subject appeared about the same time, in the Glasgow Courier.

Mr Scott did not choose to reply to either of these letters; but whether his silence arose from a conviction that he was mistaken, or from some other cause, I cannot tell. I have no hesitation in saying that he ought to have replied, and answered the question, what he meant by a "principle of the Catholic Church?" and how far he acknowledged the authority of the Council of Trent? If it be replied on his behalf, that he was not at liberty to make any exception against the authority of that council, seeing he had bound himself by solemn oath to believe every doctrine, and obey every canon

declared by it, then I reply, he ought to have taken care what doctrine he published, so as not to have contradicted the holy council, whose doctrines he had sworn to maintain.

In one of my letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, P. 18. I alluded to the controversy between Mr Scott and W. M. and mentioned his silence when the authority of the Council of Trent was quoted against him. In reply to this, AMICUS VERITATIS says, (P. 25.) "In your correspondent's last letter, I noticed an allusion to a Rev. Gentleman, which was certainly characteristic of the author. Every minister of the *gospel* should be a minister of *peace;* and it was unfair to suppose, that because the Rev. Gentleman here alluded to did not reply, it was either from a conviction of the validity or correctness of what might have been advanced against him. I myself am confident, and I do not *commit myself* when I say so, that your correspondent cannot produce any decree of the Council of Trent absolutely forbidding the reading of the Scriptures. The Council of Trent, and the church, merely command her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures but that which is approved by the church; and consequently, cannot be said to forbid the reading of the Scriptures, any more than the Bible Society, who will not permit the circulation of any edition of the Scriptures but their approved version, although many other different editions exist."

There are many strange things in this paragraph which require a particular reply. The last is the first I shall notice. The Bible Society, it seems, according to the assertion of AMICUS VERITATIS, "will not permit the circulation of any edition of the Scriptures but their approved version." The British and Foreign Bible Society has been accused of many things by Papists, and by Protestants popishly inclined; but I believe AMICUS VERITATIS is the first, and the only writer, who has accused it of *not permitting* the circulation of more than one version of the Scriptures. The fact is, the Bible Society never presumed either to *permit* or prevent the circulation of the word of God, in any version or edition whatever. The Society was formed for the purpose of distributing the Scriptures gratuitously, or at a small price, in order that the poor might have free access to the words of eternal life: and the Society made it a rule, which they had a right to do, that the version which they would print and circulate in our own language, should be the authorized one. But this is very different from not *permitting* the circulation of any other version. If I choose to give to a few poor families in the city a comfortable dinner from the stall of my own flesher, does this imply that I will not *permit* any family in Glasgow to procure a dinner from any other quarter? This is the amount of my opponent's assertion. The Bible Society profess to *give away* only one version in English; *ergo,* they will not *permit* the circulation of any other. A child would be ashamed of such logic.

But there is more in this than at first meets the eye. AMICUS VERITATIS wishes it to be understood, that, with regard to the circulation of the Scriptures, his church acts upon the same principle with the Bible Society. He knows that this society is popular. He knows that they confine their distribution of the English Scriptures to the authorized version; and, taking it for granted that this is the same as *not permitting* the circulation of any other, he brings his church under the protection of this respectable Society, and hopes that all the friends of the latter will respect the former, for she does not permit her children "to read any edition of the Scriptures but what is approved by the church."

I am persuaded none but a Papist could have used the language of AMICUS VERITATIS, at least no enlightened Protestant would speak of either permitting, or not permitting, the circulation of the Scriptures, except it were in reference to the practice of the Church of Rome. From my opponent's own words, I hope to prove that his church is guilty of antichristian presumption, and rebellion against God. He falsely asserts, that the Bible Society will not permit the circulation of any but the authorized version of the Scriptures; and he represents this as the same that is done by his church, that will not permit the circulation of any version but such as she approves. The plain meaning of his words is, the Church of Rome permits the reading of some versions of the Scriptures, and does not permit the circulation or reading of other versions. I appeal to himself if this be not a correct statement of his sentiments; and I appeal to every reader, whether this be not representing the Church of Rome in the most favourable light, with regard to the subject in hand. Now, what I am to prove is, that the assumption of a power to *permit* the reading of the Scriptures, is antichristian presumption, and rebellion against God. I expect Mr Andrews will be overwhelmed by astonishment, and perfect wonder, when he reads this sentence; and he will likely reprint it in large capitals to excite the amazement of his readers. No matter, I am perfectly serious in bringing this charge against his church, and I hope to make it good.

The Scriptures contain the word of God, which is addressed to every human creature under heaven. They contain a complete revelation of his will for the salvation of our fallen race. They inform us how our race became fallen and ruined, and of the provision which God has made for the recovery and salvation of miserable sinners, by the incarnation, obedience, and death of his own Son. That part of the Bible which is properly called the gos-

pel, is purely a revelation of the mercy of God to sinners. It is a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners, upon the footing of what Christ has done in the stead of the guilty, when he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. The Bible informs us, how guilty and miserable creatures become interested in what Christ has done and suffered in the room of the ungodly;—that it is in the way of believing in him; for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life, (John iii. 16.) This is good news,—it is glad tidings of great joy to all people, (Luke ii. 10.); and by the commandment of the everlasting God, it is to be made known to all people, (Rom. xvi. 26.) Christ gave commandment to his apostles, to go into all the world and preach the gospel, that is, publish the good news to every creature, (Mark xvi. 15.) And he gave them a promise to be with them always to the end of the world, insomuch that their speaking was his speaking —their words were his words,—he that heard them heard him. The words spoken by apostles, therefore, and the words which they wrote, have all the authority of a voice from heaven. Christ is with his apostles still, and he will be with them to the end of the world, to give power and efficacy to their words, because they are his own words; and whether they are published in the way of reading, or in the way of preaching, he gives them a spirit and a power which effectually subdues the objects of his mercy, and turns them to himself. The preaching, or in any way, the publication of the gospel, is the means of divine appointment for the conversion and salvation of sinners.

In short, the Bible is the word of God addressed to his own creatures; and who are they that presume to *permit* the Almighty to speak to his creatures? The Church of Rome does so, according to the testimony of modern Papists; and it is understood to be great condescension in the church to grant such permission; for this is the same thing as granting permission to creatures to hear what the Almighty speaks to them. The reader will observe, it is spoken in the way of boasting, at least in the way of vindicating the Church of Rome, that she does not *absolutely prohibit*, but in certain circumstances she *permits*, the reading of the Scriptures; that is, she permits fallen and miserable creatures to hear what their Creator says to them, which is the same thing as permitting the Almighty to speak to them.

Where was there ever greater arrogance and presumption? Is it possible to imagine greater contempt of divine authority, and more direct rebellion against the majesty of heaven, than this affected condescension of the Romish Church? She does not absolutely *forbid* the Almighty to speak to his creature,—she *permits* it in certain circumstances.

In the Bible, the Almighty addresses us as by a voice from heaven, "Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else," (Isa. xliv. 22.) The Church of Rome stands by, and presumes to decide who shall, and who shall not, hear these words of the Almighty Saviour; and if any person at all hear them, it is by her permission. Surely, then, this Church of Rome is that Antichrist, that opposing power that exalts itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. To assume the power of permitting creatures to hear what God shall speak, is assuming a power and authority at least equal to that of God, and a right to controul, or at least to regulate the manner of his communicating his will to his own creatures.

I shall suppose a case, which I hope is level to the capacity of all my readers. I shall suppose there were some traitors in our city, or in the neighbourhood, and, suppose the Prince Regent, acting in name and on behalf of his Majesty, extremely averse from persecuting these traitors so as to affect their lives, issued a proclamation, promising a free pardon to all who would submit themselves to the authority of the laws:— Now, suppose that our Lord Provost and Magistrates were to call a council, and make it a matter of consideration, whether or not they would *permit* the said proclamation to be published in Glasgow; and if they should even come to the decision that they would *permit* it, would not they themselves be held as traitors, merely for presuming to put their authority on a footing with that of the sovereign, and presuming to *permit* his proclamation to be published.?

This is precisely the case with the Church of Rome, upon the most partial view of her conduct, as given by her own friends. The gospel of Christ is a proclamation of mercy to rebels and traitors. It is contained in the Bible. And as the Church of Rome claims the power of granting permission, only in certain circumstances, to read the Bible, she places her authority, at least, upon an equality with the authority of God, by determining whether or not the said proclamation of mercy shall be published,—who shall, and who shall not be allowed to hear it.

Thus, the very condescension of the Church of Rome,—her permitting the reading of the Scriptures in certain circumstances, of which her friends make a boast,—is proved to be impious presumption, and rebellion against God. It is arrogating an authority which belongs to no creature, nor to any assembly of creatures, to decide when and to whom the Almighty shall address his overtures of mercy and grace; and who shall hear that gospel

which he commanded to be preached to every creature.

I have hitherto been arguing on the most favourable view of the conduct of the Church of Rome,—that she does *permit* the reading of the Scriptures in certain circumstances. The claim of an authority to permit, indicates her antichristian temper; and this very claim implies an authority to prevent the reading of the Scriptures, whenever it shall happen that prevention is more agreeable to her than permission. This in general has been the case: and if her assumed authority of permitting, proves her to be the Antichrist, much more will her assumed authority of preventing, fix that character upon her.

AMICUS VERITATIS says, that I cannot produce any authority of the Council of Trent *absolutely forbidding* the reading of the Scriptures. This is admitting that the reading of them is forbidden, but not *absolutely;* and this is precisely the import of the canon of the said council. The reading of the Bible is forbidden generally; but there are exceptions. It is not forbidden to clergymen. It is not even forbidden to such discreet laymen as are otherwise secured from being hurt by it, provided they read only such translations as have been made by Catholic authors; but to the great body of the people it is forbidden. The bishops and inquisitors are constituted sole judges, who are and who are not fit to be trusted with the word of God, even after it has been neutralised by the corrupt glosses of translators and commentators: and if any poor layman should be detected with a Bible in his possession, though it should be one of those which have been fenced by Popish annotations, he is considered guilty of so great a crime, that he cannot receive the ablution,—the pardon, or washing from his sins, till he has sent away the Bible from his house. This is the express law of the Church of Rome, as it was decreed by the Council of Trent, and as it stands at this day; for every Popish priest is taken bound by solemn oath to adhere to all the doctrines and canons of that council.

The Almighty addresses his word to every child of Adam: but the Church of Rome forbids any of its members to hear or to read it, but a favoured few, who must have a license for the purpose! This is directly setting up her authority against the authority of God. He calls upon all men to hear him. His voice is to the sons of men. It is addressed to all ranks and classes of the human race without exception. But the Church of Rome will not suffer *all men* to hear the voice of God in his word. She allows it to be addressed only to such as will receive thereby an *increase* of faith and piety; that is, to persons who are already faithful and pious in some degree. God addresses his gospel to sinners, as such, in order that, hearing and believing it, sinners may be saved. But the Church of Rome exercises her authority to prevent, as far as she is able, the word of God from reaching the ears of sinners. Thus, she proves herself to be in league with Satan, for the purpose of keeping men under the bondage of sin, to the everlasting ruin of their souls.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us, in plain words, without dissembling, that the church *commands* her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures but that which she approves; and he says, the Council of Trent and the church *merely* do this, as if it were a small matter; but in fact, this was an absolute prohibition of reading the Bible, to at least nine tenths of the people, for the only edition or version that was approved by the Church, for many centuries, was the Latin Vulgate, which none but the learned could read. Commanding her children, therefore, to read no other, was an absolute prohibition to the unlearned. It does not appear that even the original Hebrew and Greek, the very words which were written by prophets and apostles, were approved by the Church of Rome. At least, in order to discourage the study of the Scriptures in the original tongues, the Council of Trent declared the Vulgate to be of equal authority, which is the doctrine of the Church on this subject.

No. XXXI.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13TH, 1819.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells me, that I "cannot produce any decree of the Council of Trent, absolutely forbidding the reading of the Scriptures." Then he informs me that "the Council of Trent, and the Church, *merely* command her children not to read any edition of the Scriptures, but that which is approved by the Church." I showed, in my last Number, that this *mere* command was, for several centuries, the same thing as an absolute prohibition; for the only version approved by the Church was the Latin Vulgate; and the command of the Church to read no other, was really a command to the unlearned not to read the Scriptures at all. I showed also, that the assumption of a power to grant permission to read the Bible, was no less than assuming a power to permit the Almighty to speak to his creatures, which is antichristian arrogance and presumption.

It is no better, whatever worse, to assume the power of *preventing* the reading of the Bible. Of this the Church of Rome is notoriously guilty; and AMICUS VERITATIS virtually admits the fact, by asserting that she merely commanded her children not to read any version but such as she approved; that is, only the Latin Vulgate. Suppose the people were

eagerly desiring instruction; suppose they were hungering for the bread of life, that is, desiring to possess and know the word of God, the Church of Rome presents it to them in Latin,—a language which they do not understand,—and commands them not to receive it in any other language. What is this but giving the people a stone instead of bread? What is it but saying to the poor, Be thou warmed, be thou clothed, and yet not giving them the things which are needful for these purposes? The apostle James has taught us how to estimate such pretensions to charity.

The word of God was given to the Church in Rome, as it was given to other churches, for the instruction and edification of her members, and for the rule of their conduct. I say the Church *in* Rome; for the Bible knows nothing of the Church *of* Rome, but as the Antichrist, the grand apostasy that should arise in the latter days. The Church in Rome was a company of believers in the saving truths of the gospel, who made a public and explicit profession of their faith in Christ, and who remained steadfast in the faith, notwithstanding the opposition which they had to encounter; insomuch, that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. This Church claimed no authority over any other church. It was content to hold communion with the Church in Jerusalem, and with every other church of Christ, upon a footing of perfect equality. It was favoured by a letter from the apostle Paul, and by his personal ministry for a time; not by the ministry of Peter, for it has not yet been proved that the latter apostle was ever in Rome.

There is no reason to doubt that while the Church in Rome continued to hold the faith of the gospel, they would hold by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and also of the New Testament, as they were communicated to them; and they would consider it the duty of every member to read, and hear, and understand what God said to him, in the holy writings. By reading and understanding these, they would become wise unto salvation; and they would endeavour to communicate the knowledge of them to all around.

But in process of time, a deplorable change took place. The Church *in* Rome became the Church *of* Rome. The society of believers in that city was superseded by a motley group of persons of the city,—of mere worldly men,—who soon began to mould the Church according to the maxims of the world. By the time of Constantine the Great, it had become a worldly society: he took it into union with the state, became its patron, and virtually its head and governor.

Christianity now became popular and fashionable. Multitudes of heathens flocked into the Church and they were cordially received, without any evidence of their having embraced the faith of Christ, and thereby become new creatures. They were old men under a new name,—still heathens, under the name of Christians. Such persons could not submit to the simplicity of the gospel. It was necessary to introduce into Christian worship a number of heathen rites, to please the heathen converts; and thus, in a short time, what was called Christianity was little better than the old Roman idolatry.

In this state of things, it became necessary to keep the Bible out of the view of the common people. Christianity, as represented in that book, was quite a different thing from the system maintained by the Romish priests. They gave themselves out as the only channels through which the blessings of Heaven were dispensed to men. The influences of the Holy Ghost, as they taught, could be communicated only through them. Originally, a church meant a society of believers: now the priests claimed the title to themselves; and they gave out their decrees as having infallible authority. In such circumstances, they had no use for the Bible. Infallible bodies, as general councils professed to be, could not be subject to any authority but their own. The original Scriptures were suffered to be neglected. Happily there was a translation made into Latin, before the Church had reached the summit of corruption; and this Latin version, called the Vulgate, was no doubt the means of preserving and communicating the knowledge of real Christianity to many individuals during the dark ages. But the Latin became a dead language, and was not understood by the common people in any country. It was the interest of the priests to keep the sacred word thus locked up from the sight of vulgar eyes; and, for several centuries, there was no attempt made by the Church of Rome to give a version of it, in the vulgar tongue of any nation. Thus, practically, the Church was guilty of withholding the Bible from the people; and, therefore, guilty of cruelty and injustice, according to the declaration of the Rev. Andrew Scott, as quoted in my last Number.

There were, however, some individuals, whose names ought to be held in everlasting remembrance, who having derived the knowledge of salvation from the Latin Bible, desired to communicate the contents of the blessed book to their countrymen, in their own language. Among these, John Wickliffe, of England, holds a distinguished place. Wickliffe found in the Bible a purer Christianity than that which he saw every where professed; and he could not rest till he had given his countrymen a version of the word of God, in their vulgar tongue.

Now, what was the consequence? The Church of Rome took the alarm. Of all the dreadful things in the world, the Bible was most to be dreaded. When Wickliffe published

his translation, Pope Gregory sent a bull to the university of Oxford, in 1378, in which the translator, who was a Professor of Divinity in that university, was described as "run into a kind of detestable wickedness, not only for openly publishing, but also vomiting, out of the filthy dungeon of his breast, diverse professions, false and erroneous conclusions, and most wicked and damnable heresies." The object of this bull was to excite a persecution against Wickliffe, for having translated the Scriptures; and although he was preserved from it, during his lifetime, yet the malice of his persecutors continued, and they were not satisfied until they had dug up his bones and burnt them, many years after his death.

"Afterwards, when a new translation was made, and printed by Tindal, a proclamation was set forth, in 1546, by the king for the abolishing of English books, published under pretence of expounding and declaring the truth of God's Scripture; and it was directed, that, from henceforth, no man, woman, or person, of what estate, condition, or degree soever he be, or they be, shall, after the last day of August next ensuing, receive or have, take or keep, in his possession, the text of the New Testament, of Tindal or Coverdale's translation into English."—*See Mr Fox's Account of the Proceedings of the Lancasterian School Society in Glasgow*, pp. 69, 70.

"When Luther had commenced the glorious work of reformation on the Continent, and printed the Scriptures in the German language, Pope Leo X. issued a bull against him, couched in the most violent and opprobrious terms, and, after having called upon the Lord to rise up, and the apostles Peter and Paul to rise up, against the foxes which had risen up, seeking to destroy the vineyard, lest these heresies should further increase, and these foxes gather strength against us, he adds, 'Finally, let the whole universal church of God's saints and doctors rise up, whose true expounding of holy Scriptures being rejected, certain persons, (whose hearts the father of lies hath blinded,) wise in their own conceits, (as the manner of heretics is,) do expound the Scriptures otherwise than the Holy Ghost doth require, following only their own sense of ambition and vainglory, yea, rather do wrest and adulterate the Scriptures. So that, as *Hierome* saith, now they make it not the gospel of Christ, but of man; or, which is worse, of the devil. Let all the holy church, I say, rise up, and, with the blessed apostles together, make intercession to Almighty God, that the errors of all schismatics being rooted and stocked up, his holy church may be continued in peace and unity.'

"This bull farther condemned all persons who did not surrender Luther's books, and it was the forerunner of one of the most bloody persecutions which ever fell upon the earth. The time would fail me to record the histories of those of whom the world was no worthy, who were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; but I wish to produce two examples:—In 1514, Richard Hunne, of London, who was murdered in his prison, was charged with various religious offences, one of which was, 'that he had, in his keeping, divers English books, prohibited and *damned* by the law; as, the Apocalypse, in English, Epistles and Gospels, in English,' &c., and he was further charged, that 'he defendeth the translation of the Bible and holy Scriptures into the English tongue, *which is prohibited by the laws of our holy mother church.*"—*See Mr Fox's Pamphlet, as above.*

From these facts it is perfectly evident, that it was understood to be a law of the Church of Rome, that the Bible was, by all means, to be withheld from the common people. The Scriptures in English, and, of course, the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue of any nation, were prohibited, in most cases, *absolutely prohibited*, "by the laws of our holy mother church."

I grant, that, after the Reformation, the Church of Rome began to *permit* the translation of the Scriptures into modern languages, by Popish translators; and generally with notes and annotations, to guard the faithful from the danger that might arise from reading the simple unadulterated word of truth. Yet even this was considered as a dangerous experiment; and it was judged best not to give the people the Bible, in their own language, except when there was danger of their receiving it from Protestants. The Rhemish translators, as we shall see by and by, plainly avow this as the motive of their undertaking.

It is worthy of remark, that, in one instance at least, the Pope was more forward in granting the Bible to the people, in their own language, than most of his clergy were. It is recorded of Pope Sixtus V.—*(See his Life,* with Preface and Notes, by Farneworth, 8vo., Dublin, 1766, p. 562.)—"He had caused the Vulgate Latin edition of the Bible to be published, the last year, which occasioned a good deal of clamour in the world; but nothing like what there was this year, (1589,) upon his printing an Italian version of it. This set all the Roman Catholic part of Christendom in an uproar. Count Olivarez, and some of the cardinals, ventured to expostulate with him pretty freely upon it, and said, it was a scandalous, as well as a dangerous thing, and *bordered very nearly upon heresy*. But he treated them with contempt, and only said, *we do it for the benefit of you that don't understand Latin.* The most zealous of the cardinals wrote to the king of Spain, intreating him to interpose, and think of some remedy for this evil, as he was more interested in it than any one else, with regard to the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, and the duchy of Milan; for, if the Bible should come to be publicly read there, in the vulgar tongue, it

might raise scruples and uneasinesses in the consciences of those people: as it was, besides, one of the first principles of heretics to read the Scriptures in the common tongue.

"Philip, who was a furious bigot, ordered his ambassador to use his utmost endeavours with the Pope to suppress this edition, as it would give infinite offence; and said, if he did not, he should be obliged to make use of such means to prevent its being read, in his kingdoms, as his zeal for true religion suggested, and the Almighty had put into his hands. Olivarez, having received these orders, immediately demanded an audience of the Pope, and represented to him, with much warmth, how disagreeable this new version was to his master, and what scandal it gave to his whole court. Sixtus suffered him to harangue, with great vehemence, for above an hour, and when he was come to the end of his career, made no answer. Upon which the Count said, 'Won't your Holiness be pleased to let me know your thoughts upon this matter?' 'I am thinking,' says Sixtus, 'to have you thrown out of the window, to teach other people how to behave, when they address themselves to the Pontiff;' and immediately made haste out of the apartment. The poor ambassador, who was sufficiently acquainted with the temper of Sixtus, made haste out of the Vatican, expecting he would have been as good as his word; and when he got home, and had recovered his spirits a little, said, 'Thank God, I have had a great escape to-day.'"

This shows the manner in which the Pope could speak to the ambassadors of the greatest monarchs in Europe. And it shows clearly that the feeling of the Church, and of the cardinals, and the king of Spain, in particular, was so decidedly against giving the Bible to the people, in their own language, that the very head of the Church incurred some danger, at least great opposition, when he was determined to publish an Italian version, for the use of his own countrymen. Sixtus was extremely arbitrary in his administration, and sometimes whimsical in his actions. Of the latter, I suppose, his Italian version of the Bible will be considered an evidence. It does not appear, from his history, that he cared much for the doctrine of the Bible, or for any thing else, human or divine, but as it might serve to promote the purposes of his own vanity and ambition. I believe his version of the Scriptures, in Italian, was not extensively circulated. It is probable, his successors would take care to have it suppressed.

More lately, it was judged proper to give the Italians something that should pass for a Bible, in their own language. This was done under the title of *Storia del Vecchio e Nuovo Testimento, &c.* This is a collection of stories taken from the historical parts of Scripture, with what are called moral reflections; and the book is that which is, at this day, presented to a stranger in Italy, when he inquires for a Bible. The following translation of a part of the preface will show that, in the opinion of the editor, who no doubt spoke what he understood to be the doctrine of the Church, the whole Bible was not to be given to the people, in their own language. After complaining of the evil of reading comedies, romances, &c. he says, "I believe that some excuse so pernicious an abuse with the vain pretext of the necessity of diverting themselves with the reading of delightful books, they not being permitted to find this entertainment in the historical books of the sacred Scriptures, because they do not understand the Latin language; *and for just reasons, the vulgar being forbidden them by the Church,* think themselves constrained to have recourse to profane books.

"There is nothing more established by common consent of all the holy fathers, than the respect that Christians are bound to have for the word of God, and the care with which they ought to seek the rule of good living for salvation. And as these saints perfectly knew the profundity of the sacred Scripture, which is filled with mysteries, veiled under various figures and parables, they have made some distinction in this work, although divine, which although it is all equally holy, is not therefore equally intelligible. Therefore, they have thought that the historical books, which represent the lives of the patriarchs, and of the admirable men who had an apostolical charity, so many ages before the apostles, were more proper than others to instruct with example, proportioned to the light which the unlearned faithful usually have. St Basilius, when reflecting upon this, says, that the Scriptures, in describing the lives of these early saints, place before us so many living and animated pictures for our rule and regulation.

"You will find there admirable examples for kings, for princes, for those who govern states, for ministers of the church, for virgins consecrated to God, and finally for all those who desire to live Christianly in the world, and in the matrimonial state, with which the lives of the saints of the Old Testament have greater agreement; because then, they knew almost no other chastity, excepting the conjugal, and of widowhood; the state of virginity being reserved for the new law. Therefore, as Pope St Gregory says, the ancient patriarchs were astonished at any other virtue. Abel, says he, taught innocence; Enoch, purity of heart; Noah, perseverance in justice; Abraham, perfection of obedience; Isaac, chastity in marriage; Jacob, constancy in labour; Joseph, the forgetting of injuries; Moses, mildness towards persons the most contumacious; in fine, Job, invincible patience under a load of afflictions."

With such arguments, the compiler of stories from the Old and New Testament endeavours

to satisfy his Italian readers, that such a compilation is much better for them than the real and entire Bible, as it was given by God himself, by the ministry of prophets and apostles. We are told that, for *just reasons*, the Bible, in the vulgar tongue, *is forbidden by the Church*. We are told that the saints, who drew up such stories, "perfectly knew the profundity of sacred Scripture;" and, I suppose, they knew also the capacity of every layman's understanding, and how much he was able to receive of the truths contained in the Bible. As I mentioned in a former Number, they took great care that nothing should appear in these stories, or the moral reflections upon them, that could injure the holy mother Church, or teach a sinner the way of salvation by Christ alone, without the aid of a priest. While the book continues to be circulated under the authority of the Church, especially while it is sold *as the Bible*, it will furnish the clearest evidence that the Church of Rome does not generally permit the reading of the holy Scriptures: that, in fact, she withholds the word of God from the people, and, therefore, is both cruel and unjust.

With regard to the translation of the Scriptures into English, we have seen how violently the Pope was enraged against Wickliffe for his undertaking such a work. Had the Pope had his will, the translator and his version of the Bible would have been burnt in the same fire; and, indeed, it was no uncommon thing, previous to Luther's Reformation, to burn heretics with the Bible about their neck. The reading of the Bible was understood almost invariably to produce heresy; and there were many who suffered death for no other crime.

I was about to quote the doctrine of the Rhemish translators, on the subject of giving and withholding the Bible from the common people; but lest it should be thought disrespectful to these doctors to bring them in at the end of a Number, I shall fill up what remains of this sheet with something more modern, though perhaps less venerable.

My great opponent, W. E. Andrews, has a correspondent who writes four long letters, in derision of the Bible Society, and against the plan of distributing Bibles, which he declares to be absolutely useless, if not extremely pernicious. He winds up the subject, in his fourth letter, in the following words:—"I would, therefore, suggest to the Bible-men, in order to render their work complete, to give the Book, when they distribute it, a new title, viz. '*Every man his own parson.*' For, as the general distribution of the Bible must infallibly expose that sacred volume to contempt, abuse, and profanation, in meeting with its tattered contents on the public stall, or in the trunk, I would much rather find it exhibiting the above title, than calling itself the word of God. Our Catholic favourers of the Bible-scheme, I would advise to turn their donations to real charity; and one truly consistent with the principles which they profess, the gratuitous distribution among the poor of *your excellent School Book*, one single reading of which will convey to the minds of the ignorant a knowledge of religion, with which a whole life spent in the reading of the Bible would never furnish them. I mean not to flatter you, Mr Editor, but I speak from experience and conviction; and I hesitate not to assert, that, if you had published nothing else but your school book, you would be deserving of the praise and encouragement of every member of the true Church of Christ." —*O. J.* Vol. ii. p. 142.

Thus Mr Andrews is declared by one of his correspondents to have composed a book much better than the Bible. It imparts, at a single reading, more knowledge of religion than one will gather from the Bible in a whole life. Anxious to see this wonderful book, I sent to London, and procured a copy from the shop of Mr Andrews himself, for the small and easy charge of eighteen pence. On opening the book, the following was among the first things that caught my eye:—"Chapter XII. *Of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.* One of the last means which I assign, but also one of the most effectual, for acquiring virtue in youth, is, devotion to the Blessed Virgin. It is infallible to such who assiduously employ it; because it affords, at the same time, the most powerful intercession, in the sight of God, for obtaining his favour, and the most perfect model for our imitation. Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son, Jesus Christ, is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of Mother of God, which raises her above all creatures that God has ever created. By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. She is most powerful with God, to obtain from him all that she shall ask of him." &c. &c. There are five pages of such matter; pp. 151—155. Such are the sentiments of the book composed by Mr Andrews, which is said to be so much more useful than the Bible. If religion consists in devotion to the Virgin Mary, no doubt, we may seek in the Bible all our lives, and not find it; but in this book composed by Mr Andrews, (THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR,) we shall find it in five minutes.

It is vain to expect that Mr Andrews will argue upon Scriptural principles, since, according to the testimony of one of his correspondents, which he prints with great satisfaction, no doubt, in his own Journal, he has composed a book so much better than the Bible, as to render the use of it quite unnecessary. To add weight to the testimony of the above correspondent, the Rev. Dr Milner, Vicar Apostolic, declares, in a letter of recommendation prefixed to the work, that it is by far the most complete and valuable work of its kind

in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public.

No. XXXII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20TH, 1819.

AT the conclusion of my last Number, I quoted the words of a modern Papist, who declares that Mr Andrews, the Catholic Vindicator, and Editor of the Orthodox Journal, had written a book much better than the Bible; a book, one reading of which, he says, will impart more knowledge of religion than could be gathered from the Bible in a whole life: and the author himself seems to acquiesce in the opinion of his correspondent, as he prints the panegyric in his Journal, without so much as a modest hint, that his friend had praised his work too highly.

In the opinion of modern Papists, the Bible is a very useless, and a very dangerous book. Some of them endeavour to conceal, but others very plainly avow this opinion. Of the latter, is the correspondent of the Orthodox Journal, above referred to, and so far as appears, of the Journalist himself. On this subject, it must be allowed, they have deviated less from the doctrine of their fathers than on some other points. I must not be understood to mean that they have in any respect deviated from the ancient doctrine of their church; but merely that their language with regard to the Bible, and the danger of reading it, is more like the language of their fathers, than their modern professions are with regard to other doctrines, such as the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, which, though generally held at one time, is now generally disavowed. In short, it seems to have been a doctrine universally maintained in the church for ages, and it is still publicly maintained by Papists, that the reading of the Bible, by the people indiscriminately, is to be deprecated as a most dangerous thing.

Under this impression the Rhemish translators went to work. They were grieved to see that Protestant translators were giving the people in England the Bible in their own language, some of them without note or comment. They, being mostly English Papists, who were obliged to leave the country in the reign of Elizabeth, settled at Rheims: and there they undertook to give an English version of the Scriptures for the use of their countrymen, with such a load of notes and annotations, as would both make it a costly book, and prevent as much as possible the people from gathering any thing like heresy out of it. They begin their preface in the following manner. Let it be observed, it is only of the New Testament they are speaking, for they say they had not the means of printing the whole Bible, though the whole would have been published at less expense by itself alone, than their New Testament with its cumbrous notes.

"The Holy Bible, long since translated by us into English, and the Old Testament lying by us for lack of good means to publish the whole, in such sort as a work of so great charge and importance requireth: we have yet, through God's goodness, at length fully finished for thee (most Christian reader,) ALL THE NEW TESTAMENT, which is the principal, most profitable, and comfortable piece of holy writ: and as well for all other institutions of life and doctrine, as especially for deciding the doubts of these days, more proper and pregnant, than the other part not yet printed.

"Which translation we do not, for all that, publish upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought, or were ordained of God, to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one that readeth or heareth them in a known language: pernicious and much hurtful to many: or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical learned languages: not for these, nor any such like causes, do we translate this sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, unto which divers things are either necessary, or profitable and medicinable now, that, otherwise, in the peace of the church, were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable."

If we translate this into plain modern English, the meaning will be found to be, that it is not necessary to have the Bible in the mother tongue of any country; that it was not ordained by God to be read by the vulgar; that the reading of it is often very hurtful; that it was not requisite, or even tolerable to have the Bible in the vulgar tongue during the time of the church's peace, that is, before the Reformation; and the grave doctors consent to give a version in English now, merely because, if they will not, some other will; and if they do not give a version well fenced with notes and annotations, the people will be in danger of getting it without any such safeguard. The doctors proceed:—

"In this matter, to mark only the wisdom and moderation of holy church and the governors thereof on the one side, and the indiscreet zeal of the popular and their factious leaders, on the other, is a high point of prudence. These latter, partly of simplicity, partly of curiosity, and especially of pride and disobedience, have made claim in this case for the common people, with plausible pretences many,

but good reasons none at all. The other, to whom Christ hath given charge of our souls, the dispensing of God's mysteries and treasures, (among which holy Scripture is no small store) and the feeding his family in season with food fit for every sort, have neither of old, nor of late, ever wholly condemned all vulgar versions of Scripture, nor have at any time generally forbidden the faithful to read the same; yet they have not by public authority prescribed, commanded, or authentically ever recommended, any such interpretation to be indifferently used of all men."

Here we learn that those who plead on behalf of the people, that they may have the word of God in their own language, do it of simplicity, curiosity, and specially of pride and disobedience; and though they make many plausible pretences, can give no good reasons at all why the people should be allowed to read the word of God. We learn farther, that the church did not condemn all vulgar versions, or forbid the faithful to read the same; that is, she did not condemn, or forbid the people to read what did not exist: and it is admitted, that the church never so much as recommended the Scriptures to be read generally by the people. It would be more like the truth to say, that she did not think it proper, or consistent with her own safety, to give the people a translation of the Scriptures. In the following paragraph the learned doctors speak more plainly:—

"Now since Luther's revolt also, divers learned Catholics, for the more speedy abolishing a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sects, and for the better preservation or reclaim of many good souls endangered thereby, have published the Bible in the several languages of almost all the principal provinces of the Latin church: no other books in the world being so pernicious as heretical translations of the Scriptures, poisoning the people under colour of divine authority, and not many other remedies being more sovereign against the same (if it be used in order, discretion, and humility) than the true, faithful, and sincere interpretation opposed thereunto."

The translators cite the authority of the Council of Trent, and regret that in their days the law, as ordained by that council, could not in all cases be observed; that is, they found it impossible to enforce the law against perverse and presumptuous readers of the Bible. They speak with exultation of those happy times when "the scholar taught not his master, the sheep controlled not the husbandman, artificer, prentice, boys, girls, mystress, maid, man:"—Then the holy Scriptures were not "sung, played, alleged, of every tinker, taverner, rhymer, minstrel;" "they were not for table talk, for ale-benches, for boats and barges, and for every profane person and company. No; in those *better times* men were neither so ill, nor so curious of themselves, so to abuse the blessed book of Christ: neither was there such easy means, before printing was invented, to disperse the copies into the hand of every man, as there is now."—*See the Preface to the Rhemish Translation of the New Testament.*

Certainly, in Popish estimation, these must have been happy times, when the priests held the key of knowledge in their own hands; and when nobody, without their permission, durst look into the word of God. When there was little danger of the people falling into heresy, the priests taught and did what they pleased; and this would probably have been the case to this day, had not such men as Wickliffe and Luther, by translating the Bible into the language of the common people, generously put the key into their hands, that they might search the Scriptures and judge for themselves.

When the Rhemish doctors were giving a translation of the Bible into English, and speaking so strongly of the great evil and danger of its being universally read, one is apt to wonder what comment they would give on such passages as these: "Search the Scriptures," (John v. 39.) and "these were more noble than those of Thessalonica, for they searched the Scriptures daily," &c., (Acts xvii. 11.) On John v. 39. they have the following marginal note:—"Catholics search the Scriptures, and find there Peter's and his successors' primacy, the real presence, priests' power to forgive sins, justification by faith and good works, virginity preferred before matrimony, breach of the vow of continency damnable, voluntary poverty, penance, alms, and good deeds meritorious, divers rewards in heaven according to divers merits, and such like." And upon the same verse they have the following annotation:—"He reprehendeth the Jews, that reading daily the Scriptures, and acknowledging that in them they should find life and salvation, they yet looked over them so superficially that they could not find therein him to be Christ, their King, Lord, Life, and Saviour. For the special masters and scribes of the Jews then, were like unto our heretics now, who be ever talking, and turning, and shuffling the Scriptures, but are of all men most ignorant of the deep knowledge thereof. And, therefore, our Master referreth them not to the reading only, or learning them without book, or having the sentences thereof gloriously painted or written in their temple, houses, or cotes; but to the deep search of the meaning and mysteries of the Scriptures, which are not so easily to be seen in the letter." By such unintelligible jargon the grave doctors attempt to set aside the divine command to search the Scriptures.

They are not more successful in their annotation on Acts xvii. 11. They say, "The heretics use this place to prove that the hearers must try and judge by the Scriptures, whether

their teachers' and preachers' doctrine be true, and so reject what they find not in the Scriptures, as though here the sheep were made judges of their pastors, the people of their priests, and men and women of all sorts, even of St Paul's doctrine itself; which were the most foolish doctrine in the world." It may appear to Popish priests a very foolish thing, that the people should judge of their doctrine, and try it by the standard of Scripture; but the inspired writer of the Acts of the Apostles has left on record an honourable testimony on behalf of the Bereans, that they did the very thing which the priests would reckon so foolish and disorderly; and however much the teachers of error may dread the practice of trying their doctrine by the Bible, I can imagine nothing more delightful to a teacher of the truth, than to know that his hearers can, and that they do make it their business to examine and prove all that he inculcates, by that unerring standard. Faithful ministers have nothing of their own to inculcate. Their business is to publish the very truth which they find in the Bible, and nothing else; and should they, at any time, mistake the meaning of a passage, a circumstance which may happen with persons who lay no claim to infallibility, instead of being offended, they would be much indebted to any one of their flock who might set them right. Popish priests look upon the common people as the dust beneath their feet, to whom no degree of respect or consideration is due; but the evangelical pastor of a Christian congregation looks upon his people as his brethren and his equals, who, though they have not the official oversight of the flock with which he is honoured, and may not have had the same advantages of education, yet, having the word of God in their hands, and daily access to the throne of grace, by prayer, for the understanding of it, may, by the divine blessing, come to such a knowledge of its contents, as to be able, in some cases, to instruct their teachers, especially such of them as are young, and have but recently entered upon the work of the ministry. In point of fact, I know that this has been the case; and what minister of Christ would not glory in having such persons among his flock, instead of complaining of them as an insufferable nuisance? This is, however, incomprehensible by a Papist. With him the priest is every thing, and the people are nothing. The priest may utter from the pulpit the grossest nonsense; and the people dare not judge of it, or call in question the truth of what they hear. This would involve the absurdity of the sheep judging their pastor: and the use of this similitude, which is brought forward oftener than once by the Rhemish translators, seems intended to impress upon the people the idea that they are as much inferior to their priests as sheep are to their shepherds.

In short, it seems to have been the design of these translators, even when they were presenting to their countrymen the New Testament in English, to impress them with an idea that they would have been much safer without it: and that they would act the part of wise men by meddling as little with it as possible. The translators cannot conceal their apprehension that the word of God in English will do mischief; but they have done every thing in their power to prevent this, by mixing up with it a copious quantity of their own stuff, in the form of notes and annotations, which are calculated, as much as the traditions of the elders were, to make the word of God of none effect. Indeed, these Rhemish doctors have proved themselves genuine descendants of the Jewish priests, of whom the Lord by his prophet complained, that instead of dispensing his word as living water, pure from the source, they had rendered it muddy by their corrupt mixtures. "Seemeth it a small thing unto you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures? and to have drunk of the deep waters, but you must foul the residue with your feet? And as for my flock, they eat that which ye have trodden with your feet; and they drink that which ye have fouled with your feet."—Ezek. xxxiv. 18, 19.

Now, as I said at the beginning of this Number, there is less difference between the language of ancient and modern Papists on this subject than on some others. Whatever Mr Scott, who resides in Glasgow, where it would be very unpopular to speak against the circulation of the Bible, may please to say or write upon the subject, his brethren in other places, at this very day, write against the circulation of the Scriptures as plainly as any Papist could have done four hundred years ago; and the Pope lately issued a bull against Bible Societies, of which I may give a copy in my next Number. The following is the doctrine of the Orthodox Journal, as declared by a correspondent, and not objected to by the Editor, or any other correspondent; from which I infer it is the doctrine of English Papists in general, especially as the Editor tells me, that in his church, the faith of one is the faith of all.—(See *Catholic Vindicator*, p. 1.)

The writer says, I shall "conclude my present (letter) with lamenting that the characteristic spirit of my country, a spirit of charity and benevolence, should evaporate in such airy schemes, as the attempt to propagate Christianity by the mere distributing of the Bible among people, of whom not one half can read at all, and of those who can read, each is to be allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense he pleases. Time was, Mr Editor, but it was when the genuine form of Christianity, as introduced by its first Apostles, flourished in the land, when the charity of our truly pious ancestors, receiving its proper direc-

tion from *religion*, excited the admiration of surrounding nations by the magnificent and heaven-inspiring edifices which it erected for the celebration of the worship of the Most High, by the countless foundations which it instituted for the promotion of piety, and by its innumerable receptacles for the distressed of all conditions, which, while they afforded relief to the body, provided much more effectually for the soul the kind aids and comforts of religion, to prepare her for future bliss. May heaven grant those days may yet return!" —*O. J.* Vol. II. p. 98.

I invite this writer to come to Glasgow, and he will witness the accomplishment of his prayer. Such days have actually returned in our city. Papists have expended, it is said, fifteen thousand pounds in erecting a "heaven-inspiring" edifice; and I question if ever they expended fifteen hundred pence in distributing the Bible. Their charity has not evaporated in such "airy schemes," as giving the people the word of God. In the New Testament, we read nothing of "heaven-inspiring edifices," nor of any sort of material buildings, as at all connected with the glory of the gospel church; but in the opinion of Papists, whose religion is not derived from the New Testament, but from ancient Heathenism, the building of splendid edifices is looked upon as a much more pious work than the distribution of the holy Scriptures. Let it be observed, this is not merely the opinion of ancient doctors of the church; it is publicly avowed in the Orthodox Journal as lately as 1814.

The writer ought to have known, that it is no part of the Bible Society's plan to give the holy Scriptures to those who cannot read; but only to those who can; and though it is no part of its plan, as a society, to promote the education of the poor in the art of reading, yet, in point of fact, most of its members have become in one way or other extremely active in the work of education. The necessity of distributing the Bible for the salvation of sinners, suggested the necessity of teaching the poor to read; and societies upon an extensive scale have been formed for the purpose. These, so far as they relate to the teaching of poor Papists, are as great an eye-sore to Popish writers as the Bible Society itself, of which I have abundant evidence before me, in some virulent letters in the Orthodox Journal, against the Hibernian Society, whose object it is to teach the art of reading to all the poor in Ireland.

To the insinuation of the correspondent of the Orthodox Journal, that each of those who read the Bible is "allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense he pleases," I have only to reply that I know no power on earth that has a right to hinder him, if he be so wickedly inclined. The word of God is addressed to sinners with sufficient evidence, and sufficient plainness; and if, through prejudice, or any corrupt bias of the heart, men choose to pervert it, and twist it to a meaning which it does not convey, they must answer for their wickedness, not to man, but to God. He reserves the judgment in this case to himself; and though he authorizes all his churches to put away from them those who so pervert his word, if any such should arise among them, yet he has given no man, or body of men on earth, the power either to allow or prevent the free exercise of private judgment. If persons would bring to the perusal of the Bible an unbiassed mind, they would find it the plainest book in the world. Every thing that relates to the way of salvation, that is, every thing of primary importance, is perfectly level to the capacity of a child; and if persons will pervert, and twist to a false meaning, what is so plain and simple, they must answer to God for their folly. Fellow creatures have no right to hinder them. Christians pity them, and pray for them, and would gladly reclaim them, even at the expense of suffering the scorn and contempt of the objects of their pity; but they have no right to use coercion.

If it were not so that all men, in this free country, were allowed the exercise of private judgment; if they were not even allowed to twist the sacred letter to whatever sense or nonsense they pleased, Papists would not be allowed to hold, much less to publish their nonsense; for of all the sects in existence, none exhibit such a monstrous mass of nonsense as the Church of Rome does; and it is nonsense founded partly upon the twisting and perversion of many plain texts of Scripture, of which numerous examples could be given from the Rhemish notes and annotations.

From this writer, however, I learn that if his party had the upper hand in this country, they would not allow persons to twist and turn the letter of Scripture to any sense or nonsense they pleased: that is, in plain English, they would not allow the right of private judgment. They would withhold the Bible altogether, as their fathers did, if they could, and if they could not, they would give it with an authoritative interpretation, with a command, under severe penalties, not to derive any other meaning from the sacred word than what they chose to impose upon it. This is not the doctrine of any one writer; it pervades the writings of all Papists ancient and modern. Even AMICUS VERITATIS (see Prot. p. 31.) speaks of "private judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and in all matters of religion," as if it were the fruitful source of anarchy, rebellion, and every evil; from which it is plain, that if he had the power in his hands, he would allow none to believe but as the church believed.

No. XXXIII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27TH, 1819.

THE circulation of the holy Scriptures has, of late years, engaged a great deal of public attention. Since the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the subject has become popular. Christians of all denominations have been aroused from their lethargy; and they have begun to wonder at the supineness of their fathers, and of themselves, with regard to an object to which the heart of every Christian ought to be feelingly alive. If the Bible be the word of God, addressed to sinners, for the purpose of showing sinners the way of salvation, every Christian who reflected on the subject, must have felt ashamed that he had made no effort, at least that he had done so little, in order to promote the circulation of the divine word throughout the world. When the subject was brought distinctly before the eyes of our Christian population, all seemed to be impressed by a sense of its importance; and the voluntary contributions of thousands showed that the impression had not been made in vain.

But how did the Popish part of our population feel on this occasion? It has been proved that, according to the ancient doctrine of their church, it was not proper or safe to allow the universal circulation, and indiscriminate reading, of the word of God: it has been shown, that the holy council of Trent solemnly declared that it was manifest by experience, that this did more harm than good. How then could those priests of the Romish church, who had sworn to adhere to all the canons of that council, fall in with the current of public opinion, and consent to the free circulation of the Scriptures among their people? Indeed this was a difficult and a delicate matter. Mr Scott, however, attempted to get over the difficulty, by publicly declaring, that it never was a doctrine or principle of the Church of Rome, to withhold the Bible from the laity; and I must do him the justice to say, that he applied for, and received from the Society, a number of English Bibles, to be distributed among the poor of his communion.

Several Protestant gentlemen in London had formed a plan for printing and dispersing the holy Scriptures in those English versions which are approved by the Church of Rome; and they were encouraged by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a Romish priest in that city, who declared, on behalf of himself and brethren, that they would be ready to circulate the Bible in English among their people, if any society would give them their own version. Papists make many unreasonable objections to our authorized version of the Scriptures; and they accuse our translators of wilful perversion of the meaning of many passages, while, in point of fact, there is no great difference between their translation and ours, of those passages which relate most immediately to the way of salvation. Their own Douay Bible, and Rhemish Testament, both of which I have been consulting, declare very explicitly the way of salvation by Jesus Christ; and I think they would not lead to any fatal error,* were they disencumbered of the absurd notes and annotations, which are hung as a dead weight upon them.

The following are the words of the priest above referred to, in a letter to the Rev. Dr Marsh: "If any of the Bible Societies feel disposed to try our esteem for the Bible, by presenting us some copies of a Catholic version, *with* or *without* notes, we will gratefully accept, and faithfully distribute them."

A sum of money was subscribed, and plans were taken into consideration, for printing and circulating gratuitously, or at a small price, those Bibles in English which the priests professed to approve; and the gentlemen associated for the purpose were so simple as to expect that the priests would concur with them, seeing it had been publicly declared, that they would gratefully accept, and faithfully distribute copies of their own version, if any of the Bible Societies would put it in their power. The event, however, showed that they would do no such thing. When the proposal was made by a body of Protestants, to supply the poor of the Romish Church with their own version of the Bible, *without* notes, the very priest who had publicly declared his readiness to further the plan, resisted the execution of it.

This led to a long correspondence, which has been printed, and very extensively circulated, under the title of "Correspondence on the formation, objects, and plan, of the Roman Catholic Bible Society," &c., 8vo., London, 1813. I need not give large extracts from this work, as it is pretty generally known. It shows clearly, that the reverend gentleman, though he wished to make a parade of his regard for the Bible, and his willingness to assist in dispersing it, while the subject was popular, had yet no real intention of doing so. When his offer was embraced, and Protestants were about to give him copies of the New Testament, in his own approved version, he found out, or "he feared it would oppose a *principle* of his church, if Catholics were to print the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue without notes; and that they could not allow the English Bible without them, because ignorant persons would misinterpret certain important texts, unaccompanied by explanations."

* I must be understood to except their translation of Heb. xi. 21. which represents Jacob as an idolater at the hour of his death. He "adored the top of his rod," say the Rhemists;—He "worshipped the top of his rod," say the Douay doctors: meaning, as they say in a note, the top of Joseph's sceptre, as to a figure of Christ's sceptre and kingdom.

Mr Gandolphy was asked, "whether the New Testament, which Protestants meant to reprint without notes, provided it were done faithfully from the Rhemish version, would be generally acceptable to the Catholic people? He answered, that himself and several other clergymen would put some copies in circulation; though he could not say they would be universally acceptable, as it was not a Catholic principle to recommend the Scriptures without such explanations. Moreover, the English Catholic Board did not now intend to disperse *gratuitously*, even their own stereotype edition, *with notes;* for they could not go about to desire people to receive Testaments, '*because the Catholics did not in any wise consider the Scriptures necessary.*' He said, they learnt and taught *their* religion by means of catechisms and elementary tracts."—P. 12, 13.

"Mr Gandolphy was positive that the Catholic clergy would not relax a single principle which had always been in exercise to this time; that they would never put the English Scriptures into the hands of the poor and ignorant; nor yet give the Bible gratuitously, even *with notes*, to every body who applied for it, but only under the direction and at the will of their superiors." P. 14.

Thus it appears very plainly, that Popish priests in England, at this very day, dare not trust their common people with the word of God, even as translated into English by themselves, without safeguards of their own creation, to prevent the people from finding in it a meaning unfavourable to their fundamental principles. It would be a libel upon the work of any human author, to say that he had written so equivocally, and expressed himself so unhappily, upon subjects interesting in the highest degree to every man and woman, that no one could read his work without great danger, and almost a certainty of imbibing fatal errors. Yet, in this manner do Papists every day libel the book of God. In short, they cannot trust the Almighty with direct communication with his own creatures. While He speaks in his word, they stand by, and claim to have at least word about with him, lest, without their interference, his word would do mischief. Nay, such is the awful presumption and impiety of these priests, that when the Almighty is about to speak to sinners by the Bible, they step forward and say, "Hear us first." Nothing less than this is implied in their guarding and fencing the Bible, by their pernicious prefaces, notes, and annotations, especially as they will not suffer it to speak without these safeguards.

This, of itself, ought to convince the reader that there is, with the Romish priests, a consciousness that the Bible is against them. The Bible is an impartial witness for the truth. The priests will not allow it to speak but through them; the inference is unavoidable,—they are afraid it would speak against them.

Popish writers speak with great reverence of the Bible, as it is locked up in the learned languages, but when it appears in the vulgar language of any country, and when it becomes the study of the common people, then they speak of it as the most pernicious book in the world. Their affected respect for the word of God, and their real abhorrence of it, are more offensive than the sneers of the grossest infidels, just as the "Hail Master!" of Judas was more disgusting than the "Away with him —crucify him!' of the Pharisees and the profane rabble.

The following are the sentiments of another modern Papist on this subject:—"If the promiscuous reading of the Scriptures be calculated to produce any effect, it is to scatter the seeds of religious discord and frenzy, to give birth to new species of Methodists, and to fill the world with scriptural maniacs. Were the sacred volumes clear and intelligible to every one; were it impossible to mistake their meaning, the Rev. and Right Rev. Patrons of Bible Societies would merit well of Christianity. But as long as they are difficult to be understood; as long as they treat of subjects which do not lie within the sphere of limited capacities, the sacred text will be wrested by the vulgar to their own perdition, unless a pillar of light go before them to direct their steps through the dark mazes of Biblical erudition. Ignorance is generally self-sufficient; and we cannot be surprised, that the most illiterate plebeian should imagine himself capable of understanding the sacred writings. Let him but once form this notion (and what Dissenter has not already formed it?) and then farewell to the tenets of the Established Church. I have somewhere read a story of a Dutch Calvinist, who, like an English Protestant, thought herself capable of understanding the word of God contained in her Bible. It happened that this Biblical lady was in company with an English priest, and the conversation turning on religion, she grew warm. During the course of their polemical disquisitions, the priest asserted the insufficiency of Scripture, as a rule of faith: his female antagonist, anxious for the integrity of her fundamental principle, boldly asserted the contrary; and, with more zeal perhaps than prudence, defied her sacerdotal adversary to point out a passage which she could not expound. To try her scriptural abilities, he fixed on the 14th verse of the xlii. chapter of Ecclesiasticus, "*Better is the iniquity of a man, than the good works of a woman,*" and desired her to explain it. After waiting some time, in hopes of being visited by the Holy Spirit, she found it impossible to solve the difficulty. At length growing impatient of defeat, and ashamed of being unable to defend herself and her sex, from the appar-

ently harsh and ungenteel reflection of the sacred penman, she threw herself headlong into the canal, and it was with considerable difficulty that the waterman rescued her ladyship from an untimely grave." *Orthodox Journal Vol.* III. *p.* 355.

The above, I suppose, is intended to exhibit a specimen of Popish wit, at the expense of the Bible, which is said to treat of "subjects which do not lie within the sphere of limited capacities," and which, it is taken for granted, are not clear and intelligible to every one. But if the Bible contains only matter which does not lie within the sphere of limited capacities, it must be as much beyond the capacity of the priest as of the plebeian, for the priests have not yet proved that their capacities are unlimited; and if the Bible be not clear and intelligible to *every* one, it is not so to *any* one; and therefore the Popish argument goes to set aside the authority of the Bible altogether. Papists would act more like honest men, by avowing this to be their object, than by affecting great respect for the Bible, while they are labouring to undermine its authority.

As for the story of the Dutch lady, I shall not call it a forgery, though many things, a thousand times better authenticated, are called forgeries by my Popish opponents. Supposing it to be a true story, I am far from praising her boldness and confidence in her own theological knowledge; for while I maintain that such parts of the Bible as relate directly to the salvation of sinners are level to the capacity of a child, I must allow that there are some things not easily understood, particularly prophecies not yet accomplished, and of which the priests are as ignorant as the meanest of their people. But it is unfortunate for the argument of the writer on whose letter I am animadverting, that the passage of which he made choice to try the lady's knowledge of the Bible, is not in the Bible; and it is also a little unfavourable to the credit of his story, that the lady should not have known this. There is certainly no such assertion in the Bible, and there is nothing in sentiment that borders upon it, that the "iniquity of a man is better than the good works of a woman;" and I cannot imagine any object which the writer could have in view, but to bring the Bible into contempt, by palming such a sentiment upon it. The Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, in a religious point of view, has no more authority than the Orthodox Journal; and therefore I have nothing to do with the sentiments contained in it; yet, if the reader will look into the passage as in our English version, he will see that it does not express the meaning above ascribed to it.

In short, it is now, as it has always been, that Papists hate the Bible; they look upon it as their enemy, and they cannot conceal their hostility against it. That this is the case, not merely with a few obscure individuals, but with the very head of the church himself, will appear by the following Bull issued by the present Pope against Bible Societies, in which, it will be seen, he refers to the authority of the council of Trent, and pleads this as a reason for refusing the people in general the Bible in their own language, except under such limitations as would effectually deprive the people of the free use of the sacred volume.

Translation of the Bull against Bible Societies. Issued June 29th, 1816, by Pope Pius VII. to the Archbishop of Gnesn, Primate of Poland. Pius P. P. VII:—

"Venerable Brother,—Health and apostolic benediction.

"In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours; in which you have appealed to this holy see, in the name of the other Bishops of Poland, respecting what are called Bible Societies, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of weighty concerns have so pressed upon us, on every side, that, till this day, we could not yield to your solicitation.

"We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device by which the very foundations of religion are undermined; and having, because of the great importance of the subject, conferred in Council with our venerable Brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we have, with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our Pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence, as far as possible. In the meantime, we heartily congratulate you, venerable Brother, and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances so dangerous to Christianity, in having denounced to the apostolic see, this defilement of the faith, so imminently dangerous to souls. And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since of your own accord you have already shown an ardent desire to detect and overthrow the impious machinations of these innovators; yet, in conformity with our office, we again and again exhort you, that whatever you can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness, placing yourself as a wall for the house of Israel.

"With this view, we issue the present Brief, viz. that we may convey to you a signal testimony of our approbation of your excellent conduct, and also may endeavour therein still more and more to excite your pastoral solicitude and diligence. For the general good imperiously requires you to combine all your means and energies to frustrate the plans,

which are prepared by its enemies for the destruction of our most holy religion; whence it becomes an Episcopal duty, that you first of all expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme, as you have already done so admirably, to the view of the faithful, and openly publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the Church, with all the erudition and wisdom which you possess; namely, 'that the Bible printed by heretics is to be numbered among other prohibited books, conformably to the Rules of the Index (§ Nos. 2 and 3.); for it is evident, from experience, that the holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit,' (Rule IV.) And this is the more to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church. It is, therefore, necessary to adhere to the salutary Decree of the Congregation of the Index (June 13th, 1757,) that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic see, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of holy fathers of the Church.

"We confidently hope that, in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will give the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors; and, by your care, as well as that of the other Prelates of this kingdom, whom, on account of the stand they have wonderfully made for the depository of the Faith, we congratulate in the Lord, trusting that they all may very abundantly justify the opinion we have entertained of them.

"It is moreover necessary that you should transmit to us, as soon as possible, the Bible which Jacob Wulek published in the Polish language with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth without those annotations, taken from the writings of the holy fathers of our Church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it; that thus, from collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, that certain errors lie insidiously concealed therein, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair, for the preservation of the true faith.

"Continue, therefore, venerable Brother, to pursue this truly pious course upon which you have entered; viz. diligently to fight the battles of the Lord for the sound doctrine, and warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snares which are prepared for their everlasting ruin. The Church demands this from you, as well as from the other Bishops, whom our rescript equally concerns; and we most anxiously expect it, that the deep sorrow we feel on account of this new species of tares, which an adversary has so abundantly sown, may, by this cheering hope, be somewhat alleviated: and, we always very heartily invoke the choicest blessings upon yourself and your fellow Bishops, for the good of the Lord's flock, which we impart to you and them by our apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome, at St Mary the Greater, June 29, 1816, the 17th year of our Pontificate. PIUS P. P. VII."

It will be observed that this Bull relates to Poland, a country still enveloped by the grossest darkness of Popery. Attempts had been made to introduce the word of God into that benighted region, by means of a Bible Society; and I believe the attempt has partly succeeded, under the auspices of the emperor of Russia; but the above shows how much the supreme authority of the Church of Rome was opposed to the measure. As a late writer has observed, a council of bats and owls will naturally vote against the light, so it seems the supreme head of the Romish church, with his cardinals and clergy, are decidedly against the people in Poland receiving the holy Scriptures, which are a light to the feet, and a lamp to the path of all that read and believe what they contain, unless this light shall be allowed to shine only through the dense atmosphere which they would throw around it. "No versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue," says his Holiness, "must be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic see, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of holy fathers of the Church."

Now, the Bible stands by divine appointment as a witness for God, between the people and those who profess to teach them. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," Isa. viii. 20. This was a rule which God gave to his people, by which they might try those who professed to have even the gift of prophecy: by this rule the people of Berea tried the preaching of the apostles, and they are praised by the inspired penman for what they did. By this rule, therefore, every man is authorised, nay, he is commanded to try the doctrine of any church, or of any individual, who may address him on subjects of divine revelation. To the law and to the testimony,—does this doctrine agree with the word of God? Is it according to the testimony of the faithful Witness?

Persons conscious of innocence and integrity, if brought to trial before any tribunal, wish above all things to have the plain unbiassed testimony of faithful honest witnesses. But, if I saw a person brought to trial before a court of justice, who would not allow a witness to speak in his own plain way, but would insist on his testimony being received, through the medium of himself, or his counsel, with such glosses and explanations as they chose to give; I would form a verdict in my own mind, which would be confirmed by any jury in the

kingdom, that the pannel was guilty of something which he wished to conceal.

This is precisely the predicament in which the Church of Rome is placed. She is brought to the trial of public opinion. The Bible is the witness by whose testimony she must stand or fall. But she will not suffer the witness to speak, except through the medium of herself; she will not allow the words of the witness to have any meaning but such as she chooses to give them. She is therefore without further evidence convicted;—she has departed from the doctrine of the Bible, and set up her own authority, in opposition to the authority of God.

No. XXXIV.

SATURDAY, March 6th, 1819.

I wish some Popish author would inform me what evil the Bible has done. The Council of Trent has solemnly declared, that if it be permitted to be read every where, or by all, it does more harm than good; and this, they say, is manifest by experience. The present Pope, in the Bull which I gave in my last Number, quotes the words of the said Council, and upon this high authority, he condemns Bible Societies, and prohibits the circulation of the Scriptures among the common people in their own language, because it is manifest by experience, that the reading of the Bible, by all indiscriminately, does more harm than good. Both the Pope and the Council, however, satisfy themselves with a general sweeping sentence of condemnation. They enter into no particulars. They do not mention the nature or extent of the evil. The Bible must by all means be proscribed; but the Romish priests are as silent as the enemies of Christ were, when it was asked, "Why, what evil hath he done?"

Experience is generally allowed to be a competent, a credible, and an intelligible witness. If, then, the holy Council of Trent, or his Holiness the present Pope, had brought forward this witness, and allowed him to speak for himself; in other words, had they produced a series of undoubted, or well authenticated, historical facts to substantiate their accusation of the Bible, we would have been able to form a better judgment with regard to the truth of their unqualified assertion. But nothing of the kind is attempted. Neither the Pope nor the Council have facts to show,—at least that they choose to show.

The apostle Paul tells us, that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and that it is able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work; nay, he says, it is able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All the inspired penmen,—more properly the Holy Spirit, who guided the pen of every one of them,—bear witness that the word of God contained in the Bible, is calculated to give understanding to the simple, to impart knowledge, life, and salvation to the most wretched of the human race. But, no, says the present Pope of Rome; no, say the holy fathers of the Council of Trent; it is manifest by experience, that the Bible does more harm than good, if it be permitted to be read every where without difference.

Let the Church of Rome be tried upon this ground alone, and she will be found to be the Antichrist that was foretold by prophets and apostles;—that malignant, idolatrous power that should exalt itself above the authority of God. It was the will of God, when he gave his word to men by the ministry of his servants, that it should be made known to all the world; but the Church of Rome, having, by means of cunning and falsehood, obtained an ascendency over other churches, and having prevailed upon them to submit to her usurpation, laid hold of the sacred word, by which this usurpation, and her other tricks, were unequivocally condemned, and locked it up from the view of vulgar eyes. Thenceforward, it was to be seen and read only by the initiated; that is, by those who had acquired an interest in its concealment; and who readily joined in the conspiracy of their predecessors to keep it from the view of all the world besides. Thus the word of God was concealed. The light was put under a bushel. Countries in which the light of the gospel had shone for a time, became, no less than the heathen world, a land of darkness and of the shadow of death, and where even the light was as darkness.

I know that the Church of Rome endeavours to clear herself of this wickedness, by openly maintaining, that the Scriptures were not meant to be given to all men in their own language, but only to the church; and, by a strange perversion of language, they make the word *church* to signify the clergy. The priests thus place themselves between God and the common people. They say, they alone are commissioned to tell the people, by word of mouth, what God tells them in the Bible. They say, the *church* (still meaning the clergy,) has power and authority to declare what is the true meaning of the divine word; that Christ has promised to be with his church (that is, the clergy) to the end of the world; that therefore they cannot err in their exposition of Scripture: whereas the people themselves would almost certainly imbibe error, if they were to read the Bible without the glosses of such infallible interpreters. This doctrine is plainly avowed by Popish writers of the present day, particularly by the Editor of the Orthodox Journal and his correspondents; and by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a Popish

priest in London. Though, therefore, they should deny every historical fact, and call every quotation from every ancient book a forgery, I am ready to meet them, and to prove them antichristian out of their own mouths, and by their own pens. Though every intelligent reader knows that all history is against the Church of Rome on this point; that the writings of fathers, and the canons of councils, prove her guilty; yet I am willing to give up all these in the present instance; and I engage to show from the testimony of living Papists, that their religion is hostile to the free circulation of the word of God; and is, therefore, opposed to the authority of God.

The first thing to be established is, that God requires his word, as contained in the Bible, to be universally published, and universally read. I am not called at present to prove the divine authority of the holy Scriptures, or any part of them. I am not reasoning with professed infidels; but with persons who profess to receive every part of the inspired canon. They very foolishly, indeed, profess to receive as inspired some Apocryphal books, upon no higher authority than the Council of Trent; but so far as I know, they reject none of the inspired writings acknowledged by Protestants. From the writings, therefore, which they themselves acknowledge, but which they have studiously concealed from the vulgar, I endeavour to prove that God requires his word to be published to the whole world.

I rest my argument on the first section of the seventy-eighth Psalm; and that my Popish readers may have no apology for rejecting its authority, I shall give it in their own Douay translation. I know that they would reject our Protestant translation, though there was not a shade of difference in the meaning. Following the Vulgate, they call it Psalm lxxvii. though it is added, the same line, *Heb.* lxxviii. Verses 1—8. are as follow:—

"Attend, O my people, to my law, incline your ears to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in parables: I will utter propositions from the beginning. How great things have we heard and known, and our fathers have told us. They have not been hid from their children, in another generation. Declaring the praises of the Lord, and his powers, and his wonders which he hath done. And he set up a testimony in Jacob, and made a law in Israel. How great things he commanded our fathers, that they should make the same known to their children: that another generation might know them. The children that should be born, and should rise up, and declare them to their children. That they may put their hope in God, and may not forget the works of God; and may seek his commandments. That they may not become like their fathers, a perverse and exasperating generation. A generation that set not their heart right; and whose spirit was not faithful to God." They have no annotations on this passage, except one on verse second, which is as follows:—"*Propositions.* Deep and mysterious sayings. By this it appears that the historical facts of ancient times, commemorated in this Psalm, were deep and *mysterious;* as being figures of great truths appertaining to the time of the New Testament."

Now this Psalm bears on the very face of it, to be an address by the God of Israel to his *people.* It is not a private message to the priests; but a public proclamation to the whole nation, or church of Israel, introduced with a solemn note of attention;—"Attend, O my people!" This proclamation sets forth the following important facts, that God set up a testimony in Jacob, and made a law in Israel; that he *commanded the fathers to make the same known to their children;* and they again to their children, throughout all generations. The testimony and the law, denote the whole of divine revelation, particularly the Scriptures of the Old Testament, (Isa. viii. 16, 20.) It is not merely the system of legal observances, ordained according to the law of Moses, but the divine testimony concerning the Saviour promised of old, whose work of atoning and sanctifying, was shadowed forth, or typically represented, by the Mosaic rites. This is evident from what is declared to be the design of setting up the testimony in Jacob, and making the law in Israel, which was, that *they might put their hope in God;* which no sinner was ever required to do upon the footing of the law, but solely upon the ground of that righteousness, which was the subject of the testimony.

Now, the command of God is distinct and explicit, that this testimony and law should be made known by the fathers to their children; and not to their children only, but also to the strangers or foreigners who should reside among them, (see Num. xv. 26; Deut. xxix. 11; Isa. lvi. 3, 6.) There is no exception made on account of the dulness of the apprehension of children, or the prejudices of strangers. Call the subjects of the testimony and of the law, "propositions," or "deep mysteries," or what you will, they are evidently things which fathers could teach, and which children could learn. They are things with which both parents and children were required to be so familiar, that they should talk of them when they lay down, and when they rose up, when they sat in the house, and when they walked by the way, (Deut. vi. 7.)

It is no less evident that the Scriptures of the New Testament were ordained to be published to all the world. These declare the accomplishment of what was predicted and typically represented in the Old Testament; and what is thus accomplished, is, by the *commandment* of the everlasting God,

made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. Still there is no account made of the weakness of the minds of children, or of the prejudices of education, or of the danger of misinterpreting the word of God. It is declared of Timothy, that from a child he had known the holy Scriptures; those of the Old Testament are no doubt meant; he had learned them from the reading of his mother and grandmother; and Christ himself declares, concerning the things of his kingdom, that is, the subjects contained in the New Testament, that, though hid from the wise and prudent, they were revealed unto babes. They were subjects level to the capacity of children, and to such they were actually made known.

In short, there is nothing that appears more clearly in the Bible, than that it is addressed to all, and that it ought to be accessible to all. The command of God was to Jacob or Israel, (for the words are used indifferently for the church of God,) to make known the testimony and the law; that is, not only to publish it, but to teach it diligently. Every father in Israel was commanded to teach it to his children. This supposes that every family had access to it, in a language which they understood. The same thing applies to the Scriptures of the New Testament, for they were written for the purpose of being made publicly known. We read much of the benefit which results from a knowledge of the word of God,—of its dwelling in us richly,—of being filled with the knowledge of his will, and of making the holy Scriptures the subject of our daily meditation. But no where do we read in the Bible, that the word of God does mischief; that the reading of it is dangerous; and that it ought to be kept from the common people.

Thus, I think, it appears evidently the will of God, that the Bible should be published to all the world; and that it should be accessible to all men. But the Council of Trent has decreed otherwise, as the Council of Thoulouse did before it. These bodies were in effect the same as the Church of Rome. They acted in name of the whole church; and with the Pope at their head, they gave forth their decrees as the infallible dictates of the Holy Ghost. Modern Papists do not deny the doctrine; nay, they publicly maintain what was solemnly decreed by the said councils, particularly that of Trent, that the indiscriminate reading of the word of God does more harm than good. Thus they prove themselves in opposition to the will of God, and to belong to that Antichrist who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.

I engaged to prove the point from the writings of living Papists. Take, therefore, the following from the Orthodox Journal. "It must be acknowledged, Mr Editor, that such a plan for propagating Christianity, (that is, by distributing the Bible) was totally unknown to past ages, and had escaped the notice of Him who was Wisdom itself, the co-eternal Son of God, the Author and Founder of Christianity. For, we no where find it recorded, that the Son of God, before he ascended into heaven, either wrote down, or commanded to be written, the doctrines which he delivered for the instruction of mankind. He adopted the plain and simple method of verbal instruction; and, when about to leave this world, charged a chosen few, whom he had selected from his followers, to pursue the same plan, and preach, by word of mouth, the truths which they had received from him, no mention being made of distributing Bibles. Accordingly, we find the apostles, in obedience to this divine commission, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, boldly announcing to mankind, by word of mouth, the truths of religion.

"Such was the method by which the Christian religion was first established and propagated, at least if Scripture and church history speak the truth. Our Bible-men of the 19th century, may, perhaps, think that it would have been much more wise, in the Founder of Christianity, to have furnished each of the apostles, before his setting out upon his mission, with a knapsack well filled with Bibles, to be distributed among the towns and villages through which they were to pass. It must be confessed, that the Bible-distributing scheme, *if it added to the burthens*, would have considerably lessened the labours of the apostles, and would certainly have freed them from one care, that of providing themselves with successors, as in this scheme none were likely to be wanting. However, from the most authentic monuments, it is clear that no such plan for the propagation of Christianity was then adopted, but the plain simple method above mentioned, of appointing a set of men to deliver the truths of the Christian religion, by word of mouth, with an injunction upon the rest of mankind of hearing and receiving the truths thus delivered.

"Indeed, Mr Editor, our Bible-men ought to know that the books composing the New Testament, which is the part of Scripture which chiefly regards us Christians, were not all written till nearly a century after Christianity had been announced to the world. What then, (I put this question to the Bible-men) what was the guide to faith, or the rule of faith, during that period? Not the Old Testament, for this would have left Christians in the dark, as to the very first and most important articles of their belief. Not the New Testament, for this was not yet composed, nor consequently known, but in part, and that to a very small portion of believers. Most undoubtedly, Sir, the only rule of faith then known and universally received, was the preaching of the apostles and their lawful successors. Every doctrine conformable to their preaching, was acknowledged to be of

divine authority; while every doctrine, whether written or unwritten, contrary to their preaching, was rejected as spurious. When a dispute arose among the faithful, respecting the obligation of observing the Mosaic law, was either the Bible or any other written authority referred to, as the rule of faith? No: the living voice of the pastors of the church was consulted; the apostles assembled in council at Jerusalem; and the affair was terminated by the decision of those who were, by divine institution, the teachers and guardians of the faith. It is by a similar appeal to the living tribunal of the pastors of the church, that, in every succeeding age, "the doctrines once delivered to the saints," have been preserved from all mixture of error and human invention. This is the only rule of faith which the Scriptures themselves hold out to us, and to which they enjoin implicit obedience, under pain of exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, with heathens and publicans, in case of disobedience.

"Reason itself, Mr Editor, tells us, that the Scriptures, left to private interpretation, cannot possibly form an unerring rule of faith and morals. To assert that the Almighty has left us his sacred word to be our sole guide in matters of religion, and, at the same time, giving authority to every individual to put upon this word whatever interpretation his private judgment, or want of judgment, suggests, is to convert the God of truth into a God of contradiction and falsehood, and to make the Deity responsible for all the errors, blasphemies, and absurdities of every heretic and fanatic, from the days of Ebion and Cerenthus, to Ann Lee, the shaker, and Johanna Southcott, the raving prophetess of the present day. What then is the conclusion to be drawn from the above observations? Clearly this, that the Bible-distributing scheme was not the method appointed by Christ for the propagation of Christianity, and, consequently, that the Bible Societies are preferring the folly of man before the wisdom of God." *O. J.* Vol. II. *pp.* 15—17.

Perhaps some apology is due to my readers for putting so much blasphemy and nonsense in my pages; but I did not know any other way by which I could so effectually expose the hatred with which modern Papists regard the Bible, and their opposition to the general circulation of the word of God. There is no occasion to go to the bulls of Popes and the canons of councils to prove that Papists are hostile to the free circulation of the Scriptures; their writings in the present day convict them. They do, therefore, prove themselves to be opposed to the authority of God, who has commanded his word to be made known to every creature.

If it shall be alleged, that the Editor of the Orthodox Journal is too contemptible to be cited as an authority in this, or any matter connected with religion; I answer, that this will readily be admitted by every Protestant who reads his writings: but he is by no means a contemptible person in the esteem of his own sect. He is praised in a high degree by most of his correspondents, who are unceasingly commending his excellent work. It will be recollected, that the very correspondent from whose letters I have quoted so largely in this Number, puffs him off as a man who understands the subject of religion better than prophets and apostles did; and knows much better how to teach it; for which see the conclusion of my thirty-first Number. In fact, he is the champion, if not the oracle, of modern Papists, especially of those who resist the veto; and his writings are highly commended by the Bishop of Castabala, the Vicar Apostolic of the midland district.

Now, this said Editor and his correspondents, have set themselves down to revile those who are labouring to give the poor the word of God; and they do not scruple to vilify the Bible itself. It is quite fair to consider them as expressing the sentiments of their brethren in general, unless some other writer of equal authority with bishop Milner, and Mr Gandolphy, and the other correspondents of the Orthodox Journal, shall come forward and publicly disavow such sentiments. Such disavowal has not been made by any Popish writer in England or Ireland, so far as I know; and as they are well known to be in general hostile to the circulation of the Bible alone, they may be presumed to hold the same sentiments with the writer above quoted.

This writer asserts, that the Scriptures alone, that is, simply as they were given by the Almighty, *cannot possibly be an unerring rule of faith and morals;* which is asserting plainly, that the word of God cannot accomplish the object intended by it, without human aid. Nay, from what follows, it is insinuated, that it will do incalculable mischief, if left to be privately interpreted; and the writer has the presumption to say, that this mischief will be chargeable against God himself, if he shall permit his word to be generally read, and to be at the mercy of ignorant and perverse interpreters. No Protestant ever taught that the Almighty has given authority to every man, or to any man, to put upon his word whatever interpretation he pleases. He has given a revelation of his will sufficiently intelligible for the salvation of the guilty, and the instruction of the simple; and persons to whom this revelation is made known by reading the Bible, are in no danger of misunderstanding it, if they really desire to understand it, and pray for divine instruction; for God has promised his Spirit to guide into all truth. The words of God are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge. Such a knowledge of them as is connected with sal-

vation, is the fruit of divine teaching. Under such teaching, the poor and illiterate, by means of the Bible, are made wise unto salvation. Without such teaching, the Holy Father of Rome, with all his army of cardinals, priests, and doctors, are no better than mere fools who hate knowledge. "How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorners delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof: Behold I will pour out my Spirit upon you; I will make known my words unto you." (Prov. i. 22, 23.) This is a public proclamation of the Author of the Bible. He requires it to be made known to all, without any consideration of the danger of misunderstanding it; and he will secure against such danger by giving his Spirit, and making known his word, to all who apply their hearts to such knowledge.

I shall resume this subject in my next Number. In the meantime, I request my Popish readers to read the Bible. Let them see what it is which their priests are so anxious to conceal from them. If they find it unintelligible at first, let them read on, and they will find what is difficult or obscure in one passage made quite plain in another. The Bible contains the words of eternal life. Christ is in the Bible; and he that finds him, finds life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord.

No. XXXV.

SATURDAY, March 13th, 1819.

Papists tell us that publishing and distributing the holy Scriptures is not the way which Christ appointed for the propagation of Christianity. They triumphantly maintain what nobody denies, that Christ commanded his apostles to teach all nations; that "accordingly we find the apostles, immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, boldly announcing to mankind, *by word of mouth*, the truths of religion." This, I say, is what no Protestant denies: but the Popish writer in the Orthodox Journal, on whose letter I am animadverting, adds some words which are not in the commission which Christ gave to the apostles; and of which the apostles themselves were entirely ignorant. These words, and the doctrine founded upon them, are entirely of Popish origin. After the apostles, he slips in their *lawful successors;* and these, he says, are the pastors of the church in every succeeding age. He has not the hardihood to assert, though he evidently means it to be understood, that every priest or pastor of the church is a successor of the apostles; that he is equally commissioned by Christ to declare the "truths of religion by word of mouth;" and that he is equally infallible, or incapable of error in what he shall declare; at least, that this is the case when these pastors sit in council. If his words have not this meaning, I cannot see that they have any meaning at all. "When a dispute," says he, "arose among the faithful respecting the obligation of observing the Mosaic law, was either the Bible, or any other written authority, referred to, as the rule of faith? No: the living voice of the pastors of the church was consulted; the apostles assembled in council at Jerusalem, and the affair was terminated by the decision of those who were by divine institution the teachers and guardians of the faith. It is by a similar appeal to the living tribunal of the pastors of the church, that, *in every succeeding age,* the doctrines once delivered to the saints have been preserved from all mixture of error and human invention. *This is the only rule of faith which the Scriptures themselves hold out to us, and to which they enjoin implicit obedience under pain of exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, with heathens and publicans, in case of disobedience.*"

This, it will be allowed, is speaking plainly. Here the authority of the Bible is completely set aside; and, though it may seem a paradox, it is set aside by its own authority. "The Scriptures themselves hold out" no other rule of faith but the living voice of the pastors of the church! The bare word of a Romish priest, therefore, is the only rule of faith! Du Mans then said truly, in the council of Trent, "the Bible is become useless!" The Bible, according to the Orthodox Journal, has denuded itself of all its authority in favour of the priests. With Protestants the mere statement of such absurdity and impiety is a sufficient refutation; and it would be utterly in vain to attempt to convince the writer by any scriptural argument, because, in his opinion, the Bible has surrendered its authority to the pastors of the church; and because the Editor, whom he addresses, has written a much better book! Papists would act more like honest men, if they would openly avow themselves infidels, than by continuing to assume the name of Christians, while they vilify and reject the authority of the Christian revelation.

The writer, on whom I am animadverting, says, "we no where find it recorded that the Son of God, before he ascended into heaven, either wrote down, or commanded to be written, the doctrines which he delivered for the instruction of mankind." From this we are left to infer that the writing of what Christ taught, was unauthorized by him; that the apostles and evangelists exceeded their commission when they wrote the New Testament; and then it follows, of course, that such writings have no authority when put in competition with the living voice of the pastors of the church, who are the successors of the apostles, who were not commanded by Christ to write

his word, but to teach it by word of mouth. Thus Papists invest their pastors with supreme authority in religious matters, and ascribe no authority to the Bible, but such as the pastors choose to allow, and no meaning, but such as they choose to give it. Certainly the priests would have had much easier work to keep the people in ignorance, if the apostles had written nothing; it is evident that they owe them no good will for what they have done, and for the trouble which is daily given them by their writings.

Whether Christ commanded his word to be written or not, is of no consequence to us, seeing the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, did write it. Their writing of it was according to the will of Christ. He promised to send the Spirit to lead his apostles into all truth. Seeing, then, the Spirit led or directed the apostles to the measure of writing the New Testament, it follows that this was a part of the work which Christ appointed them to perform.

Besides, we find that Christ did command at least part of the New Testament to be written. "I was," says John, "in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, What thou seest, *write in a book*, and send to the seven churches which are in Asia," &c. Again, "I am the first and the last; and am alive, and was dead; and behold I am living for ever and ever, and have the keys of death and hell. *Write* therefore the things which thou hast seen, and which are, and which must be done hereafter." Rev. i. 10, 11, 17—19. *Douay Version.* And we know that Christ did such honour to the written word of the old covenant, as to appeal to it as a witness for the truth of what he personally taught. Surely after the disciples believed that he was the Christ, the Son of the living God, especially after they were witnesses of his resurrection from the dead, they would consider his own simple testimony sufficient to confirm the truth of all that he said. Yet, in fact, he did not rest, nor call them to rest, upon his own simple testimony, though that was undoubtedly true; but he gave an example by which the apostles, and his followers, in all time coming, should try every doctrine by the *written* word. "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spoke to you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then he opened their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures. And he said unto them, Thus it *is written*, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day: and that penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv. 44—47. *Douay Version.* This, of itself, was enough to show the apostles, that their Lord and Master approved of the word written; and unless he had given them a special command not to write; they would consider themselves authorized to write down what they had seen, and heard, for the instruction of the church in all ages.

Further, it does not appear from the commission which Christ gave to his apostles, that their labours were to be confined to mere speaking "by word of mouth." Go, teach all nations;—Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, are the words of the commission; and the meaning of them evidently is, that the apostles were commanded to *make known* the gospel,—to *publish* it to every creature. They were not limited with regard to the means; but left at liberty to speak or write as they had opportunity.

My Popish Letter-writer depreciates the written word of the New Testament, and pleads on behalf of the pastors of the church, the lawful successors of the apostles, that we should rather hear them, because they are commissioned, in all succeeding ages, to teach mankind, by word of mouth, the truths of religion. This argument would have applied with much more force in our Saviour's time on earth, for there had been a regular succession of priesthood from the days of Moses; and there were many traditions taught by the scribes and doctors of the law, which had at least as good authority as any Popish tradition; and yet we know that Christ spoke of such traditions, and such word-of-mouth teaching, only to condemn them, as making void the law, and seducing souls to their ruin.

I know that the preaching of the gospel—the declaration of divine truth by the living voice, is an ordinance of God, and an ordinance which he has been pleased to honour in a singular manner for the conversion of sinners; but it is only when preachers publish the doctrine contained in the written word, that such a blessed effect follows. I might defy the world to produce a credible instance of conversion to God by any other sort of preaching than that of the truth contained in the Scripture.

Popish writers always proceed upon the presumption that their priests are successors of the apostles; and that, of course, they have equal authority, individually or collectively, to decide on matters of faith. If they could prove this, the question would be at rest. If they could prove that they are inspired by the Holy Ghost, as the apostles were, in all that they preached and wrote, and when they assembled in council at Jerusalem to give forth their decree respecting the freedom of Gentile Christians from the obligation of the law of Moses;—if, I say, they could prove themselves possessed of the same supernatural and miraculous endowments, we would regard them as successors

of the apostles, and infallible teachers of Christianity: but, until they prove this by some sensible sign, we must be excused while we regard them as of no authority whatever in matters of religion; nay, while we consider them as impostors and deceivers, who are employed as the agents of the prince of darkness, to accomplish the everlasting perdition of the souls of those who confide in them.

The truth is, the apostles never had any successors; and if they had, we would never look for them among such characters as the Romish priests. Christ gave to his church apostles first; that is, men divinely inspired for the extraordinary work to which they were called, as witnesses for Him, of what they had seen and heard: but, for the permanent edification of the church, and for preaching the gospel, in after ages, he gave pastors and teachers, men whose business it is not to publish any new doctrine, but merely to preach and make known what is already published in the Scriptures. I might illustrate this subject at great length; but I believe it is sufficiently intelligible to my Protestant readers; and as for my Popish readers, I know that all I might write upon it, would be no better than beating the air, for their minds are preoccupied by the idea that the Bible is not a rule of faith, any farther than it has the consent of their priests, who have set up their authority as equal to it, and above it.

If, however, I can show that modern as well as ancient Papists are directly opposed to the word of God, and the free circulation of it, I shall have proved, to the satisfaction of every one who regards the Bible as of infallible authority, that Popery is Antichrist, and that it ought to be abhorred by every Christian.

In addition to the evidence already adduced I shall now bring forward that of a dignitary and renowned champion of the Popish faith. This is no less a personage than Dr Milner, Bishop of Castabala, and Vicar Apostolic of the midland district of England, of whom it is declared, by Mr Andrews, the Catholic Vindicator, that he is "the great and unanswerable living historical and theological disputant, Dr. Milner, than whom a firmer or more orthodox divine never breathed." (*C. V. No.* X.) This great, unanswerable, and incomparable divine writes as follows, in his pastoral charge to his clergy, dated 30th March, 1813:—

"Of late years, you know that numerous societies have been formed, and incredible sums of money raised, throughout the united kingdom, among Christians of other communions, for the purpose of distributing Bibles gratis, to all poor people who are willing to accept of them. In acting thus, they act conformably to the fundamental principles of *their* religion, which teach that the Bible contains all things necessary for salvation, and that it is easy to be understood by every person of common sense. But who could have imagined that Catholics, grounded upon quite opposite principles, should nevertheless show a disposition to follow the example of Protestants in this particular, by forming themselves also into *Bible societies*, and contributing their money for putting the mysterious letter of God's word into the hand of the illiterate poor, instead of educating clergymen, even in the present distressing scarcity of clergy, to expound that word to them?" The Bishop then proceeds to make some observations upon what he calls "*the prevailing Biblio-mania*," (Bible madness) which, he says, he hopes his clergy "will not fail to impress upon the minds of their people."

The first remark is, that "when our Saviour Christ sent his apostles to convert the world, he did not say to them, Go and distribute volumes of the Scriptures among the nations of the world; but, Go into the whole world, and *preach* the gospel to every creature.

"2d. It is notorious that not one of the nations converted by the apostles or their successors, nor any part of a nation, was converted by reading the Scriptures. No: they were converted in the way appointed by Christ, that of preaching the gospel, as is seen in the Acts of the Apostles, Bede's History, &c.

"3d. *The promiscuous reading of the Bible is not calculated, nor intended, by God, as the means of conveying religious instruction to the bulk of mankind:* for the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters.

"In a word, it is evidently a much more rational plan to put the statutes at large into the hands of the illiterate vulgar, telling them to become their own lawyers, than it is to put the text itself of the mysterious Bible into their hands, for enabling them to hammer their religion and morality out of it.

"In conclusion, then," says the Bishop, "my dearly beloved brethren, I am confident you will not encourage or countenance the distribution of Bibles or Testaments, among the very illiterate persons of your respective congregations, as proper initiatory books of instruction for them."

The following are extracts of a letter from the same unanswerable and incomparable divine, than whom a more orthodox never breathed, to the Editor of the Orthodox Journal, and printed in that work for October, 1813. "I described *a Catholic Bible Society* as a novel and portentous institution; unknown to the Fathers and Doctors of past ages; at variance with the third rule concerning the use of holy Scripture, laid down by a committee of the Council of Trent; giving into the policy of Protestants, and of course injurious to the religion of Catholics, as also to the authority of their Pastors; it being the exclusive business

of the latter to instruct all ranks of people, by expounding to them, *viva voce*, both Scripture and tradition."

Again, says this most orthodox divine, "The Tridentine Fathers make no distinction between Bibles, in the vulgar tongue, *with notes*, and those *without notes;* and *it is evidently impossible to add any notes whatever to the sacred text, which will make it a safe and proper elementary book of instruction for the illiterate poor.*" That is, in plain English, the Bible is so thoroughly and incorrigibly a bad and a dangerous book, that all the safeguards which man can plant around it are insufficient to prevent it from doing mischief to those who shall read it, and form their own judgment of its contents!

"The Catholic Pastors," continues the Right Rev. Prelate, "can instruct, and do instruct their people, at the present day, in the manner they have instructed them in all days since those of Christ, much better than these Lay-Evangelists can teach them, with the help of Bibles, though they stereotyped all the linen in Ireland into Bibles; and the labouring poor in Ireland, *without a single Bible in a village*, know more of the revealed truths of the gospel, and can give a more rational, as well as more detailed account of them, than the same class of people can in this country, which the Bibliomaniacs boastingly call the *land of Bibles*. I am, &c. *John Milner*, D. D."

This is corroborated by the other writer in the Orthodox Journal, from whose letters I have made liberal extracts, and who puffs off the Editor's school book as so much better than the Bible, or, perhaps, the writer is the same, for the signature is M. and the style and sentiment very much resemble those of the venerable Vicar Apostolic. This writer, be he who he may, writes as follows:—"We, *of the old school*, shall continue to think as the whole body of Christians thought for fifteen hundred years, and as nine out of ten of that body still think, that, as Christianity was first taught and established before that part of the Bible which contains the distinguishing doctrines of its Divine Founder was ever written, *so it might have been propagated and continued to the end of the world, had the Bible never made its appearance among Christians. O. J. April*, 1814, *p.* 140.

Most unhappily, however, for the Church of Rome, the Bible has "made its appearance among Christians;" and it is more from the want of power than the want of will, that the priests do not conjure the *apparition* to the bottom of the Red sea.

I find in the writings of modern Papists, in general, especially of those in the Orthodox Journal, a deep-rooted abhorrence of the Bible as a book of general instruction in matters of religion. There is indeed an affectation of respect for it, as it is locked up in the cloister, or to be found only in the hand of learned and discreet persons; but to put it into the hands of the common people, is considered as a step toward the subversion of all religion, and even of social order. It is with the Bible as with reason: people are not against it, unless it be against them. I leave it to the reader to judge whether I have not proved by the writings of living Papists, that they are against the Bible; that, of course, the Bible is against them; and, therefore, God, who is the Author of the Bible, is against them. Let them think how they will answer to Him for their contempt of his word and opposition to it.

The following decree of the Council of Trent, relating to the holy Scriptures, shall conclude the present Number. Some farther reflections on the subject may be expected in my next.

"Decree concerning the edition and use of the Sacred Books.—Moreover, the same holy Synod considering that much benefit might accrue to the Church of God, if among all the Latin versions of the Sacred Books, that are in circulation, any one should be reckoned authentic: *Maketh* known, appoints, and declares, that the old and common edition which has been approved for so many centuries in the Church, and in public readings, disputations, preachings, and expositions, be reckoned authentic: and that no man dare or presume to reject it, on any pretence whatever.

"Besides, for restraining petulant wits, it decrees, that no man, leaning to his own understanding, in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, —twisting the holy Scripture to their own sense; dare to interpret the holy Scriptures contrary to the sense that the holy mother Church (to whom it belongs to judge of the *true* sense of the holy Scriptures) hath holden and does hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; though these interpretations be never intended to be published. Those who contravene this statute shall be reported by the Ordinary, and punished by the pains ordained by law.

"But, being also willing to place a limit to printers, in this matter, as is right, who now, without any rule, thinking it right for them to do what they please, without license of their ecclesiastical superiors, print these books of holy Scripture, along with annotations and expositions of any sort indifferently, often without the printer's name, and often even under a fictitious name, and, which is worse, without the name of the author, and have such printed books sold elsewhere: it *decrees* and ordains, that henceforth the holy Scriptures, even this ancient and Vulgate edition, shall be printed in the most correct manner, and that it shall be lawful to none to print, or cause print, any book on sacred subjects, without the name of the author, nor in future to sell, or even to

keep by them, unless first examined and approved by the Ordinary, under pain of excommunication, and the fine set on this offence by the last Council of Lateran. And if they are regulars, besides examination and probation of this sort, they are also bound to obtain a license from their superiors, the books being acknowledged by them according to the form of their ordination.

"They also who communicate to others, or publish by writing, unless it be first examined and proved, shall be liable to the same punishment as printers. And those who have them in their possession, or read them, shall be held as the authors, unless they give up the real authors.

"And the approbation of books of this sort is to be given in writing, so that it may appear in front of the written or printed book. And the whole of this examination and approbation is to be done gratis, that what is good may be approved, and what is bad rejected."

Here the arrogance and intolerance of the church of Rome appear, in binding all men down to one translation of the Bible. Even their own translations into modern languages, by the index of Pius IV. are forbidden books; and it is an unpardonable sin to read them without license from a Bishop or Inquisitor. And, as if this were too great a privilege, in the after edition of Clement IV. it is declared "that all power of granting such license is taken away." But the chief thing to be observed in the above decree, is an absolute prohibition of the exercise of private judgment in reading the Scriptures; which is as bad as a prohibition of reading them. It is made a very dangerous thing to read the Bible; for if one should find a meaning in a passage different from what the church gives it, he is to be punished by the pains ordained by her, and in point of fact many have suffered death for no greater crime.

No. XXXVI.

SATURDAY, March 20th, 1819.

In my two last Numbers, I endeavoured to establish the fact, that living Popish writers are hostile to the general distribution of the Bible; and that they consider it as not intended by God as the means of conveying religious instruction to mankind. This is the avowed opinion of that most "unanswerable" and "orthodox" divine, Bishop Milner, whose words are quoted in my last Number, and who gives this as a reason for withholding the sacred word from the bulk of mankind, that "the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters."

Here is a wonderful exhibition of love and respect for the Holy Scriptures. Here is such tenderness of conscience, in a Right Reverend Prelate, that he will consider nothing lawful or expedient, but what is commanded, in so many words, in the Bible; and as he does not find it commanded that all mankind should learn to read, he will have no hand in furnishing them with Bibles, or in enabling them to peruse them.

It is undoubtedly true, there is not in the Bible, so far as I recollect, a direct commandment, requiring all men to go to school and learn the letters: and a Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic, that is, one who stands in the place of an apostle, and has all the authority of an apostle over English Papists, pleads the want of such a command, as an argument that the word of God was not intended by its Author for general circulation.

Had such an argument been advanced by some poor layman, it would, perhaps, have called forth no answer but a smile of pity. But it is brought forward by the highest Popish authority in the kingdom;—by a man, who, to his official weight as a Bishop, and Vicar Apostolic, adds that of wonderful personal endowments, being unanswerable, both as a historian and a theologian, and as orthodox a divine as ever breathed. I must be excused if I feel a little elated, when I enter the lists with such a man; and the reader must have patience with me, while I attempt to answer the argument, not so much for its own sake, as for the sake of its dignified author.

I reply, then, that the Bible was not given for the purpose of instructing us in those things of a secular nature which are within the reach of our own natural understanding. The word of God is conversant about things spiritual and eternal. It makes known what we could never have discovered by our own efforts. It declares the eternal love of God, the Father, to our ruined world, so that he sent his Son, Jesus Christ, into the world, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. He gave commandment that this truth should be published to all the world, that sinners, coming to the knowledge of it, and believing it, might be saved. But he did not think it necessary to prescribe the precise mode of its publication in every instance. He did, indeed, command it to be preached; this implied a command to the people to hear it. He commanded John to write to the seven churches in Asia; this implied a command to the churches to read what was written to them. Speaking of the spreading of the gospel throughout the world, and the calamities that should come upon the Jewish people, Christ says, Mat. xxiv. 15. "Whoso *readeth* let him understand." This implies that the persons addressed should be able to read; and there was no occasion for a specific command that

they should go to school, or have a tutor at home, or learn from their parents. This was a matter belonging to the common-sense business of every family, and for which no divine revelation was necessary.

When Jesus Christ spoke to the apostle John from heaven, and said, "What thou seest write in a book," he did not instruct the apostle to provide himself with pen, ink, and parchment. This was a matter that would occur to himself, without a divine revelation, as absolutely necessary to his obeying the divine command. In all such matters, if I may use the expression, Christ trusts to the discretion and common-sense of his people. When he gives a commandment, and the means of obeying are such as will occur to an enlightened understanding, he does not make such means the subject of a special revelation; yet, if necessary to the end, they are as really commanded as the end itself.

We are commanded to "search the Scriptures." Every one who hears such a command, must see that it requires, on the part of the hearer, ability to read, unless there be some natural impediment, such as the want of sight. Christ commanded the apostles to teach all nations what they had seen and learned of him. This they did by word of mouth, as far as they were able; but, as their living voice could not reach the millions of men scattered over the face of the whole earth, they committed the word to writing, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who guided their pens, as he did their tongues, to declare the whole truth of God for the salvation of sinners, and the edification of those who, by means of it, should be saved from their sins.

The word of God, thus written, they threw upon the world, and the providence of Him who gave it, to supply the place of their voice, after they should be dead. The apostle Peter plainly declares this to be the design of his writing. "Moreover," says he, "I will endeavour, that you may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance," 2 Epist. i. 15. This he did, not by the appointment of a successor, to repeat them by word of mouth, but by writing one epistle and then another, and by commending the writings of his beloved brother, Paul, in which, though he says there are *some* things hard to be understood,* yet the simple fact of his recommending them to Christians in general, shows that, in his esteem, or rather of the Holy Ghost who inspired him, they were fit for general reading, and able to teach all mankind the way of salvation, through the long-suffering and tender mercy of God. Both these apostles, and all the others whose writings were given to the world, testify the good news of the glory of Christ. They declare that the same Jesus who was crucified, is exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and the forgiveness of sins. By their writings, the apostles are still speaking to the world; and by writing, as well as by word of mouth, they obeyed the command of their Master,—teach, preach, publish, make known the good news to every creature.

The New Testament, thus thrown upon the world, fell, in the first instance, into the hands of Christians, who knew its value; and it became their duty to publish and make known its contents to all around them. There was no occasion for a divine command to learn to read, or to teach all men to read; for the command to search the Scriptures necessarily implied this, as much as the command to the apostle John to write, implied that he should be furnished with the necessary materials. Follow

* "And account that the long-suffering of our God is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of those things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction," 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. This passage is often referred to by Papists, to confirm their doctrine, that the Bible is not intended for general reading, and that the unlearned are in danger of being injured by it. But Paul himself, writing to the same people, to wit, Christians who were Jews by birth, lets us know the reason why some things which he taught were hard to be understood. It was not because the things themselves were unintelligible; but because the people were dull of apprehension. (See Heb. v. 11.) They had been so long accustomed to look upon the shadows of the Mosaic law as of perpetual duration, that they could not clearly see the substance when it had come, and when the shadows were superseded by it. To minds thus preoccupied, very plain things appeared very mysterious. It is so with persons of the Romish communion at this day. The most liberal and intelligent among them, have their minds so prepossessed and bewildered with the ideas of a visible, universal, infallible church; with a visible head and apostolic succession; with the merit of good works, penances, pilgrimages, purgatory, &c., that the plainest passages in the word of God appear to them quite unintelligible. Most of the errors taught by their church they look upon as infallible truths, and first principles, which must not be called in question. Coming to the Bible with minds thus preoccupied, they must find many things mysterious and inexplicable, because it is impossible to make them bend to what they have already fixed in their minds as the truth. In this unhappy condition, they generally find it most comfortable to let the Bible alone, and acquiesce in the infallible teaching of the church.

Arguing from the passage in 2 Pet. above quoted, Papists always proceed upon the principle that the bulk of Christians must be unlearned; and it will be allowed that the Church of Rome has always been successful in keeping the bulk of its members in that condition. But this is not a Christian state of things. Peter speaks of being unlearned as a sinful state, the same as being unstable. Every Christian, therefore, is required to be *learned* in the things which relate to the salvation of his soul, that is, to be learned in the Scriptures. Paul exhorts the Ephesian Christians to "be not unwise, but *understanding* what the will of the Lord is," (Epist. v. 17.) And he speaks of Christians in a prosperous state of mind, as being "filled with the knowledge of his will." Every evangelical Protestant pastor labours and prays that this may be the condition of his people. But the nature and effect of Popish teaching appear by the following answer, which a poor Papist gave lately to some questions of a religious nature. "Please your Honour, we leave all these things to God and the priest."

out this principle, and it will be found to afford a sufficient warrant for printing and circulating the Bible; for establishing schools to teach the art of reading; and every other means which Christian prudence and benevolence may devise, for communicating to the world the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.

The whole world might have been enlightened by the knowledge of this truth many centuries ago, had Christians of the second and following ages possessed the spirit of Christians of the first age. Had the impulse which was given by the preaching and writing of apostles and evangelists continued through subsequent ages, every Christian church would have had a company of zealous and faithful missionaries employed in distributing the word of God, and declaring its contents, to the heathen all around them. Daily inroads would thus have been made upon the kingdom of Satan. The reign of idolatry and superstition would have given place to the reign of righteousness and peace. The earth would have been filled with a holy seed, and heaven with an innumerable company, out of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations.

The time is approaching when this shall be realized, as we are assured by Old and New Testament prophecy; and it will be so, when Christians and Christian churches shall have returned to the principles which were abandoned at so early a period; and shall be animated by the same spirit of love and zeal which marked the character and the conduct of those of the first age. Nothing remains to be done, but what ought to have been done seventeen hundred years ago; and which was prevented only by the false principles and corrupt practices which began to prevail even before the close of the first century. All the churches, without exception, and the Church of Rome, in particular, neglected the important duty of giving the word of God, and publishing the gospel to the whole world. Nay, the Church of Rome having gotten possession of it, locked it up from the sight of all but a chosen few. She, therefore, is justly chargeable with the guilt of slaying the many millions who have perished for lack of knowledge. Other churches cannot plead innocent, considering how little they have actually done for promoting Christianity; but the Church of Rome herself must sustain the greatly aggravated guilt of positively withholding the means of promoting it, by prohibiting the translation and distribution of the holy Scriptures.

Bishop Milner tells us that "the bulk of mankind cannot read at all; and we do not find any divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters." This shows us the low esteem in which the common people are held by priests of the Romish communion. It is not considered a duty to promote their mental improvement, because there is no divine commandment as to their being obliged to study letters. Christianity teaches us to promote, in every possible way, the mental improvement as well as the eternal salvation of our fellow creatures. This is implied in the comprehensive commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This, however, has no place in the Popish system. If the priests find the people ignorant, they will keep them so. They will instruct them only in such things as will give them an awful and distant respect for their ghostly authority; but they will take care to prevent, as far as they are able, the people from having access to the source of knowledge, lest they should think and judge for themselves. Though there were nothing else objectionable in the Popish system, this alone would mark it out as not of divine origin, because it is hostile to the improvement and civilization of the human race.

Having thus paid my respects to the avowed writings of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Castabala, I return to the Correspondent of the Orthodox Journal, who subscribes himself M., who, if not Dr Milner himself, expresses the same sentiments, as the reader will see by turning to my thirty-fourth Number, in which I gave large extracts from his letters. In page 162, I quoted his words, which are as follows: —"Our Bible-men of the 19th century may, perhaps, think that it would have been much more wise, in the Founder of Christianity, to have furnished each of the apostles, before his setting out upon his mission, with a knapsack well filled with Bibles, to be distributed among the towns and villages through which they were to pass."

I have the charity to think that the writer considered himself as addressing only persons of his own communion,—persons who were studiously kept in ignorance, and who were left to suppose that matters, in our Saviour's time on earth, with regard to the publication of books, were precisely the same as they are now. Papists in our day, even though they cannot read, see that what is called the Bible is comprised in a small volume that any man may carry in his pocket, and of which one might carry twenty in a knapsack. The writer takes for granted that it was the same at the time when the apostles received their commission; and, by this assumption, he attempts to delude his readers into the idea that the distribution of Bibles is not approved by Christ. If the writer did not know the real state of matters, in this respect, he was guilty of great presumption in attempting to write upon it; if he did know it, then he is guilty of wilfully misleading and deceiving those who confide in him.

My Protestant readers must bear with me while I state a fact, of which they do not need to be informed; but which I take to be neces-

sary for the information of my readers of the Romish communion,—that, in the time of the apostles, a single copy of the Old Testament, written upon skins, was as much as a man could carry; that those who could write copies of it correctly were comparatively few; and that, had the apostles been set to the work of writing them with their own hands, it was not possible that they could attend to the work of preaching. It does not appear that the apostles carried Bibles about with them. Their minds were familiar with the contents of the Old Testament, on which they were enabled, by the Holy Spirit, to draw at all times. Whenever they came to a synagogue of Jews, or a church of Christians, they would find a copy to which they could refer; and when they addressed either Jews or Gentiles, there was a power in their preaching, accompanied by the miracles which they wrought, that made it manifest that God was with them.

The gift of miracles accompanied that of inspired preaching. Those who possess not the former, can lay no just claim to the latter; and, therefore, no man has a right to demand, for his word-of-mouth teaching, the respect and obedience which were yielded to apostles, unless he can show himself possessed of the same miraculous endowments.

The mode of teaching which the apostles adopted, in the first instance, was that of declaring the divine message by word of mouth. Afterwards they committed it to writing; their writings completed the revelation of God to men; and, together with those of the Old Testament, they form a divine and infallible standard of faith and practice. Notwithstanding the labour and expense of multiplying copies before the invention of printing, copies were multiplied, and translated into various languages at a very early period. It was the duty of Christians to multiply them; and had they continued to do so, and had they given attention to their contents, they might have been preserved from the flood of error and superstition which so soon overwhelmed them.

Should any of my Popish adversaries reply, that had it been the will of Christ to propagate Christianity by the distribution of Bibles, he would have enabled mankind to invent the art of printing in the apostolic age, I have only to answer, that it does not appear to have been a part of his plan, as a teacher come from God, to instruct men in any thing which they were capable of learning or discovering by their own ingenuity; and that the art of writing, tedious as it is in comparison of printing, was sufficient to multiply copies of the Scriptures for all needful purposes, had men but devoted themselves to the work with a diligence in any degree proportioned to its magnitude and importance.

Our Orthodox Letter-writer informs us, that the books of the New Testament were not all written till nearly a century after Christianity had been announced to the world. If by this he means the period when the apostles received their commission, or when the Holy Ghost came upon them, on the day of Pentecost, he states what is not the fact; for the greater part of the New Testament was written within half a century of that period, and during the life of those who were witnesses of the events recorded in it. I have before me an interesting work of *Père Lamy*, a divine of the Romish Church, and one who pays a thousand times more respect to the Bible than our modern Papists do. The work is entitled, "An Introduction to the Holy Scriptures." Speaking of the period in which the books of the New Testament were written, he says, Matthew wrote his Gospel only six years after the crucifixion: Mark wrote his ten years, and Luke his twenty-three years thereafter; and that the Acts of the Apostles, and all the Epistles of Paul, together with those of Peter, were written within thirty-three years of the same period. He does not pretend to fix the dates of the Epistles of James and Jude; but he brings the latest writings of John within sixty-five years of Christ's death; and there is no part of the inspired writings even pretended to be of later date than those of John. Lamy states these facts on evidence that satisfied him, though absolute certainty is, perhaps, not to be obtained in a matter of this kind. Then it is not true that a century elapsed after Christianity was announced to the world, before the greater part of the New Testament was written. The binding obligation of the law of Moses remained in every respect until Christ said upon the cross, "It is finished." It was but a few years after that period, when the Scriptures of the New Testament were written; and, in the interval, the church was favoured with the personal presence of the apostles, whose living voice supplied a rule of faith of equal authority with that of Christ; for, according to his own declaration, they that heard them heard him.

These things may appear at first view of small importance, but they are really of great importance in the popish question. It is with the Church of Rome a fundamental point to get her clergy acknowledged as successors of the apostles; and to have the same authority and power with which Christ endowed these his extraordinary ambassadors. It would help very much to the attainment of this end, if it were allowed that a hundred years elapsed between the expiring of the old dispensation and the writing of the New Testament; because it is well known that the apostles did not live so long; and the Church of Rome would shove in, behind them, their lawful successors, whose living voice was to be the only rule of faith, as that of the apostles had been. But the

fact of the matter, plainly stated, overthrows the whole system. The apostles left their writings, which were divinely inspired, as their only successors; and, until these writings were completed, some of them remained alive to give instruction, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with regard to every doctrine and practice, respecting which a question might be agitated in any of the churches. When they had not personal access to any of the apostles, they consulted them by writing to them, and received an answer in writing. The seventh chapter of first Corinthians is evidently an answer to a letter which Paul had received from the church in Corinth.—Since the death of the apostles, the Scriptures have been the church's only guide. They will be so till the end of the world; and there is no need of any other, for they are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

My opponents complain that I take my representations of Popery from the writing of enemies, and not from their own approved authors. The complaint, however, is unfounded, as the reader will see by this and some of my preceding Numbers: for, independently of the Council of Trent, whose authority is supreme in the Church of Rome, I have quoted largely from the very works of my opponents themselves, which I hope they will admit to be approved writings. Besides quoting and replying to the Orthodox Journal, I have presumed to attempt an answer to the most "unanswerable" and most "orthodox" Dr Milner. Both he and Mr Andrews, indeed, are unanswerable on some points; not from the truth and accuracy, but from the extreme absurdity, of their statements.

If a man should come boldly forward, and deny that two and three make five, I presume most persons would think him unanswerable, at least unworthy of a serious answer. Yet the proposition that two and three make five, is not more evident to those who understand the terms, than the proposition, that, if the Bible be the word of God, it will do good, and not evil; and that all ought to read it, is evident to every mind under the influence of Christianity. Yet this proposition is solemnly denied by the Council of Trent, and by all the Popish authorities of the present day. There is really, therefore, no arguing with Papists upon the principles either of Christianity or common sense. There is no common ground on which we meet them. Through the influence of a dark and cruel superstition, their minds are unsusceptible of impressions from moral evidence; and this is not surprising, seeing they actually refuse the evidence of their own senses.

Mr Andrews is much offended with Luther for comparing the Papists of his day to asses. I am aware that my Paper will not rise in dignity by descending to use the language of the Reformer in this instance; but really I cannot help thinking the asses are dishonoured by the comparison; for I defy the Church of Rome to produce an ass that will refuse the evidence of his own senses—that will be so stupid as to mistake a bundle of hay for a human body; yet such stupidity is exemplified by Papists every day, in their sacrifice of the mass, and their doctrine of transubstantiation.

No. XXXVII.

SATURDAY, March 27th, 1819.

I dare say I have written more than enough to convince every reader, that the Church of Rome is hostile to the circulation and the reading of the holy Scriptures. The avowed doctrine of that Church, as laid down by the last of her general councils, a late Bull of the Pope, and the writings of modern Papists, as quoted in my late Numbers, all go to establish the fact, that the Church of Rome is against the word of God. It follows, as a thing of course, that the word of God, and God himself, is against the Church of Rome; and that, though she may maintain her ground for a while, like the heathen parts of the kingdom of Satan, she must ultimately be consumed by the Spirit of his mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming.

The subject of withholding the word of God, has occupied seven Numbers of my work. I hope my Protestant readers will not think I have given it more space than the importance of the subject required, for it is really a fundamental point; and having convicted the Church of Rome of direct hostility against the divine testimony, I hope it will be allowed that I have succeeded in proving her to be the Antichrist that was spoken of by the apostles of Christ, as to arise in the latter days; and if there be any persons at present within the pale of that church, who regard the salvation of their souls, the command of God to such is, to come out of her, that they be not partakers of her sins, and that they receive not of her plagues.

I have not the vanity to think, that what I have written will make much impression on the minds of such persons as Dr Milner, and Mr Andrews, and the other writers of the present day, who oppose the circulation of the holy Scriptures. My labour, however, will not have been in vain, if I have put the public in general upon their guard against the pretensions of those men, who advocate the cause of the Church of Rome, and who endeavour to soften down all the monstrosities of the system; but who while they oppose the circulation and the reading of the Bible, show enough of the cloven foot to make it manifest that the authority

under which they act, is that of the prince of darkness. I hope I have shown also what we may expect whenever Papists shall acquire power and authority among us: the Bible will be prohibited; and those who presume to read it, will be punished according to the decree of the holy Council of Trent.

I believe it is usual, in writing upon religious subjects, as well as in preaching, to connect doctrine with practice: following what I take to be a very good rule, I shall now proceed to the practical improvement of my subject, that is, to adduce certain instances of the actual practice of Papists, even in the present day, of withholding the word of God from the people in general, and making it a crime to have it in possession, or to read it, or even to acquire the art of reading, so as to have access to it.

In the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, is a Spanish New Testament, printed at Venice, in 1556. It had no doubt been printed without the knowledge of the church, or holy Inquisition; as there is no record of their having granted permission for such an undertaking. On the title page is written "Granville Sharp," and a remarkable memorandum is prefixed with his own hand, as follows:—"*Mem.* Several years ago, I presented this Castilian Testament to an eminent Spaniard, a merchant of Bilboa, who was delighted with it during his temporary abode in London; but, just before his departure for Spain, he returned the book, being afraid to carry it with him, lest it should be discovered by the searchers of his baggage, *and occasion the forfeiture of all his goods, G. S.*" *Correspondence, &c. between Messrs. Gandolphy, Blair, &c. p.*87. Such was the hostility known to exist by this Spaniard among his countrymen, against the word of God, that he durst not carry home a copy in his own language. What must be the state of things in Spain, with regard to religion, when a respectable individual of that country is led to make such a humiliating declaration? In Spain Popery is to be seen in its true character. There it has received no softening from Protestant influence, and it is as it appears there that we ought to judge of it; for the apparent amelioration of the system in this country, is merely accidental; and if the causes which have produced such amelioration were removed, it would appear in Britain as bad as it is in Spain. From the open declarations of Bishop Milner, and the Orthodox Journalist, against the Bible, and their incessant outcry about the danger of reading it, there cannot be a doubt that they would, if they were able, prohibit the book and the reading of it, under a penalty, perhaps heavier than the confiscation of goods.

The following extract of a letter from Paris, of date the 25th ultimo, which appeared in the London Star of the 1st of the present month, will show the hostility which exists among certain clergy of that country against education and reading the Bible:—"We have, with some difficulty, procured M. Durand's Lent Mandement or Homily: he is the capitulary Vicar General of Besançon. M. Durand warns every one to avoid penetrating into the mysteries of the gospel; and he triumphantly asks, Who would believe in God if it were necessary to comprehend him? In his holy zeal the vicar general declares the Lancasterian schools an invention of the devil; and cautions all his flock to beware of sending their children to them. If they do, they will incur excommunication here, and damnation hereafter. He invites, with Moloch ferocity, his diocese to exterminate the heretics, (that is the Protestants.) It is, he says, a mark of grace; its omission is a mortal sin."

There are many thousands of Papists, chiefly Irish, who reside in St Giles', and the neighbouring parishes in London, whose children are suffered to grow up in the grossest ignorance and vice. A few years ago, some benevolent individuals established schools for the gratuitous education of such children, in the arts of reading, writing, &c.: that no alarm might be excited in the minds of the parents, or their priests, it was expressly stipulated, that no catechism should be used in the schools, and no means used to make the children Protestants; that, in short, nothing should be admitted on the subject of religion, but the plain simple letter of the English Bible. But this benevolent plan met with the most determined opposition from the priests, some of whom plainly declared before the Committee of the House of Commons, that it was much better for the children not to be able to read, than to learn this art, without learning, at the same time, their Popish catechisms. See proof of this, at great length, in the Report of the Committee, printed in 1816.

The last Report of the Hibernian Society furnishes numerous instances of the opposition of the priests in Ireland to the reading of the Scriptures, and even the instruction of the children in the art of reading, when it is understood that the Bible is used in the schools. One of the teachers writes as follows:—"January 10th, 1818. I herewith send you the protest of two priests against the use of the Scriptures in the schools. It is taken *verbatim* from the book, which lies on the table for the remarks of the visiting committee. The priests continue exceedingly angry with the parents who persist, at least many of them, to send their children to the schools, notwithstanding all that they have said and threatened." The following is the protest of the said priests:—"Having observed that the children of our communion are obliged to read the Protestant version of the New Testament, we

protest against the introduction of *any version;* and we are determined to withdraw the children from the school, by every means in our power, unless the rule which prescribes a portion of the Holy Scriptures to be daily read be annulled. Signed, J. P. J. R. A true copy, T. G." *Report for* 1818 *page* 40.

Another teacher writes as follows:—"June 23d, 1817. Some time ago, I apprehended much injury would be done to the Society's schools under my care, in consequence of the Catholic priest opening a free school in his chapel, and charging his flock to send their children to it, or else they would be finally ruined. He publicly lectured on this subject for three successive sabbaths; notwithstanding which, only one of my pupils left me. This child had been very sick for some time, and its parents were made to believe, that it was a judgment sent on the child, for being at the Society's school. Since then, as a child at the priest's free school was reading in a Testament which he took with him to the school, the master struck the child a violent blow, took the Testament from him, cursed the child, and asked if he was going to turn a heretic. The child told this to his parents; upon which they withdrew him and his sister from the priest's school, and put them both to mine; at which they would learn to read the word of God." *Page* 72. This is the way in which the people ought to treat their priests, and every body else who would hinder them or their children from reading the Bible. It is gratifying to see the manifestation of such a spirit; there are not a few instances of it now in Ireland; and if it shall become general, as I hope it will by and by, Ireland will be prepared for a much more important emancipation, than that which Papists are thinking of, and demanding with so much clamour;—she will be emancipated from the slavery of superstition and error, raised to the enjoyment of rational liberty; and every hamlet and cabin will be accessible to the word of God, and the salvation which it reveals.

In these reflections, I am happy to have the concurrence of some of the Irish of the Romish communion. One of the Society's inspectors of schools writes as follows:—"May 25th, 1817. The few days I have been in this neighbourhood, I have had frequent conversations with many of the Catholics, who exclaim greatly against their clergy, for prohibiting the reading of the Scriptures. One man, in particular, said that, if all mankind were of his opinion, superstition, idolatry, and the fear of man, would soon cease, and Scripture knowledge would prevail and flourish gloriously in the world." The same inspector gives the following account of one of the schools, and of its teacher:—"Visited F—'s school at R.—He had 88 pupils assembled; 16 of whom read the 2d of Ephesians, and gave pertinent answers to questions from it. I am glad to say, that both masters and pupils, in this country, are progressively advancing in the knowledge of the Scriptures: and I perceive that when the pupils are enlightened with this knowledge, the masters of such are much affected with the necessity and importance of it. I greatly rejoiced to hear Mr F— (whom I knew to have been brought up in the Church of Rome,) explain, from the Scriptures, the gospel, very clearly. He said, I bless the day that Mr B— gave me a Bible, and advice how to read it. He added, I brought it home, but did not dare to read it, except in private, lest my friends or the parish-priest should hear of it: but, in the course of some time, I lost the fear of man; and now I can say, I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. I acknowledge to all around me, that the Scriptures are the true word of God.' This declaration made me many enemies in the country; and even my nearest friends and acquaintances were against me; but especially the priest of the parish, who used every exertion to prevent and stop me." *P.* 47, 48.

The Report before me contains many such instances of priestly opposition to the Bible, and of the determination of the people not to submit to the control of their ghostly guides. One priest, besides a heavy penance, laid a poor woman "under an obligation, on pain of inevitable destruction, never to open a Bible, or converse with a Protestant on the subject of religion. All this, however, did not do; for though, while terrified and intimidated by the threats and injunctions of her confessor, she had unwillingly promised obedience, she relapsed in a few days, and returned to her Bible." *P.* 22. I do not expect that my work will speedily reach the remote parts of Ireland, which are held in bondage by these priests of the god of darkness, else I would entreat the people who have access to schools and to the Bible, diligently to improve the opportunity of acquiring the knowledge of that blessed book, which they may rest assured will do them no hurt, and which may be the instrument of conveying to them the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, which is eternal life.

Though I have not access to the benighted parts of Ireland, I am happy that many Irishmen and other Romanists in this country read my Papers. Let me entreat such to read the Bible. I propose to myself no higher aim than this. I will be glad if my work is laid aside, and never thought of again, if it shall only be the means of exciting my readers to read and study the word of God. Let me entreat, also, that those who can read, will advise those of their acquaintance who cannot, to avail themselves of the opportunities afforded for acquir-

ing that most necessary art. There are many schools now established in Glasgow, for educating the old as well as the young; and both old and young are made welcome to receive, without money and without price, the benefits of education, as well as the blessings of religion.

I believe an idea prevails very generally among Protestants, that the reading of the Scriptures is not so much calculated to convert sinners, as the preaching of the gospel; and I doubt not the experience of past ages will be found to confirm the doctrine of the Westminster Divines, that "the Spirit of God maketh the reading, but *especially the preaching*, of the word, an effectual means of convincing and converting sinners." But I stay not at present to inquire, whether this arises from something in the nature of preaching more than in that of reading? whether there be any scriptural ground to expect more from the one than from the other? or whether it be not enough to account for the fact, that the experiment, with regard to giving the Scriptures and reading them, has never yet been so extensively made as that of preaching has been? It is enough to know that conversion is the work of God; and that, in ordinary cases, he effects it by means of his word, revealed to the heart and understanding, through the medium of hearing or reading. Of the blessed effects of the latter we have many recent instances, of which the following is a specimen:—"Dr Carey, in one of his letters, speaking of nineteen natives who had come to him to request Christian baptism, mentions, that eighteen of them had become converts to Christianity, by reading of the Bible alone, having never heard the missionaries preach: their acquaintance with Christian truth and doctrine was derived entirely from the solitary and unaided perusal of the Scriptures."—*See Third Report of the Calton and Bridgeton Association for Religious Purposes*, p. 71.

I recommend to my readers of the Romish communion the perusal of the Bible, with the more confidence of being attended to, seeing I have the concurrence of some of the greatest of their own saints and fathers. The council of Trent, the present Pope, and all the modern authorities, down to Dr Milner, have actually departed from the ancient doctrine of their own church. This I will prove by reference to St Augustine, St Gregory, and others, who spake of the Bible as if they had been English Protestants.

I translate the words of these saints from the preface to a translation of the New Testament into French, by the Faculty of Theology of Louvain, printed at Mons, in 1667. The translators themselves seem to have been of a different spirit from Papists of the present day, as they not only gave their countrymen a version of the New Testament in their own language, but strongly recommend it to the perusal of all classes of the people.* The following are the words of the translators rendered into English, and those of the fathers will appear as quoted by them:—

"Now if God heretofore commanded his people to read unceasingly in the law, and has given it for their meditation day and night; and if the orders of religious believe themselves bound to read every day the *Rule* which they have received from their founder, how can we neglect to read the law of Jesus Christ, whose words are spirit and life; and being entered, by baptism, into the Catholic and Universal Religion, of which Jesus Christ is the founder, we ought to look on the gospel as our *Rule*, which makes known to us his will, confirms his promises, which is our light in this world, and which will one day be our judge in that which is to come. The word that I speak unto you shall judge you at the last day. This is that which made St Cesaire, Bishop of Arles, say, that those who cannot read are not excusable, on that account, to be ignorant of what may be learned by the reading of the gospel; for, if the plainest and most homely persons, not only in the cities, but also in the villages, find means (saith this Saint) to read and learn profane and worldly songs, how can they, after this, excuse themselves for their ignorance, in having learned nothing of the gospel? You have plenty of invention, adds he, to learn to read what the devil teaches you for your destruction, but not enough to learn what you are taught from the mouth of Jesus Christ,—the truth which should save you."

The translators proceed:—"It would be an endless task to relate all that the holy fathers have said of the excellence of the gospel. All their works are full of the marks of respect which they have, not only for the sacred history of the life of Jesus Christ, but also for the other books which compose the New Testament."—Again, "Not to say that it is not a very useful labour to gather from the writings of the fathers, who are the true interpreters of this holy book, explanations and notes which will aid us very much in the understanding its divine truths and holy instructions: but we conceive this a work altogether different, and of another kind from that, and though useful in itself, does not prevent a simple translation, like the present, from being useful to believers:

* It is a fact, that more liberty of reading the Scriptures has been allowed to all classes of the people in France, for a hundred years past, than is allowed by the Popish priests in England and Ireland to their people, at the present day. Charles Butler, Esq. who is said to be one of the most liberal and enlightened of the Romish communion in Britain, declares as follows, in his examination before the Committee of the House of Commons, June 13th, 1816:—"In point of fact," says he, "there has not, for the last century, been in France, (as I have informed myself from good authority) any objection to reading the Old or New Testament in the French tongue, or without notes, by any age, or any description of people."

for we hope, that not only the more enlightened minds, but the more simple, may find that which is necessary for their instruction, whilst they read, in an entire simplicity of heart, approaching humbly to the Son of God, and saying, with St Peter, Lord, to whom shall we go, &c.; and it is thou alone who can teach us. We must come to him like those of whom it is said in the gospel, that they came to hear him and be healed of their diseases: for "curiosity," according to St Augustine, "is one of the diseases of the soul, insomuch the more dangerous that it is the more hid: and if we think of nothing but to satisfy it, in reading the word of the Lord, this would be to nourish our disorders by the very remedy which ought to cure them. He who seeks nothing in the Scriptures but his own salvation, will find it there, and that knowledge which he did not seek."

"Holy Scripture," says St Gregory, "is like a great flood which has run, and will always run, to the end of the world. The great and the little, the strong and the weak, find there that living water which springs up to heaven; it offers itself to all, it proportions itself to all; it has a simplicity which stoops even to the souls of the most simple, and a height which gives exercise and elevation to those who are highest. All may draw indifferently, and so far from being able to empty it, in filling ourselves, we will always leave depths of knowledge and wisdom, where we may adore without being able to comprehend."

"But what ought to comfort us, under this obscurity, is that," according to St Augustine, "Holy Scripture proposes to us, in an easy and intelligible manner, all that is necessary for our conduct in life, that it explains and clears up itself in revealing clearly to us in some places what has been said obscurely in others, and that this obscurity has its use, if we view it with the eye of faith and piety."

Speaking of charity or love, St Augustine says, "This is the root, and all the other truths are the branches and the fruits. If you cannot," saith he, "comprehend all those branches which are of so vast extent, satisfy yourselves with the root, which includes the whole. He who loves, knows all, because he possesses the end to which all tends. Say not then you cannot understand the Scripture; love God, and there is nothing which you shall not be able to understand. When the Scripture is clear, it clearly marks the divine love; and when obscure, it marks its obscurity. He, then, knows the clear and obscure in the Scripture who knows the love of God, and who regulates his life by that love."

The translators conclude their preface as follows:—"The New Testament is the treasure of the church, hence a translation is a common good. There is, therefore, ground to hope, that all will take part in what is useful to all, and that humble souls will seek nothing but their own edification in this work; praying God for those who have engaged in it, that he would not impute rashness to this service which they have attempted to render to the church, without sufficiently considering that it was above their strength; that he would cover and repair the faults in the execution, in their not having laboured with all the respect, and all the attention, and all the piety, that they ought; that he would accompany it with the blessing of his Spirit; and that he would not permit any thing strange or human to be mixed, that might turn or change in any manner this impression which the words of grace, truth, and life, ought to have on men's souls."

Thus, it appears, that not only the reverend translators, but the principal saints and fathers of the Church of Rome were Protestants in sentiment, with regard to the reading of the Bible. St Augustine, St Chrysostom, St Cyprian, St Dennis, and St Gregory, all of whom are cited as authorities on this subject, speak very much like the fathers of the Church of England, who composed the Homily, on reading the Scriptures. Had the ancient fathers lived in the time of Luther, and found the church so incorrigibly corrupt as she was in his time, they would most probably have joined the Reformation; and had they lived in the present day, they would have joined the Bible Society; for, to use the language of Dr Milner, they were all infected with the Bible madness, and they spake like downright enthusiasts of the advantage of reading and knowing the Holy Scriptures.

Papists are continually boasting of the antiquity of their religion; but real antiquity is all against them. I wish them to go farther back than any of the saints whose names I have mentioned; I wish them to go as far back as Peter and Paul, and the other apostles; but if they should even stop short of this, and take up with St Augustine, or St Gregory, I venture to assure them, they will then find it their duty to abandon the Council of Trent, and the Pope, and the church which makes it a crime to obey God by reading his word.

No. XXXVIII.

SATURDAY, April 3d, 1819.

The celebrated Dean Swift having preached a sermon against sleeping in the church, began his application in this manner,—"These arguments may have weight with men awake; but what shall we say of the sleeper? By what means shall we arouse him to a sense of his sin and danger?" A reflection like this has occurred to The Protestant, on looking over what he has written on the subject of the Bible,

and the duty of reading it: these arguments, he hopes, will have weight with persons who are awake to the subject; but what shall he say to the Papist, who is asleep, and worse than asleep; and who will not allow his mind to open to the consideration of what is infinitely interesting to himself, but which he spurns away from him, as being the business, not of him, but of his priest? If ever the minds of such shall be opened, it will be the work of God and not of man.

Yet this work may be accomplished by human instrumentality. We know the means by which the priests shut the hearts of the people, and keep them shut, against the light of God's word. Along with the terror of their persons and office, which they hang over the heads of the people, it is by means of such arguments as I have detailed in some of my late Numbers, taken from the writings of Bishop Milner and others, against the Bible Society, and the circulation of the Scriptures. I believe the best answer to such arguments is to give the Bible itself to those who can read; but perhaps much good might be done among our Popish population by the distribution of cheap Tracts, recommending the Bible, giving copious extracts from it, and, in a lively summary way, exposing the absurdity of the reasons which the priests give for withholding it from the people. It will be objected, that this would appear like an attempt to make proselytes, and thereby excite alarm among both the people and their priests. What then? Is it not the desire of every Protestant Christian to win his brother from error and superstition? We have too much delicacy with regard to our fellow creatures who are living in fatal error, and who, while they continue to reject the gospel of Christ, are in the broad way of destruction. Would we win them secretly, and by stealth? This would not behonourable in itself, and certainly not like the example set by the apostles. They told unbelievers plainly, that they were unbelievers; and idolaters, that they were idolaters; and they told them this for the avowed purpose of turning them from vain idols to serve the living God. In this manner should we deal with our Popish neighbours; and if we do so with kindness and affection; if, while we point out the cruelty and wickedness of the priests, who rob the people of the bread of life, we make it manifest that it is not hatred but love to their souls that prompts us, our endeavours will, through the divine blessing, tell upon the conscience and heart of some, perhaps of many individuals, and lead them to renounce the Pope, and the Priest, and all their idols, and embrace the Saviour of sinners.

The distribution of cheap Tracts has been very useful in instructing and awakening ignorant Protestants: and why should not Papists have a similar benefit extended to them, in the form of Tracts, calculated to engage their attention, and to remove their prejudices against the Bible and the gospel which it reveals? They have access, indeed, to all the Tracts that are in circulation, if they please to read them; but then there are few, if any of them, calculated for their meridian, or suited to their modes of thinking. The plainest evangelical Tracts take much for granted which Papists require to be taught; and none of them that I have seen contain the necessary exposure of the folly of what is taught by their priests. I am aware no Bible Society can properly adopt this mode of promoting Christianity, because their business is to distribute the Bible *alone;* but there are Tract Societies, and education societies of various names, by whom this hint may be improved; and if, by any means, we can persuade the adherents of Rome seriously to read the Bible, the reign of superstition and priestcraft will not long maintain its ground before the light of the divine word, which shines in every page of the Bible.

Having finished what I had to say on this subject, I shall now indulge the reader and myself with a few pages of lighter matter.

I feel much gratified in being able to inform my readers, that, through their kind and persevering support, I have been enabled to give fifty pounds for charitable purposes, being profits of THE PROTESTANT up to the twentieth Number inclusive. This sum was tendered to the Committee of the Society for the support of Catholic Schools, in Glasgow; but being by them refused, I disposed of it in donations to three Societies, which are eminently entitled to public support, viz., the Hibernian Society, and the Sunday School Society for Ireland, £20 each; and £10 to a Sabbath School Society in Glasgow.

I take this opportunity of replying to such of my correspondents as have complained of the high price of THE PROTESTANT; and I hope they will be satisfied when I inform them that, when the allowance to booksellers and other retailers is deducted, together with the expense of distribution, advertising, collecting a great number of small sums from different quarters, postages and parcels from the country, &c., all paid by the publishers, the nett proceeds of each Number is a fraction less than a penny farthing. This is all that remains for paper, printing, and profit; it is out of this small sum that the £50 has been realized; and if I had sold my Numbers for three half-pence, there would have been a considerable loss. By using coarser paper and a larger type, I might perhaps afford to sell them at the last mentioned price; but I do not think this would be generally agreeable to my readers. It is right to add that I believe those who complain, do it solely from a wish that my work might be more extensively circulated, by being more accessible to the poor. This also is my wish.

but I cannot accomplish it without reducing the quality of the paper, and giving less matter in the page, which I would be sorry to do. My readers in general, I hope, will pardon me for introducing so much of the merchant into THE PROTESTANT.

I am often asked how is THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR coming on? and it may be proper to give a short answer to this question, especially as many who read his earlier Numbers have given him up from mere disgust. That the Protestants in this country were very willing to hear a defence of the Church of Rome, if conducted upon the principles of fair reasoning, is abundantly evident, from the ready sale of the first and second Numbers of THE VINDICATOR; but when they found that there was neither truth nor reason in him, most of them thought proper to leave him to those to whom the opposite might be acceptable.

As a general answer to the question, how is he coming on? let it suffice, that the poor man is extremely angry: that he is even swearing with passion; for which, see his seventh Number, column 108, in which he begins a sentence with an oath: that great part of his work has little relation to the facts and arguments of the Protestant, but exhibits a ludicrous combat with phantoms of his own raising: that, with all his folly, he has sense enough to see that I am aiming at the vitals of his system; and, therefore, he uses every species of provoking and insulting language, and accuses me of many bad things, in order to divert me from my purpose, and set me upon my own defence, or engage me in a contest about miserably distorted scraps of history. Though I avowedly take my stand upon the Bible alone, and am the advocate of no sect or party, he will have it, that I am responsible for all the errors and crimes which he chooses to say have been committed in Protestant countries, by parliaments, armies, thief-catchers, and others, though they were persons who had no religion at all; and when he has dilated at sufficient length upon these subjects he thinks he has repelled every charge against his own church, by whatever evidence it has been established. His work, with all its faults, seems to be in great favour with persons of his own sect here, from the industry with which they puff it off by means of hand-bills, which, every week, deface the corners of our streets, and the gates of our churches,* headed by great capitals, announcing THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, with its contents for the week; which contents, by the bye, usually contain more than the work itself; for they announce the refutation of this, and the refutation of that, whereas, in the book, there is nothing refuted. The deplorable state of intellect and of taste which must exist among the admirers of such a work, excites, I hope, in the breast of every Protestant a feeling of gratitude for the blessings of the Reformation; yet Mr Andrews will be as much astonished at my want of intellect and of taste in disparaging his style of writing, as any Hottentot beauty would be, on finding her charms disparaged by some barbarous European.

A blundering officer in a camp will sometimes very effectually, though unconsciously, serve the cause of his enemy. In this way I still hail Mr Andrews as an auxiliary; for, with all his boasting and bluster, he lays open, from time to time, the vulnerable parts of the cause which he undertakes to defend, in such a way as will make my work easy when I come to reply to his declamations.

He has laboured hard to vindicate his church against the accusation of holding it lawful to break faith with heretics. Yet the matter stands just as I left it, as any one may see who will take the pains to read carefully and compare what has been written on both sides. This, it must be allowed, he has rendered somewhat difficult by an immense mass of irrelevant matter, which serves, in a great measure, to cover and conceal the real question at issue. Yet if any of my readers find it possible to muster up as much patience as to make the comparison between my evidences and his replies, I am very well assured they will find the charge established. To this subject I intend to address myself, at some future period; but I will not gratify Mr Andrews so far as to deviate from my own plan to reply to him, farther than what he will find in this Number.

Whatever may be the public avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome, it is evident that Mr Andrews himself holds, in substance, that of which I accused his church, namely, the lawfulness of breaking promises, and, by a little stretch of the principle, the lawfulness of violating oaths; for promises and oaths are only different degrees of the same thing. The promise of an honest man is as binding as his oath. He feels it so; and when he is lawfully called to confirm his word with an oath, he does it for the satisfaction of others, not for the purpose of binding himself more firmly.

Now THE VINDICATOR actually pleads the lawfulness of breaking promises, that is, breaking faith, in at least five different cases, for which see his twelfth and thirteenth Numbers, in which he justifies and defends the immoral principles of Bishop Lanigan, contained in his letter, quoted in my twenty-ninth Number. The doctrine there laid down appears to him

* Mr Andrews tells us, in his Orthodox Journal for October last, page 374, "that civil liberty is not the offspring of Protestantism, nor has she even been permitted to abide wherever the light of the Reformation has dawned." He uses the words, "light of the Reformation," in derision. Now I would ask him, what would be the consequence, if THE PROTESTANT were to publish his work in Spain, and have the contents of it stuck up on the church gates every Sunday morning, to insult the devout worshippers of the Virgin Mary? Let him answer this question, and say where the balance in favour of liberty would lie.

a thing so indisputable, that he presumes Protestants to hold the same. Now, though nobody denies, what he labours through many a long page to prove,—that many wicked men, called Protestants, have broken their promises; yet I maintain, and I am sure every honest man will agree with me, that it is not lawful, in any case whatever, for a man to break a promise voluntarily made, if it does not bind him to commit sin. And, even in this case, he ought not to break it lightly or hastily; but on solemn consideration, and deep repentance before God, for having made such a promise, together with adequate compensation if any person came innocently to be injured by it. But Dr Lanigan lays it down as a principle, or doctrine taught by great divines and saints of the Church of Rome, with St Thomas Aquinas at their head, that it is lawful to break promises in all the different cases which he has stated: particularly, that it is lawful to do so on a change of circumstances; no matter what loss may be sustained by the person to whom the promise is made; his interest is out of the question; the promiser is the sole judge with regard to the change of circumstances, and what is best for his own interest. If it be alleged, that it is understood that the promiser shall have the consent of the other party, I answer, it is no such thing; for that forms a case by itself, and is the third upon the Bishop's list: but, in the fifth case, on a change of circumstances, the promiser acts for himself alone, and sets the other party at defiance, as Lanigan did in his own case, upon the authority of the rule laid down by St Thomas and other canonists. *

Now Mr Andrews seriously defends this principle; and he maintains that THE PROTESTANT would act upon it too, if he found it for his interest. See *Cath. Vind.* col. 203. In short, it seems to him incomprehensible that any man should act otherwise, which shows that he has no distinct ideas of common honesty. As if conscious of nothing but obliquity in his own mind, he has no conception of rectitude in the mind of another. He supposes a case of an agent sending a man such goods as he has *not* ordered; and he pleads this as a case in which the person who gave the order might lawfully break his promise, and refuse to accept his correspondent's bill; and, by thus shuffling from one thing to another, he attempts to evade the natural consequence of which I had convicted his principle, of breaking a promise, in relation to goods which a man *had ordered.* This is a disingenuous trick, quite worthy of a man who writes not to instruct but to deceive his readers; and I suppose the Popish part of them are so blind as not to see through it. If they did, they would not identify themselves with him, as they do by applauding and circulating his work. It is painful to think that the Papists in this country, in general, hold the same standard of moral obligation that is held by their organ and advocate; and yet I see not how they can acquit themselves, but by publicly disavowing him and his work.

Again, Bishop Lanigan teaches, on the same high authority, that the obligation arising from a promise ceases, "when a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made." Here, as in the other case, the promiser is the sole judge of what would be pernicious or useless. Suppose a Papist to have received a great sum of money in trust, under a promise to make it over to a certain young man, on his coming of age; and finding that the possession of a large fortune would be pernicious to the young man, he might lawfully break his promise, and apply the money to build a monastery, or do whatever he pleased with it. Those who are acquainted with the practices of the Jesuits, will not consider this an extravagant supposition, or improbable case.

It was, no doubt, on some such principle that the Rev. Peter Gandolphy satisfied his conscience. He promised publicly, and in print, that if any Society would furnish him and his brethren with copies of the Bible in their own English version, with or *without* notes, they would receive and distribute them. The said Priest, however, broke his promise almost as publicly as he had made it; finding, perhaps, upon reflection, as he actually maintained in argument, that the distribution of the Bible *without* notes, that is, the keeping of his promise, would be pernicious to those on whose behalf it was made.

These principles, publicly taught from the Episcopal chair in Ireland, and defended by the organ of English Papists in London, have done more to show me the danger of admitting Papists to places of power and trust, than all that I ever read against what is called Catholic emancipation. I request my readers not to take their opinion of these principles from my commentary, but from the very words of Bishop Lanigan himself, and of Mr Andrews, their defender; let them take the words as they stand,—let them study their import,—let them reflect that, in four of the five cases, the man who has made a promise is the sole judge of the propriety of breaking it; and let them say whether the principles thus distinctly avowed

* It seems the most redoubted and most orthodox Dr Milner had a hand in this promise-breaking; and Mr Andrews, no doubt, finds himself obliged to defend any thing in which his oracle and idol is concerned. "Dr Lanigan had promised to sign for the concession of the veto; but, in consequence of Dr Milner's influence and instructions, he retracted, and published his celebrated apology, in which he gave five reasons why a promise might be broken: and that, at all events, the promise he made, though a serious, was not a solemn one; and, therefore, according to his maxims, not binding."—*History of the Jesuits*, &c. 1816. vol. I. p. 138.

and defended are not subversive of all the laws of moral obligation.

Suppose a few Papists were returned members of Parliament, a thing that would soon happen, if emancipation were granted to them. They would have to swear, indeed, to support and defend our Protestant Constitution; but when they had got possession of their seats, they would find the "circumstances" completely "changed;" they would find themselves now a part of the Constitution; they would find it lawful to break their oaths, for breaking oaths and breaking promises are only different degrees of the same thing; and they would find themselves bound, by every possible means, to promote the interest of their church, whatever might become of our Protestant Constitution.

These ideas are confirmed by the weekly and monthly publications of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. No Westminster demagogue can write with more asperity against the measures of government, or declaim with greater volubility about the miserable and *enslaved* state of our country. It is no part of my business, in a controversy about religion, either to approve, or to condemn political measures; and it would be no part of his business, if he would confine himself to the question of religion: but he cannot forbear abusing our Protestant government. He speaks of the Stuarts, particularly Charles I. as if they were the most amiable and tolerant princes that ever reigned. He speaks with the greatest abhorrence of those who opposed the arbitrary measures of that infatuated family. He does not, in plain words, condemn the Revolution of 1688, and the Hanoverian succession; but he condemns the principles on which they are founded; and, in the Orthodox Journal, he labours, at great length, to show that the kingdom was much more free and happy before that event, than it has been since. Nay, he tells us pretty plainly, that matters will not be right until all that was done at the Revolution be undone, together with all that has been done since. In his Journal for October last, p. 376, he quotes from a declaration of the Birmingham Hampden club, which "loudly demands a return to the *ancient* practice of the Constitution," that is, "in *Catholic times*," as Mr Andrews is pleased to inform us. From this it is evident that if such men as he were in parliament, they would labour to restore the ancient state of things. Then farewell to our Protestant Constitution, and the Hanoverian succession.—No matter though these men had sworn to support and defend the Constitution as it is. They are taught by the casuistry of St Thomas Aquinas, and Bishop Lanigan, with the approbation of Mr Andrews himself, that it is lawful to break a promise, and, by a little extension of the same principle, an oath, when circumstances are changed, and when the keeping of the promise or oath would be pernicious or useless; and what can be so pernicious in the eye of a Papist, as to support a government that is opposed to the establishment of the "Catholic faith?"

My readers know that I have meddled very little with the political question of what is called Catholic emancipation; and I would not likely have touched upon it now, in this general reference to the writings of my opponent, were not he incessantly obtruding it upon his readers, and railing against our government for withholding from Papists a place in that Constitution, which, he says, was framed by their ancestors; insinuating pretty plainly, that the kingdom is theirs in point of right, and that they will not be satisfied till they have it in possession. Something of this appears here and there in THE VINDICATOR, but not nearly so much as the same writer exhibits in his Orthodox Journal, in which, with singular effrontery, he abuses our government under its own eye, in the very pages in which he is endeavouring to prove that Popery is more favourable to liberty than the religion of Protestants.

There are few things which I abhor so much as accusing persons of sedition and treason, on account of their religion. This was the practice of the enemies of Christ and his apostles. It was the practice of heathen Rome; and it has been the practice of Papal Rome, from the time of the Waldenses down to the days of Eusebius Andrews, who deals out, with an unsparing hand, accusations of treason and sedition against men of whom the world was not worthy,—who were really the best friends of their king and of their country,—to whom we are indebted for both our civil and religious liberty, and to whom THE VINDICATOR himself is indebted for the liberty of railing against the government of his country. This, he will say, is mere assertion. Be it so: it is at least as good as his assertion to the contrary; and it will be proved, without difficulty, when I enter seriously upon the subject.

No man can justly accuse him of sedition or treason, on account of religion; for it does not appear that he possesses any thing worthy of the name. His declamations are almost entirely of a political character. What he demands for the adherents of the Pope, is not freedom of religious worship, but political power; and while, in doing so, he explicitly avows principles that are subversive of those laws of moral obligation which bind society together; while he abuses our established government, and the principles on which it is founded; and while he acts as the organ of thousands of discontented and intriguing Papists in Britain and Ireland, I do him no injustice when I point out the tendency of his writings; and when I warn my countrymen of what they may expect, if persons holding such principles shall come

to have power and authority in this Protestant country.

No. XXXIX.

SATURDAY, APRIL 10TH, 1819.

IN discussing the subject of the Church of Rome withholding the Bible from the people, I find I made a mistake which I hasten to rectify. I proceeded upon the idea that it was a principle admitted on both sides, that the Bible was the word of God. This fundamental principle I took for granted, not aware that it would be denied by modern Papists. I find, however, it is in effect denied by their organ, The Catholic Vindicator; and I have no reason to think that he does not speak the sentiments of the general body. In his fifteenth Number, which I did not see till after my last was in the printer's hands, he speaks as if he were surprised that I should unhesitatingly assure my readers "that the Scriptures contain the word of God, which is addressed to every human creature under heaven; that they contain a complete revelation of his will, for the salvation of our fallen race; that, in short, the Bible IS the word of God addressed to his own creatures." I acknowledge that I did say all this; and the Vindicator lays it down to be controverted, though he has not yet said much in the way of refutation, further than challenging me to say how I came to the knowledge of the above truth. Towards the conclusion of the same Number, he repeats part of the above, together with a further declaration of THE PROTESTANT, that that part of the Bible which is called the gospel, is a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners; which declaration surprises him so much, that he exclaims, "What nonsense!"

I am glad that I have driven my opponent off the sacred ground of divine revelation, and compelled him to avow his infidelity. I would have rejoiced much more if I had succeeded in bringing him to submit to the word and the righteousness of God for his own salvation; but since he does reject, and declare to be nonsense, the gospel of Christ as a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners, he acts more like an honest man by rejecting the Bible, than by professing to believe it. Now, therefore, I consider him, and those who adhere to him and admire his writings, in the light of mere heathens and idolaters. I shall proceed to discuss the subject of their idolatry, and to show its conformity with ancient heathenism, from which it was undoubtedly derived.

It is a first principle of Christianity, that there is one only living and true God; and that HE *alone* is the proper object of religious worship. The language of Jehovah, the God of Israel, to his people is, "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt worship *only me*." Divine worship, therefore, offered to any other, is direct rebellion against him. It is marked by the prophet Jeremiah, as one of the grossest instances of the idolatry of the children of Israel, in imitation of their heathen neighbours, that they worshipped an idol whom they called the queen of heaven, (Jer. vii. 18; xliv. 17—19.) Now this is actually a title which is given by the Church of Rome to one of her principal idols, namely, the Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There can be no doubt that the mother of our Lord, according to the flesh, was blessed among women. From all that is recorded of her, however, it is evident that her blessedness arose not only or chiefly from the mere circumstance of her being the mother of Jesus, but from her being a partaker of that grace which is extended to all Christians alike. Mary makes no great figure in the evangelical history; and when she is brought into view, it seems intended rather to repress than to cherish any idea of her being preferred before other followers of Christ. Indeed, when she is brought into view, one is apt to wonder that so little account is made of her; but the Spirit of God, no doubt foreseeing that she would be made an object of idolatrous worship, so ordered matters, that nothing should be done to her, or said of her, that should give the smallest countenance to such impiety.

In the Church of Rome, however, she is as really an object of worship, as Diana was in Ephesus, or Venus in Paphos, or any other god or goddess in any heathen nation in the world. I hope to prove this at great length, before I finish this part of my subject; but, as an introduction to it, I shall quote the history of this idol as given by the Rhemish translators of the New Testament, who, no doubt, give the true doctrine of the church on the subject.

Annotation on Acts i. 14. "Mary the mother of Jesus.] This is the last mention that is made in Scripture of our lady; for though she was full of all divine wisdom, and opened (no doubt) unto the Evangelists and other writers of holy Scriptures, divers of Christ's actions, speeches, and mysteries, whereof she had both experimental and revealed knowledge: yet, for that she was a woman, and the humblest creature living, and the pattern of all order and obedience, it pleased not God that there should be any farther note of her life, doings, or death, in the Scriptures. She lived the rest of her time with the Christians (as here is peculiarly noted and named among them), and specially with S. John the Apostle, to whom our Lord recommended her, who provided for her all necessaries; her spouse, Joseph (as may be thought) being deceased before. The common opinion is, that she lived 63 years in all,

At the time of her death, (as S. Dennis first, and after him S. Damascene, *de dormit. Deipara* writeth) all the Apostles, then dispersed into diverse nations to preach the gospel, were miraculously brought together (saving S. Thomas, who came the third day after) to Jerusalem, to honour her divine departure and funeral, as the said S. Dennis witnesseth, who saith that himself, S. Timothy, and S. Hierotheus were present, testifying also of his own hearing, that both before her death, and after for three days, not only the Apostles and other holy men present, but the angels also, and powers of heaven, did sing most melodious hymns. They buried her sacred body in Gethsemane; but, for S. Thomas's sake, who desired to see and reverence it, they opened the sepulchre the third day, and finding it void of the holy body, but exceedingly fragrant, they returned, assuredly deeming that her body was assumpted into heaven, as the church of God holdeth, being most agreeable to the singular privilege of the mother of God, and, therefore, celebrated most solemnly the day of her assumption. And this is consonant not only to the said S. Dennis, and S. Damascene, but to holy Athanasius also, who avoucheth the same, *Serm. in Evang. de Deipara;* of which assumption of her body S. Bernard also wrote five notable sermons extant in his work."

Here is laid the foundation of the idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary, a poor mortal creature, who owed her own salvation to free grace, like any other sinner who believed in the Saviour. The inventive fancy of some early fathers, found out that all the apostles were miraculously assembled to witness her death, except St Thomas, who, it seems, had a practice of being out of the way. Mary having been buried, arose again the third day, and was assumpted, that is, taken up into heaven, as Christ had been; from which it was inferred, that she is raised to the same glory with him, and that she is to be worshipped: this, at least, is the practical inference which has been drawn from the doctrine, for many hundred years. The Rhemish doctors proceed as follows, to censure and condemn the Protestants, who will not fall down and worship the idol which the Church of Rome has set up:—

"But neither these holy fathers, nor the church's tradition and testimony, do bear any sway now-a-days with the Protestants, that have abolished this her greatest feast of her assumption; who of reason should, at the least, celebrate it as the day of her death, as they do of other saints. For though they believe not that her body is assumpted, yet they will not (we trow) deny that she is dead, and her soul in glory; neither can they ask Scripture for that, no more than they require for the deaths of Peter, Paul, John, and others, which be not mentioned in Scriptures, and yet are still celebrated by the Protestants. But concerning the blessed Virgin Mary, they have blotted out, also, both her nativity and conception; so that it may be thought the devil beareth a special malice to this woman, whose seed broke his head. For as for the other two days of her purification and annunciation, they be not proper to our lady, but the one to Christ's conception, the other to his presentation; so that she, by this means, shall have no festival at all.

"But, contrariwise, to consider how the ancient church and fathers esteemed, spake, and wrote of this excellent vessel of grace, may make us detest these men's impiety, that cannot abide the praises of her whom all generations shall call blessed, and that esteem her honours a derogation to her Son. Some of their speeches we will set down, that all men may see that we neither praise her, nor pray to her, more amply than they did. S. Athanasius, in the place alleged, after he had declared how all the angelic spirits, and every order of them, honoured and praised her with the *Ave*, wherewith S. Gabriel saluted her: 'we also,' saith he, 'of all degrees upon the earth, extol thee with loud voice, saying, *Ave, gratiæ plena*, &c. Hail, full of grace, our Lord is with thee, pray for us, O mistress, and lady, and queen, and mother of God.' Most holy and ancient Ephrem, also, in a special oration made in praise of our lady, saith thus, in divers places thereof, '*Intemerate Deipara*, &c. Mother of God, undefiled, queen of all, the hope of them that despair, my lady most glorious, higher than the heavenly spirits, more honourable than the cherubims, holier than the seraphims, and without comparison more glorious than the supernal hosts, the hope of the fathers, the glory of the prophets, the praise of the Apostles.' And a little after, '*Virgo ante partum, in partu, et post partum*, by thee we are reconciled to Christ my God, thy Son: thou art the helper of sinners, thou the haven of them that are tossed with storms, the solace of the world, the deliverer of the imprisoned, the helper of orphans, the redemption of captives.' And afterwards, 'Vouchsafe me, thy servant, to praise thee. Hail, Mary, full of grace; hail virgin, most blessed among women.' And much more in that sense, which were too long to repeat.

"S. Cyril hath the like wonderful speeches of her honour, *Hom.* 6. *contra Nestorium*. 'Praise and glory be to thee, O Holy Trinity: to thee also be praise, O mother of God; for thou art the precious pearl of the world; thou the candle of unquenchable light; the crown of virginity; the sceptre of the Catholic faith. By thee the Trinity is glorified and adored in all the world; by thee heaven rejoiceth, angels and archangels are glad, devils are put to flight, and man is called again to heaven, and every creature that was held with the errors of idols, is turned to the knowledge of

the truth: by thee churches are founded through the world; thee being their helper, the Gentiles come to penance;' *and much more which we omit.* Likewise the Greek liturgies, or masses of S. James, S. Basil, and S. Chrysostom, make most honourable mention of our blessed lady, praying unto her, saluting her with the angelic hymn, *Ave Maria,* and using these speeches: 'Most holy, undefiled, blessed above all, our queen, our lady, the mother of God, Mary, a virgin for ever, the sacred ark of Christ's incarnation, broader than the heavens that didst bear thy Creator: holy mother, of unspeakable light, we magnify thee with angelic hymns. All things pass understanding; all things are glorious in thee, O mother of God. By thee the mystery before unknown to the angels is made manifest and revealed on the earth. Thou art more honourable than the cherubims, and more glorious than the seraphims. To thee, O full of grace, all creatures, both men and angels, do gratulate and rejoice. Glory be to thee, which art a sanctified temple, a spiritual paradise, the glory of virgins, of whom God took flesh, and made thy womb his throne, &c.' "

There is another long paragraph to the same purpose, containing the words of St Augustine, or of St Fulgentius, for the translators are not sure which; then of St Damascene, and St Ireneus, all puffing off the Virgin Mary as above the celestial hosts, as being the special hope of sinners, &c. &c. Fulke endeavours to show that some of the saints above named never wrote any thing like what is ascribed to them, but that these things were forged in their names, hundreds of years after their death; and I have no doubt this is the fact, for the worship of creatures, that is of idols, was by no means general in the church for a long time after the death of some of the fathers, who are here cited as recommending and practising the worship of the Virgin Mary. Be that as it may, the Popish fathers of Rheims, who were the first to give their brethren in England a version of the New Testament, in their own language, gave it with a strong recommendation of the Virgin Mary as an object of worship, as the hope of the guilty, as the refuge of the afflicted, and as a powerful intercessor with her Son for obtaining every blessing.

If the subject were not shocking for its impiety, it would be amusing to observe the shifts to which the reverend fathers are reduced, in order to support the credit of their idol. They admit that it pleased not God to give any further account of the history of Mary in the Scriptures, than what we have there recorded. Christians would rest in such information as it pleased God to give; but this is not the case with our Rhemish translators. It has pleased *them* to relate what God did not think proper to make known; and for what they have related, they have no authority whatever, but the ravings of distempered imaginations of idle monks, who amused themselves in their solitude by composing such wild reveries, and imposing them upon the world as revelations from heaven. Such reveries, however, are received by our English Papists as the dictates of infallible truth, and the Virgin Mary is worshipped with greater devotion than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This I will prove before I leave the subject, by giving the prayers which are actually addressed to her, from some of their books of devotion. In the meantime, I shall give some account of another idol not so generally known, that is, the mother of the Virgin Mary.

I give the following extracts from "An Abridgement of the Prerogatives of St Ann, mother of the Mother of God;" which has the approbation of the doctors (of the Sorbonne) at Paris, London, 1688. If my readers should feel shocked by the grossness and impiety of it, I can truly say that I sympathize with them; and that, though I feel it my duty to expose the abominable wickedness of Popery, I have no pleasure in making such an exposure as the following:—

"Chap. 2nd. She (St Ann) was the mother of the mother of God, and the grandmother of God himself. Figure to yourself, chaste spouse of Jesus Christ, a royal eagle flies from mountain to mountain, to choose a tree which may serve the design, to feed there and breed her young ones. Imagine now that God is this eagle, who, running over with his eyes, as it were, so many beautiful trees, all the women who were to be from the first to the last, perceived not any one so worthy to receive the glorious Virgin, who was to be the little nut of the heavenly eaglet, who is the Word incarnate, as St Ann, in whom he rested himself as in the tree of paradise, which he knew to be the tallest in devotion, the deepest in humility, the largest in charity, and of the most pleasant odour in sanctity. So if, in one word, you would know the price of that crown which St Ann bore on earth and in heaven, it must be said, and this is to say all, that her treasure and her crown was the giving *being* to *her* who gave it to God; which is to be crowned with the merits of Mary, like the tree with its flowers and fruit.

"Whence it is to be concluded, that the dignity, the grace, and the holiness of this *only,* and only perfect daughter, ought to reflect back on her mother, even to a point. That she rendered her incomparable in sanctity, as she was in her dignity; for of two things, one must of necessity happen, either that this holy Virgin had not the power, or that having the power, she communicated to her whatever we can fancy greater in grace. Her paps have too much credit and access with the Word,

her Son, not to have the power, who being, in the terms of Clement of Alexandria, the pap of his heavenly Father, which gave fecundity to all nature, would also as he had been the principle of the universe, by being *mamele de son Pere*, the *Virgin* should be *his*, (but yet not without proportion) and a force to establish a world of grace, to make saints, and to make them worthy of glory. So that it is true, in some sort, and good divinity to say, that the felicity of the saints is derived from Mary, and that there is nobody who is not obliged to her for the fortification of his patience, for the victory over his temptations, for preservation from falls, for augmentation of his merits, for his final grace, and finally for his glory.

"This principle supposed, who will doubt that St Ann was not the masterpiece of Mary's workmanship, and that the power of this last was not the measure of the excellence of the former? And it is one of the greatest miracles of mysteries of our religion, that the children give life to their parents, and those who are not yet, give admirable advantage to those who already are. Thus Jesus is the son of Adam according to nature, and his father according to grace;—the Virgin is the mother of the Saviour, by the shadowing of the Holy Spirit; and is likewise the eldest daughter to the Redeemer. Thus, St Ann is in the state of grace, the daughter of her daughter, the holy Virgin, by a plenitude of grace which she from her received. Which ought not to be thought strange by him who has tasted the sense and universal consent of the fathers, who assert, that what was given in *plenitude* to Christ, ought in *proportion* to be attributed to the holy Virgin.

"The glory of Jesus Christ, the fourth reason of the prerogatives of St Ann, requires, that St Ann should be such, to be his worthy grandmother. St Ann having been chosen in the ideas of eternal predestination to be the grandmother of Jesus Christ; ought not this step to comprehend as many excellences as demonstrate the sublimeness of this saint's perfection? There need be used only the dignity of her name, as grandmother of Jesus Christ. An argument which the Apostle uses to prove the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ above the angelic natures, for that he was the Son of God. The dignity, therefore, of St Ann, that having entered by the conception and nativity of the Virgin, into the economy of the incarnation, and into the state of the hypostatical union, she was by this her daughter exalted into so dazzling a throne of glory, that there is only above it, the Trinity of uncreated persons, the humanity of Jesus Christ, and the holiness of her daughter, Mother of God.—In our indigences and our needs, we must address ourselves by St Ann to the Virgin, and by the Virgin to Jesus Christ, and by Jesus Christ to God the Father, who can refuse nothing to his Son, no more than He can to his Mother, or she to her's, who is St Ann."

Then follows a prayer addressed to the said St Ann, which will be introduced with more propriety when I come to give specimens of the style of devotion used in the Church of Rome, in the worship of her idols. The work from which the above extracts are made, has the approbation of the doctors in divinity in the faculty in Paris, who declare that they think it worthy to be published; and a certificate to this effect is signed at Paris, the 10th July, 1643, by "Vincent Jude, C. Bourbon."

As an introduction to what I have to write on the subject of the idolatry of the Church of Rome, I thought it proper to give this short history of their principal idol, and of her mother, in the very words of their own writers; and if it shall be said that this account is too much like what heathen authors have written about the genealogy of their gods and goddesses, I have only to reply, that I cannot help it. They have chosen such idols for themselves, and such is the account which their authors give of them.

I had marked off for insertion here, Mr Andrews' account of the Virgin Mary; but as I have not room for the whole, and as it would not be doing him justice to cut it through the middle, I reserve it for my next; and conclude the present Number with the following anecdote, which came to my knowledge since I finished what I had to say on the subject of withholding the Bible from the people.

An English officer, who was lately in Valenciennes, states the following fact, which came under his own observation. A number of Bibles, in French, had been sent from England to the above city, for sale or distribution. Many of the people received them with gratitude, and read them with avidity; but the priests getting information of the matter, ordered all the Bibles to be returned. The English officer, who was acquainted with him, asked the reason of this: to which he gave this truly *Catholic* reply;—"*I* teach the people every thing that is necessary for them to know."

No. XL.

SATURDAY, APRIL 17TH, 1819.

AMICUS VERITATIS tells us that "it would be almost endless to answer all the charges which THE PROTESTANT may bring against Catholics, as the fertility of his genius appears to be very little inferior to the original declaimers against Popery." (Page 25.) I suppose the writer refers to Luther, Calvin, and Knox, as the original declaimers against Popery; and, when he compares THE PROTESTANT to such men, he

probably intends it as a compliment; and as such, no doubt, it ought to received with all due acknowledgment.

In point of fact, however, there is no subject with regard to which fertility of genius is less necessary. It scarcely admits of imagination at all. The only faculty that is necessary for the investigation of such a subject, is patience. The materials, by which the Church of Rome is convicted of all the bad things which I have laid to her charge, are so abundant, that there is no room for invention, or the exercise of imagination. If I am so happy as to possess this faculty, I suppose my readers will not easily find it out from any thing that I have written; but if they knew the quantity of blasphemous and impure matter which I am obliged to turn over, in exploring the writings of Romish saints and fathers, in order to exhibit the true character of Popery, they would, I am sure, give me credit for some degree of patience. It would be easy to find enough to fill some ponderous folios: the difficulty is to select and condense such matter as will engage general attention, in this age of light and superficial reading.

I have undertaken to prove the Church of Rome guilty of idolatry: and so far from being at a loss for matter,—so far from being obliged to have recourse to the fertility of genius, I feel that, amidst the variety of subjects which claim attention, it is difficult to decide which to present to my readers first. In my last Number, I gave a particular account of two of Rome's female idols: namely, the Virgin Mary, upon the authority of the learned doctors of Rheims; and the mother of the said Mary, from a work approved by the doctors of the Sorbonne, at Paris: but, lest it should be pleaded, that these authorities are obsolete, and that more rational sentiments are now entertained, (for Papists can change their sentiments often enough, and disavow the sentiments of their fathers, when they have a purpose to serve,) I shall give the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as held in the present day, in the words of Mr Andrews, in his school book, which has the high *apostolical* sanction and recommendation of Bishop Milner, "than whom a firmer or more orthodox divine never breathed."

"*Of devotion to the Blessed Virgin.*—One of the last means which I assign, but also one of the most effectual, for acquiring virtue in youth, is devotion to the blessed Virgin. It is infallible to such who assiduously employ it, because it affords, at the same time, the most powerful intercession in the sight of God for obtaining his favour, and the most perfect model for our imitation.

"Next to God, and the most adorable humanity of his Son Jesus Christ, it is she whom we must chiefly honour and love, by reason of that most sublime and excellent dignity of mother of God, which raises her above all creatures that God ever created.

"By her we may receive all the assistance which is necessary for us. She is most powerful with God, to obtain from him all that she shall ask of him. She is all goodness in regard of us, by applying to God for us. Being mother of God, he cannot refuse her request: being our mother, she cannot deny us her intercession, when we have recourse to her. Our miseries move her; our necessities urge her; the prayers we offer her for our salvation bring to us all that we desire: and St Bernard is not afraid to say, 'That never any person invoked that mother of mercy, in his necessities, who has not been sensible of the effects of her assistance.'

"Although the blessed Virgin extends her goodness to all men, yet we may say she has a particular regard for young people, whose frailty she knows to be the greatest, and necessities the most urgent, especially for the preservation of chastity, which is most assaulted in that age, and of which she is a singular protectress. History is full of examples of saints who have preserved this great virtue in their youth, by the assistance of this queen of virgins, and experience affords daily examples of those who have gained great victories, by the recourse they have had to her intercession, and who have happily advanced themselves in virtue, under the protection, and by the graces she obtains of God for them.

"Be therefore devout to the blessed Virgin, dear Theotime; but let it not be the devotion of many, who think themselves so, in offering some prayer to her, more by custom than devotion; and on the other side exceedingly displease her by a life full of mortal sin, which they commit without remorse. What devotion is this, to desire to please the mother, and daily crucify the Son, trampling his blood under their feet, and contemning his grace and favour? Is not this to be an enemy both to Son and mother?

"O dear Theotime, your devotion to the blessed Virgin must not be like that, it must be more generous and more holy; and to speak plainly, if you will be a true child, and a sincere servant of the blessed Virgin, you must be careful to perform four things:

"1. Have a great apprehension of displeasing her by mortal sin, and of afflicting her motherly heart by dishonouring her Son, and destroying your soul; and if you chance to fall into that misfortune, have recourse readily to her, that she may be your intercessor, in reconciling you to her Son, whom you have extremely provoked. 'She is the refuge of sinners as well as of the just, on condition they have recourse to her with a true desire of converting themselves,' as St Bernard says.

"2. Love and imitate her virtues, principally her humility and chastity. These two virtues among others rendered her most pleasing to God; she loves them particularly in children,

and is pleased to assist with her prayers those whom she finds particularly inclined to those virtues, according to the same saint.

"3. Have recourse to her in all your spiritual necessities: and for that end offer to her daily some particular prayers, say your beads, or the little office sometimes in the week, perform something in her honour on every Saturday, whether prayer, abstinence, or alms; honour particularly her feasts, by confession and communion.

"4. Be mindful to invoke her in temptations, and in the dangers you find yourselves in of offending God. You cannot show your respect better than by applying yourself to her in these urgent necessities, and you can find no succour more ready and favourable than hers. It is the counsel of St Bernard, 'If the winds of temptation be raised against you, if you run upon the rocks of adversity, lift up your eyes towards that star, invoke the blessed Virgin. In dangers, in extremities, in doubtful affairs, think upon the blessed Virgin, let her not depart from your mouth, nor from your heart; and that you may obtain the assistance of her intercession, be sure to follow her example.'

"If you perform this, you will have a true devotion to the blessed Virgin, you will be of the number of her real children, and she will be your mother, under whose protection you shall never perish. Remember well that excellent sentence of St Anselm, who presumed to say, 'That as he must unavoidably perish who has no affection to the blessed Virgin Mary, and who forsakes her; so it is impossible he should perish who has recourse to her, and whom she regards with the eyes of mercy.'

"I shall conclude with an excellent example which I shall produce for a proof of this truth. St Bridget had a son who followed the profession of a soldier, and died in the wars. Hearing the news of his death, she was much concerned for the salvation of her son, dead in so dangerous a condition; and as she was often favoured by God with revelations of which she has composed a book, she was assured of the salvation of her son by two subsequent revelations. In the first, the blessed Virgin revealed to her, that she had assisted her son with a particular protection at the hour of death, having strengthened him against temptations, and obtained all necessary graces for him to make a holy and happy end. In the following, she declared the cause of that singular assistance she gave her son, and said it was in recompense of his great and sincere devotion he had testified to her during his life, wherein he had loved her with a very ardent affection, and had endeavoured to please her in all things.

"This, Theotime, is what real devotion to the blessed Virgin did merit for this young man, and for many others: she will be as powerful in your behalf, if you have a devotion to her; if you love and honour the blessed Virgin in the manner we have mentioned."

Such is the doctrine of my opponent, The Catholic Vindicator; and such, we may presume, is the doctrine of modern Papists, not only in Spain, but in enlightened England, and even in enlightened Glasgow. Such is the doctrine which, by the authority and recommendation of a Bishop and Vicar Apostolic, is taught in the "Catholic schools" in England, for the purpose of training up the rising generation, not to the knowledge of Christ and his gospel, but to the worship of a vain idol: for let it be remembered that this school book is declared, in the author's Orthodox Journal, to be so excellent, that one will learn more of religion from it, at a single reading, than he will derive from the Bible, in a whole life.

Now I defy all the heathens in the whole world, to produce from the writings of their poets or priests, a piece of more direct idol worship than that furnished by Mr Andrews, which is recommended by Bishop Milner, and inculcated upon the infant minds of those who are taught to read in the schools of English Papists. The religion of such is unquestionably that of heathenism and idolatry; for it is the knowledge of religion which this book is said to be eminently calculated to impart; and this religion is the worship of a fellow-creature. It is to no purpose to reply that, in the same book, the existence of a supreme Deity is admitted, and that he also is to be worshipped. Idolatry consists not so much in denying this truth, as in giving to a creature that worship which is due to God alone.

Mr Andrews invests this idol with the attributes of a deity. The Virgin Mary must be omniscient: she must see and know the hearts and thoughts of all that worship her; she must know the particular temptation to which every young man and woman is exposed, that she may provide a remedy to preserve them from sin. She must be omnipresent, to hear the prayers, and answer the requests of all that call upon her; and she must be omnipotent, to preserve the lives of those who trust in her; or, if she should not choose to do this, on all occasions, she must have power over all the spirits of darkness, so that not one of them shall touch the soul of one that dies calling upon her, in any part of the world. Common sense tells us that one, to whom prayer is addressed by millions of needy creatures, with a belief that such prayers are heard, and will be answered, must be present every where, must know all things, and must have almighty power, to do all that his worshippers call on him for. Such knowledge and power belong to the living and true God, and to him alone. To ascribe such perfection to a creature, and to worship a creature, is that very idolatry, and opposition to the authority of the true God, of which the Almighty declares his abhorrence throughout

the Bible, for which he sent his ancient church into captivity in Babylon; and for which he has not only sent the Church of Rome into a worse captivity, but has made her the antitype of that very Babylon itself, and the oppressor of the true church of God.

To trust in God for salvation, or for any spiritual blessing, is one of the highest acts of religious worship. He positively challenges this for himself; and pronounces a curse upon the man that trusts in any other. "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord: for he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land, and not inhabited. Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is," &c., Jer. xvii. 5—8. But Mr Andrews urgently advises his young pupils to trust in a woman, not only for the preservation of their chastity, but also as a sure refuge to which they may fly in a dying hour.

If it shall be said, that this is rather implied than plainly expressed by Mr Andrews, I shall proceed to cite other authorities, in which it is expressed plainly enough. The following short prayer to the Virgin Mary is extracted from a book of devotion, entitled, the "Garden of the Soul," which is, I believe, ascribed to the late Dr Challoner, a Bishop and Vicar Apostolic in England. "Holy Mary, succour the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex: let all be sensible of *thy help*, who celebrate thy holy commemoration. V. Pray for us, O holy mother of God. R. That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ. *Let us pray.* Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord God, that we thy servants may enjoy perpetual health of mind and body, and, by the glorious intercession of blessed Mary, ever virgin, may be delivered from present sorrows, and come to eternal joys, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Though the latter part of the above professes to be a prayer to God, and though Mary stands only as an intercessor, the first part is a direct prayer to Mary herself; and she is solicited to grant such things as God alone can grant. It is He alone that can hear the prayer of the miserable and afflicted throughout the world, and grant succour and comfort. The following is from the same "Garden of the Soul."

"HYMN TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

"*Ave Maris Stella.*

"Hail, thou resplendent star,
Which shinest o'er the main;
Blest mother of our God,
And ever virgin queen.

"Hail, happy gate of bliss,
Greeted by Gabriel's tongue,
Negociate our peace,
And cancel Eva's wrong.

"Loosen the sinners' bands;
All evils drive away:
Bring light unto the blind,
And for all graces pray.

"Exert the mother's care,
And us thy children own;
To him convey our prayer,
Who chose to be thy Son.

"O pure, O spotless maid,
Whose meekness all excell'd,
O make us chaste and mild,
And all our passions quell.

"Preserve our lives unstained,
And guard us in our way;
Until we come to thee,
To joys that ne'er decay.

"Praise to the Father be,
With Christ his only Son,
And to the Holy Ghost,
Thrice blessed three in one. Amen."

Here the Virgin Mary is plainly invoked as the Saviour of sinners. To "negociate our peace, and cancel Eva's wrong," is nothing less than to make reconciliation with God, and do away the effects of the fall of our first parents. She is also entreated to do the work of the Holy Ghost; that is, to loose the bands of sinners, and give light to the blind. She is presumed able to quell all the corrupt passions of the human heart, and to impart mildness and purity. Every Christian knows that this is the work of God alone; but the poor deluded Romanists ask it of a fellow creature. The priests cause the people to err, and they who are led by them are destroyed.

I have before me another manual of devotion, which seems to be still more modern than Dr Challoner's "Garden of the Soul." It is entitled, "A Manual of Devout Prayers and other Christian Devotions: fitted for all Persons and Occasions, and corrected from the Errors of former editions. To which are added, Vespers for Sundays and Complin." Printed in Preston, 1785.—This work is evidently intended for Papists in England, for it fixes the times of plenary indulgences in the London and the three other districts. I extract from it the following:—

"*A Prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary.*

"O blessed Virgin *Mary*, immaculate mother of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, recommend, we beseech thee, these our imperfect prayers to the mercy of thy glorious Son, and offer him thy own most acceptable intercession for us; that he would be pleased to pardon our sins past, and deliver us from future temptations, and protect us in all our ways, with the assistance of his grace.

"O blessed Virgin, by that unspeakable gladness, which filled and overflowed thy

spirit, when the angel declared to thee the adorable mystery of our Saviour's incarnation, and by that perfect resignation of thyself to the will of God, when thou humbly answeredst, *Behold the handmaid of our Lord, let it be done unto me according to thy word,* we beseech thee obtain for us the graces of a lively faith, a discreet humility, and a cheerful submission to the divine will in all things.

"O admirable mother, by the tender love, and continual service of the blessed Jesus, in his infancy, and by that incomparable happiness thou afterwards enjoyedst in his heavenly doctrine and miraculous life, we beseech thee to obtain for us a diligent devotion, and a constant perseverance in our duty to God, that our delight may be in his law, and our confidence in his holy protection.

"O mother of pity and compassion, by those sharp sorrows which pierced thy heart, when thou wast a sad witness of thy Son's sufferings, and beheldest him in that bitter agony, all torn with cruel scourges, and bleeding on the cross, forsaken of his friends, and dying in the midst of his enemies, we beseech thee to obtain for us compassion towards the affliction of others, and patience in our own, and also a faithful correspondence to the great love of our Redeemer.

"O glorious Virgin, by those excessive joys wherewith thy soul wholly ravished at the victorious resurrection of thy Son, and his triumphant ascension above the highest heavens, we beseech thee to obtain for us the blessings of a virtuous life, and holy death, and a happy resurrection, that we may ever rejoice in the presence of God, and admire his glory, and praise his goodness, through the same Jesus Christ; who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end."

The following is given, both in this work, in the "Garden of the Soul," and in most of the books of devotion that I have seen in Latin, French, and English:—

"*The short Litany of the Blessed Virgin.*

Lord, have mercy on us.
Christ, have mercy on us.
Lord, have mercy on us.
Jesus, receive our prayers.
Lord Jesus, grant our petitions.
O God the Father, Creator of the world, *have mercy on us.*
O God the Son, Redeemer of mankind, *have mercy on us.*
O God the Holy Ghost, Perfecter of the elect, *have mercy on us.*
O holy Trinity, one God, *have mercy on us.*
Holy *Mary, pray for us.*
Holy Mother of God,
Holy Virgin of Virgins,
Daughter of the eternal Father,
Mother of the eternal Son,
Spouse of the eternal Spirit,
Tabernacle of the glorious Trinity,
Mother of Jesus,
Mother of the Messiah,
Mother of the desired of all nations,
Mother of the Prince of Peace,
Mother of the King of heaven,
Mother of our Creator,
Mother and Virgin,
Virgin most chaste and spotless,
Virgin most mild and merciful,
Virgin most prudent and faithful,
Virgin most miraculously fruitful,
Ever-Virgin,
Root of the Tree of Life,
Source of the Fountain of Grace,
Orient of the Sun of glory,
Blessed among women,
Blessed among the children of men,
Blessed throughout all generations,
Mirror of humility and obedience,
Mirror of patience and resignation,
Mirror of modesty, silence, and retirement,
Mirror of wisdom, devotion, and sanctity,
Mirror of faith, hope, and charity,
Mirror of all virtues,
Refuge of sinners,
Comfort of the afflicted,
Advocate of all Christians,
Queen of angels,
Queen of patriarchs and prophets,
Queen of apostles and martyrs,
Queen of confessors and virgins,
Queen of saints, *pray for us.*
Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, *spare us, O Lord.*
Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, *Hear us, O Lord.*
Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, *have mercy on us.*
Lord, have mercy on us.
Christ have mercy on us.
Lord, have mercy on us.
Our Father, &c.

The Antiphon.

Wonderful art thou, O God, in all thy saints, but incomparably more in the mother of thy Son; who remaining a virgin, brought forth the Saviour of the world; and living humbly on this our low earth, is now exalted above the highest seraphims.

Vers. Rejoice, O my soul, in the glory of the blessed virgin mother. *Allelujah.*

Resp. By the fruit of whose womb we are regenerated to eternal life. *Allelujah.*

Vers. O Lord, hear my prayer.

Resp. And let my supplication come unto thee."

I dare say most of my Protestant readers would imagine that I was writing of the dark ages, or of Popish worship in the heart of Spain or Italy, if I had not told them that the above is extracted from books of devotion used in England at this very day. I have a great deal worse to exhibit for the dark ages. I can produce prayers in which Mary is actually exalted above Jesus Christ, and in which she is entreated to *command* her Son to grant what the worshipper desires of him; nay, in which she is represented as saving those whom Christ would reject; and I can show that, with regard to the moral character of those on whom she bestowed her favours, she was not more nice than the ancient Venus was with regard to the character of her worshippers.

No. XLI.

SATURDAY, April 24th, 1819.

In my last Number, I convicted modern Papists of idolatry, upon the authority of their own organ and vindicator. Mr Andrews cannot say that I rest my accusation upon the authority of authors disapproved and condemned by the Church of Rome; for he has not been honoured by such condemnation. He stands as the approved advocate of Popery in Britain; he is supported and recommended by Dr Milner, a Bishop, and Vicar Apostolic; and, under this high authority, he teaches all the youth of the Romish communion in England to worship the Virgin Mary, as the medium by which they will receive all blessings in life, and at death. I request my readers to reflect on this subject; let them carefully peruse the chapter "on devotion to the Blessed Virgin," which I gave in my last Number, and say whether it be possible that such doctrine could proceed from a Christian, or from any man but a downright idolater?

To convict an individual Papist of idolatry would be comparatively a small matter,—to find a poor ignorant devotee of the Virgin Mary bowing down and worshipping before her image, would excite, perhaps, no more than a feeling of compassion for the deluded votary of the idol, and an effort to remove the delusion, by telling him of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; but, when we find such idolatrous principles taught under Episcopal authority,—when we read a certificate, under the hand of an English Vicar Apostolic, that the book which contains them is "the most complete and valuable work of its kind in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public;" that, "as such," he "shall not fail to recommend it in those places of education over which" he has "any authority or influence;"—we are led not only to contemplate the Popish part of our population as idolaters, in the grossest sense of the word, but to compassionate the state of their helpless offspring, for whom an idolatrous education is thus systematically provided; as if Satan, aware of the efforts which Christians are making for the subversion of his kingdom, were endeavouring to provide an army for his defence, by engaging all the youth of the Romish communion to devote themselves to an idol, which he knows well is the same thing as devotion to himself. No matter though that idol be the mother of Jesus according to the flesh,—to worship her is no better than to worship the devil; for to worship any creature whatever is to obey the devil, who was the inventor, and who is the patron of creature worship. If Mr Andrews shall be pleased to controvert this sentiment, and to defend his doctrine "of devotion to the Blessed Virgin," I will give him all the advantage of laying it down broadly and plainly, as a doctrine held by The Protestant, that to worship, in a religious sense, the highest creature that God ever made, is no better than to worship the devil.

Here let me remark, in passing, that I consider as grossly blasphemous the title of "Mother of God," which is usually given to the Virgin Mary, in all Popish books of devotion. In the New Testament, she is called the mother of Jesus, but this relates only to his human nature; and the expression cannot without impiety be used in relation to him as God.

I proceed now to give some specimens of the style in which this idol was addressed, and the estimation in which she was held by her worshippers in former times. There is a great deal of matter more gross than any thing which we find in Mr Andrews' school book, or "the Garden of the Soul;" but if it be at all admitted, that a creature, such as Mary, is a proper object of religious worship, it is of little consequence how extravagant the language of such worship may be. Nay, as we can never speak too highly of the true and proper object of worship, if this were Mary, the more highly her worshippers praised her the better.

"In the contemplations of the life and glory of Holy Mary, the Mother of Jesus, published anno 1685, *Permissu Superiorum*, it is said, 'the Blessed Virgin is the empress of seraphims,—the most exact original of practical perfection which the omnipotence of God ever drew; and, by innumerable titles, she claims *the utmost duty* of every Christian, as a proper homage to her greatness.'"—*M'Culloch Pop. Cond.* p. 334.

"O Mother of God," says St Germain, "your defence is immortal; your intercession is life; your protection is security; if you do not teach us the way, none can become spiritual, nor adore God in spirit. O most holy Virgin, none can have the knowledge of God, but by you: O Mother of God, none can be saved, but by you: O Virgin Mother, none can be delivered from dangers, but by you: O favoured of God, none can obtain any gift or grace, but by you."—*Verit. Devot. de Crasset.* p. 31. *quoted by M'Culloch*, p. 335.

"From the time," says St Bernardine, "that the Virgin Mother conceived in her womb the word of God, she obtained, as I may say, a certain jurisdiction and authority over all the temporal processions of the Holy Ghost; so that no creature has received any grace or virtue from God, but according to the dispensation of his Holy Mother."—*Crasset.* p. 37. *Ibid.*

"Approach," says the abbot of Celles, "with a devout contemplation of spirit, toward the Blessed Virgin; because through her, and with her, and in her, and from her, the world both

has, and will have, all that is good.—She is our advocate with the Son, as the Son is with the Father. She solicits for us, both the Father and the Son. Often those whom the *justice of the Son might condemn, the mercy of the mother delivers.* In short, as our Saviour once said that none could come to him while he was on earth, unless the Father drew him, so dare I, in some sort affirm *that none comes now to thy glorified Son, unless thou draw him by thy holy assistance.*" *Ibid.* p. 33, 34. *Ibid.* 336.

Archbishop Usher, in his answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland, 4to. page 479, furnishes me with the following quotations from Popish authors, with whose works he seems to have been very familiar. He gives the Latin original in the margin, but I shall content myself with the English:—"That because she is the mother of the Son of God who doth produce the Holy Ghost, therefore all the gifts, virtues, and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, when she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth. *Bernardine, Senens. Serm.* 61. *Artic.* 1. *cap.* 8. That she hath singularly obtained of God this office from eternity, as herself doth testify, Prov. viii. 23. 'I was ordained from everlasting,' namely, a dispenser of celestial graces; and that in this respect, Cantic. vii. 4. it is said of her, 'thy neck is a tower of ivory;' because that as by the neck the vital spirits do descend from the head to the body; so by the Virgin the vital graces are transmitted from Christ the head into his mystical body: the fulness of grace being in him, as in the head from whence the influence cometh, and in her as in the neck through which it is transfused unto us: so that take away the patronage of the Virgin, you stop as it were the sinner's breath, that he is not able to live any longer."—*Bernardine, &c. Artic.* 3. *cap.* 3. and other authorities cited.

The Archbishop continues:—"Then men stuck not to teach, that unto her all power was given in heaven and in earth. So that for heaven, when our Saviour ascended thither, this might be assigned for one reason (among others) why he left his mother behind him; lest, perhaps, the court of heaven might have been in doubt whom they should rather go to meet, their lord or their lady: and for earth, she may rightly apply unto herself that in the first of Ezra, 'all the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord given unto me.' And we may say unto her again, that in Tobit 13th, 'thy kingdom endureth for all ages:' and in the 144th or 145th Psalm, 'thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages.' That howsoever she was the noblest person that was, or ever should be in the world, and of so great perfection, that, although she had not been the Mother of God, she ought nevertheless to have been the lady of the world."—Again: "Whence Luke ii. 51. it is written of the Virgin and glorious Joseph, he 'was subject unto them:' that as this proposition is true,—all things are subject to God's command, even the Virgin herself; so this again is true also,—all things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God himself: that considering the Blessed Virgin is the mother of God, and God is her son, and every son is naturally inferior to his mother, and subject unto her, and the mother hath pre-eminence and is superior to her son; it therefore followeth that the Blessed Virgin is superior to God, and God himself is subject unto her, in respect of the manhood which he assumed from her: that howsoever she be subject unto God, in as much as she is his creature, yet is she said to be superior, and preferred before him, in as much as she is his Mother." Usher gives in the margin, pp. 480-482, the very words of the authors who speak such blasphemies, and refers to the particular discourses from which he quotes.

I am heartily sick of such abominable stuff; but justice to my subject requires me to go on. Some of my readers will have heard of the famous Psalter of Bonaventure, of which the design was to apply to the Virgin, all the addresses made to God in the psalms and hymns of the Church. This book was printed with license and commendation, as a piece "which was profitable to be printed, and very piously and commendably to be recited by all men in their private prayers, to the honour of the Blessed Virgin." The author of it, also, has been canonized by the church, and worshipped among others of the same fraternity; which certainly implies that his works were tolerably meritorious. A few quotations will discover what exercises are permitted in the Romish Church. "Come unto Mary, all ye that labour and are heavy laden; and she shall refresh your souls. Come unto her in your temptations; and the serenity of her countenance shall establish you. O lady, in thee do I put my trust; deliver my soul from mine enemies. O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good. O give thanks unto his Mother, for her mercy endureth for ever."—*M'Culloch, Pop. Cond.* pp. 337, 338.

Usher gives several quarto pages of extracts from this Popish version of the Psalms, in the original Latin, with a translation. Here the Virgin Mary is the Alpha and the Omega. The most sublime ascriptions of praise to the Creator and Preserver of all things, are addressed to Mary, under the title of "our Lady." The last psalm is made to begin with "Praise our Lady in her saints; praise her in her virtues and miracles;" and it concludes thus, "*Omnis spiritus laudet Dominam nostram;*—let every spirit (or every thing that has breath) praise our Lady."—*Usher's Ans. &c.* p. 493.

Connected with this, the Archbishop gives

us the words of Bernardinus de Busti, which exceed even Bonaventure in blasphemy:—"But thou, O most grateful Virgin, didst not thou something to God? Didst not thou make him any recompense? Truly (if it be lawful to speak it) thou in some respect did greater things to God, than God himself did to thee and to all mankind. I will therefore speak that, which thou out of thy humility hast past in silence. For thou only didst sing, 'He that is mighty hath done to me great things:' but I do sing and say, that thou hast done greater things to him that is mighty."—*Ibid.* p. 494.

To show that Mary is exalted above Jesus Christ; and to give her greater interest in the affections of her deluded worshippers, the same Bernardine relates a vision, which he says was shown to St Francis, or (as some would have it) to his companion Friar Leon. He saw "two ladders that reached from earth to heaven; the one red, upon which Christ leaned, from which many fell back and could not ascend: the other white, upon which the holy Virgin leaned, the help whereof such as used, were by her received with a cheerful countenance, and so with felicity ascended into heaven." *Ibid. p.* 495. "More present relief," says St Anselm, and after him other authors; "More present relief is sometimes found, by commemorating the name of Mary, than by calling upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, her only Son." Which one of your Jesuits is so far from being ashamed to defend, that he dareth to extend it farther to the mediation of other saints also, telling us very peremptorily, that as our Lord Jesus worketh greater miracles by his saints, than by himself, (John xiv. 12.) so often he showeth the force of their intercession more than of his own. *Ibid. p.* 495. The author refers on the margin to Henry Fitzsimon, of the Mass, lib. 2. part 2. cap. 3.

"If Popish tales be true," says M'Culloch, page 338, "the Romish Church is under very strong obligations to pay all this homage, and a great deal more to the Virgin. There is scarcely any favour which she has withheld from her devout worshippers. She has delivered them from sickness, restored their eyesight, preserved them from dangers, saved them from the gallows, and even raised them from the dead; and, what must peculiarly tend to the consolation of Papists, she is not at all squeamish as to the choice of her votaries. 'Sinners,' says Crasset, 'being her subjects, make up her crown and glory; and it is for that she loves them with the tenderness and sweet compassion of a mother, let them be ever so wicked.' 'Know thou,' said the Virgin herself to St Bridget, 'my dearest child, that there is no man in the world so lewd and accursed of God, that he is entirely forsaken of him while he lives; no sinner so desperate, but he may return and find mercy with him, *provided he have recourse to me.*' *Brig. Revela. lib.* 6. *cap.* 10."

Crasset has given many proofs of her extensive benevolence to the chief of sinners; but this benevolence is not exercised in the way of saving them from their sins, but merely from the punishment which they deserve; or in preserving them during a life of sin, so that they shall not die without an opportunity of making confession at their last moments, which is understood to make all right. See an illustration of this at the conclusion of my third Number; and, in addition, take the following:—

"A certain young Gascon soldier, having spent his fortune, afterwards, for particular reasons, sold himself to the devil, and renounced the Saviour. No temptation, however, could induce him to sacrifice his interest in the Virgin; and this confidence in her mercy secured him protection from his old acquaintance, Satan, who began to be troublesome, notwithstanding their former friendship. On prostrating himself before an image of the Virgin with Christ in her arms, he was greatly comforted by the following dialogue between the two idols:—'O my sweet son, have mercy on this man.' 'Why, mother, what would you have me to do with this wretch who has renounced me?' The Virgin on this prostrated herself before her son, and again demanded his pardon. This was irresistible. The little image raised the large one from the ground, and replied, 'I never yet refused my mother any thing that she asked: I grant it, for your sake, and for yours alone.' *Crasset, page* 90. *quoted by M'Culloch, page* 340. Should any incredulous reader inquire how the images could hold such a conversation, or how a little image in the arms of a large one could raise it from the ground, and embrace it, let him recollect that this is the least marvellous part of the adventure."

Palbert of Tameswaer relates the following extraordinary instance of the power of the Virgin:—"A certain wicked villain fell into the Danube, and remained under water for three days. In ordinary cases, there certainly would have been some danger of drowning; but, to the rogue's great surprise, he was greeted in this new element with the following address, 'Thou well deservest, base rascal, to lose thy life, and be condemned for ever, for thy sins; but because thou art a servant of the Virgin Mary, thou shalt be delivered from this danger, that thou mayest go and be confessed.' Up he came accordingly, and made the above declaration to the priest Palbert himself. Crasset (p. 130.) refers to this story of Palbert, and informs us that the works of this priest were dedicated to the Pope, from which we may infer, if we please, that the story is worthy of all credit." *See M'Culloch, p.* 341.

Idolatrous worship was usually accompanied

by scenes of lewdness, and every species of wickedness; and the Church of Rome, following the footsteps of their heathen ancestors, have made an idol that without scruple indulges those who worship her, in such practices as were reckoned most acceptable to the idol of Paphos. In short, the Virgin Mary is represented as little better than a pander of lewdness. I have been obliged to read several stories of her, that would not be believed, if related of any virtuous woman. She has appeared to many grave monks and fathers, and caressed them just as a mother would do her infant child. It is related of several nuns who were warmly devoted to her service, that when they happened to have what in Scotland is called a misfortune, the Virgin has miraculously conveyed them out of the way, and assumed the exact appearance of their persons, till it was convenient for them to return to their places; and not one of the sisterhood knew that they had been absent. It is said that a certain Abbess, who happened to have a misfortune, had her place supplied by the Virgin, and the duties of her office performed so punctually, that though she was absent for a long time, none of the sisterhood so much as suspected the fact, or that they had the holy Virgin presiding among them, instead of their own spiritual mother. I do not choose to enlarge on this subject. Let the following story suffice as a specimen of the manner in which the Virgin Mary is represented as favouring the most vicious persons, if they be only devoted to her:—

"We read, in Martial le Grand, of a woman very much given to lascivious and impure practices; but, amidst all her imperfections, she had such a great love and affection for the Virgin, that she never let a day pass without making her seven devout obeyances, accompanied with an *Ave Maria*. Yet that woman was a common and mercenary prostitute, particularly to one of chief note in the place, who had a spouse very devout and virtuous, who, impatient of such an affront, every day prayed the virgin to avenge her of that strumpet. One day falling down before her image, she said to her, O my dearest lady, mirror of all purity, how can you suffer that harlot to insult me,—to rob me of my honour;—punish, punish her, I pray you, and take such exemplary vengeance as may deter all from like practices.—But the image, (O strange power of a prayer rightly made), the image, animated by miracle, answered her, My well beloved, it is not possible for me to satisfy your desire, not as if I knew not very well the justice of your complaint, and of the resentment of the outrage which that hussey does you: but the *honour and respect which she still bears to me*, amidst all her disorders, tie up my hands, and forbid the chastisement which you desire. But that you may not be altogether unsuccessful in your suit, I shall try, for your comfort, to obtain of my Son for her a perfect compunction of heart, and an entire retreat from such a detestable life; which she accordingly did." *Free Thoughts, p. 99.*

From these things it appears that men and women may live in the habitual practice of all manner of wickedness, and yet their devotion will be extremely acceptable to the Virgin Mary. Let them be as wicked as it is possible for them to be, if they will but pay due respect to this idol,—if they will make so many obeyances to her, and say so many Aves every day, she will take care that they shall not perish in their sins, or die without confession. It is impossible that any species of heathenism can have a worse effect upon the moral character of the people than this. Popery is corruption and abomination all over. It is the very dregs of the filth of the idolatry of ancient nations,—so much the more loathsome, that it professes to be of divine origin, and to be the religion of Him who was holy, harmless, undefiled; and who came to save his people from their sins; and to create them anew after his own image, in righteousness and true holiness.

I have given some stories relating to the Virgin Mary, as they are related by grave authors and saints of the Romish Church. It is needless to say that I do not believe one of them to be true. I take them all to be mere fables; but they are fables which were invented for the purpose of deceiving the people, and keeping them in bondage to an idol. They must have been very generally believed at the time they were published; I suppose they are believed in Popish countries to this day; and it is from the subjects of popular belief that we estimate the intellectual state of the people in any country. How deplorable, therefore, must be the condition of the people in every country where Popery is predominant; and how much to be dreaded its influence among ourselves. The Virgin Mary is held up as an object of worship, in all the schools in Britain over which Bishop Milner has any authority or influence. A story is recorded of her attention to a dying soldier, in recompense of the sincere devotion he had testified to her during his life,—a story as absurd as any of those which I have given in this Number, from the writings of Papists in darker ages; but which Mr Andrews gives as a solemn truth, for which see his own words in my last Number; and it is given evidently with the design of filling the minds of children in Popish schools with such a high notion of the power of the Virgin Mary, as that they may make her an object of worship and confidence; and by this means to train them up to all the idolatry, and of course, to all the superstition, vice, and wretchedness, of the dark ages.

At the conclusion of my thirty-first Num-

ber, I quoted a sentence or two from Mr Andrews' chapter "on devotion to the Blessed Virgin." In language pretty plain, I represented him as teaching idolatry; or, which is the same thing, making religion to consist in devotion to the Virgin Mary. He has alluded to this part of my work once or twice, but he has made no reply. He has not so much as attempted to vindicate himself and his brethren from the accusation, that they consider *religion to consist in devotion to a creature*. This, therefore, may be held as admitted. Papists are proved to be idolaters, from their own writings; and the Catholic Vindicator tacitly admits it. I intend to make a particular use of this admission in the beginning of my next Number.

No. XLII.

SATURDAY, May 1st, 1819.

THE Spectator has compared the writer of a periodical paper to the runner of a stage coach, who must send it off at the time appointed, if he should run it empty. It must always be an unpleasant thing to run a coach without passengers; but the mortification arising from this will be sometimes equalled by the regret that the capacity of his vehicle is so limited, when more persons apply than can be accommodated.

A circumstance resembling the latter often excites the regret of THE PROTESTANT. He finds it difficult to condense just as much matter as will make a complete whole within itself, and at the same time, fill eight pages of letter-press, and no more. He has often the mortification to have part of his manuscript returned along with the proof-sheet, because it cannot be comprised within the allotted space; and this extra matter is frequently condemned as useless, because what may be suitable to conclude one Number, may not be suitable to begin its successor.

I am led into these reflections by the conclusion of my last Number, which was a little abrupt. I convicted Mr Andrews of tacitly admitting that Papists were idolaters, because he passed over my accusation to that effect without any reply. I had written some paragraphs to show that this inference was made according to his own mode of arguing; but I had not room for them in my last sheet; and, therefore, though contrary to my usual practice, I begin the present Number with what was intended for the conclusion of my last. I said, "Papists are proved to be idolaters from their own writings, and the Catholic Vindicator tacitly admits it."

He cannot reasonably object to this mode of drawing an inference from silence. He has repeatedly accused me of forgery; and, because I have not replied to the accusation, he holds me convicted. This would have been fair enough, had I been writing in my own defence, or answering his numerous accusations. He has affected to find me guilty of innumerable contradictions; and he might as well maintain that I admit all these, because I have made no reply. But the fact is, I do not admit one of them. He has not detected one *real* contradiction in all that I have written; though, by misconstruction and misrepresentation, he has made out many *apparent* ones. This I intend to point out in due time. But I have more important work in hand, than replying to his accusations. He labours to make my character appear as black as possible; expecting, no doubt, that, by this means, he will make his church appear pure and white as snow. I read his bitterest reproaches and accusations without emotion, being perfectly conscious that not one of them applies to me: and as for the charge of forgery, which he has repeated so often, and about which he makes such a hue and cry, I am in no haste to reply to it; though I am ready to prove by credible witnesses, that the story (that is, of the man who left his wife, because she would not become Papist) is true as I gave it, in every material point. Mr Andrews' correspondents here know it to be true in substance; and, I doubt not, they know also what means have been used to persuade the widow to destroy the letter which she found upon the person, or in the clothes of her deceased husband. This letter is extant, and is verbatim as I gave it in my twenty-fifth Number. Mr Scott is reported (though I cannot vouch for the fact) to have declared it from the pulpit to be a forgery. If so, it must have been the work of one of his own people, who had smuggled it into the pocket of the dying man; for it was among Papists that he was taken ill, and Papists were about him during his illness. In short, if any of my readers, Protestant or Popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement. In fact I did not relate the tenth part of the cruelty of the man to his wife solely because she would not become Papist; nor the means which were used, both foul and fair, to persuade her to renounce her heresy.

Mr Andrews writes as if the whole merits of the question between Protestants and Papists depended upon the truth or falsehood of this story. The thing in itself is of no consequence at all to the general argument; but by reiterating his charge of forgery, he hopes to divert me from exposing the vital errors of his system, and to engage me in a personal controversy. But I will not be so diverted. He

may accuse me of all the crimes that were ever heard of in Newgate; but I can assure him this will not establish the credit of his church, or make her holy and infallible, or set aside the proofs of her idolatry which I have given, and which I intend to give farther in my future Numbers.

I have not yet professed to enter upon my own defence, or to make a formal reply to any part of the Vindicator. It is quite unfair, therefore, to infer from my silence that I admit the truth of any thing that he has written.

But he has avowedly engaged to defend his church against my accusations. He promised to follow me through them all; and to refute them all. It is quite fair, therefore, to infer that he admits what he has passed over in silence. His church is convicted of all those things which I laid to her charge, to which he has made no reply. This embraces almost every thing contained between the third and eighteenth Numbers of the Protestant. For instance, I denied that Peter was ever Bishop of Rome. I defied the whole church to prove that Peter was ever in that city. To this he makes no reply. Upon the principle, therefore, of inferring conviction from silence, the Church of Rome is convicted of imposition, in giving herself out as the see of Peter; the Popes are convicted of imposition in giving themselves out as his successors; and the whole fabric of the Romish hierarchy, not having a stone to stand upon, must fall to the ground.

In my thirty-sixth Number, I accused Papists of being more stupid than the beasts of the field, for believing in transubstantiation.

Mr Andrews alludes to this with much feeling of indignation; but he makes no reply to the charge. Upon his principle of inferring conviction from silence, Papists are convicted of such stupidity. Mr Andrews need not feel so indignant at the comparison I made, and which was suggested by himself, in his reference to Luther. The comparison is by no means new. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider;" Isa. i. 3. It was a very great degree of stupidity, which led the inspired prophet to make such a comparison; but not greater than the stupidity of Papists, in believing a piece of bread to be the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. Until Mr Andrews answers this, and all the other matters contained in my work which he has passed over, I shall, agreeably to his own principles, hold him convicted of maintaining the errors which I have laid to the charge of his *infallible* church.

I now come to the proper subject of the present Number.

I have reason to think that I am now heartily abhorred by all good Papists, for the disrespectful manner in which they must suppose I have spoken of their great idol, the Virgin Mary. I assure them, however, that I do not regard *her* with disrespect. It was only the idol and the image to which Papists have given the name that called forth the strictures contained in my last Number. I believe Baal, the most ancient of idols, was an image of the sun. When the prophet Elijah mocked both the god and his priests, it is not to be supposed that he spoke disrespectfully of the bright luminary which enlightens the world. Neither must I be understood to detract from the honour of the mother of Jesus, when I expose the folly and impiety of giving to her that worship and honour which is due to God alone. I am persuaded that were she on earth, she would be the first to condemn the idolatrous addresses to her, of which I gave specimens in my two last Numbers. She would disclaim, with abhorrence, the lowest degree of religious worship; how much more those blasphemous adorations in which she is exalted as equal, and even superior, to the Saviour of the world?

It cannot be denied there was a very early indication of undue respect for the mother of Jesus, which was instantly checked and reproved by Jesus himself. A certain woman, who had been listening to his heavenly discourse, cried out, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts which thou hast sucked: But he said, Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it;" Luke xi. 27, 28. It does not appear that the person who addressed Jesus had any acquaintance with Mary, or any undue respect for her personally; but being astonished by his manner of teaching, and by the divine dignity of all that he said and did, she expressed her feelings by exclaiming, What a blessed mother to have such a son! By his reply, he instructed all who heard him, and by the same he is instructing us, that to hear and obey the word of God, is greater blessedness than that which arises from the circumstance of being his mother. As a believer in Christ, Mary stood upon a footing of perfect equality with every other Christian; and every Christian, in virtue of his relation to Christ, is greater and more blessed than Mary was, considered merely as his mother. In the most emphatic manner Jesus refused to acknowledge any superiority on the part of his relations according to the flesh; nor would he suffer them to interfere in any part of his public ministry. On one occasion, when closely engaged in his work of teaching, "there came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? And he looked

round about upon them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother;" Mark iii. 31—35.

Though it appears evident from the whole evangelical history that Christ never intended that Mary should be honoured above others of his followers: or that the circumstance of her being his mother according to the flesh, should ever be mentioned as the foundation of regarding her with any thing like divine honour, the Church of Rome has found means to exalt her above all the heavenly hosts, and to make her the principal object of the adoration of her devout members.

It is related that Mary herself appeared once to Thomas à Becket, and spoke as follows: (for the original, see Bernardin. de Bust. Marial. part 10. Serm. 2d. sect. ult. as quoted by Usher, p. 487.)—"'Rejoice, and be glad, and be joyful with me,' said the Virgin Mary, 'because my glory doth excel the dignity of all the saints, and all the blessed spirits; and I alone have greater glory than all the angels and saints together. Rejoice, because that as the sun doth enlighten the day and the world, so my brightness doth enlighten the whole celestial world. Rejoice, because the whole host of heaven obeyeth me, reverenceth and honoureth me. Rejoice, because my Son is always obedient to me, and my will and my prayers he always heareth. Or, as others do relate it, the will of the blessed Trinity, and mine is the same; and whatsoever doth please me, the whole Trinity with unspeakable favour doth give consent unto. Rejoice, because God doth always at my pleasure reward my servitors in this world, and in the world to come. Rejoice, because I sit next to the holy Trinity, and am clothed with my body glorified. Rejoice, because I am certain and sure that these my joys shall always stand, and never be finished or fail. And whosoever, by rejoicing with these spiritual joys, shall worship me in this world, at the time of the departure of his soul out of the body, he shall obtain my presence; and I will deliver his soul from the malignant enemies, and present it in the sight of my Son, that it may possess joys with me.' They tell us that many (*multæ meretrices*, for example, that would not sin on Saturday, for the reverence of the Virgin, whatsoever they did on the Lord's day) seem to have the blessed Virgin in greater veneration than Christ her Son; moved thereunto out of simplicity more than out of knowledge. Yet that the Son of God doth bear with the simplicity of those men and women; because he is not ignorant, that the honour of the mother doth redound to the child; Prov. xvii. 6. They argue farther, that if a cardinal have this privilege, that if he put his cap upon the head of one that is led unto justice, he is freed thereby: then, by an argument drawn from the stronger, the cloak of the Blessed Virgin is able to deliver us from all evil: her mercy being so large, that if she should see any man who did devoutly make her crown (that is to say, repeat the rosary or chaplet of prayers made for her worship) to be drawn unto punishment in the midst of a thousand devils, she would presently rescue him; and not permit that any one should have an evil end, who did study reverently to make her crown. They add, moreover, that for every of these crowns, a man shall obtain two hundred and seventy-three thousand, seven hundred and fifty-eight days of indulgence: and that Pope Sixtus IV. granted an indulgence of twelve thousand years, for every time that a man in a state of grace should repeat this short orison or salutation of the Virgin, which by many is inserted into her crown; 'Hail most holy Mary, the mother of God, the queen of heaven, the gate of paradise, the lady of the world. Thou art a singular and pure Virgin: thou didst bear Christ without sin; thou didst bear the Creator and Saviour of the world, in whom I do not doubt. Deliver me from all evil, and pray for my sins. Amen.'

"In the crown composed by Bonaventure, this is one of the orisons that is prescribed to be said: 'O Empress and our most kind Lady, by the authority of a mother, command thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would vouchsafe to lift up our minds from the love of earthly things, unto heavenly desires: which is suitable unto that versicle which we read in the 35th Psalm of his Lady's Psalter:—'Incline the countenance of God upon us; and compel him to have mercy upon sinners:' the harshness whereof our Romanists have a little qualified in some of their editions, reading thus:—'Incline the countenance of thy Son upon us; compel him by thy prayers to have mercy upon sinners.' The Psalms of this Psalter do all of them begin as David's do; but with this main difference, that where the Prophet in the one aimeth at the advancement of the honour of our Lord, the Friar in the other applieth all to the magnifying of the power and goodness of our Lady." *Usher's Answer*, see pp. 486—492, in which there are numerous quotations from this saint's Psalm book, by which all glory and power in heaven and earth are ascribed to the Virgin Mary.

When Papists are pushed hard upon this subject, they use many shifts and evasions. They are very much offended when we call them idolaters; and they will maintain broadly in the face of the sun, that when they pray to the Virgin Mary, they mean only to ask the benefits of her prayers, as one Christian friend asks the prayers of another; and that when they worship her, they intend only such a degree of civil respect as an inferior gives to a superior whom he addresses as right worship-

ful. They maintain "that there is no more danger of robbing God of his honour, by worshipping his angels and saints, than of robbing a king of his honour, by reverencing his peers and nobles, according to their several dignities and capacities." *Manual of Controversies clearly demonstrating the truth of the Catholic religion*, p. 285. They have accordingly different words for expressing their different degrees of worship. *Latria*, they say, signifies divine worship which they give to God alone: *Dulia* signifies that inferior sort of worship which is due to angels and saints: and they have their *Hyperdulia*, which signifies that superior kind of inferior worship which is due to a creature so exalted as the Virgin Mary. But these distinctions are of no use to the great bulk of the people, who do not understand Greek; and who being incessantly urged to worship the saints, especially the Virgin Mary, fail not to give her the highest degree of devotion and worship of which they are capable. Besides, those who are acquainted with Greek know that the words *Latria* and *Dulia* are used indifferently to express divine worship; and that when the latter is used for civil respect, it is so connected with other words as to fix its meaning without danger of leading to idolatry.

If it were true that Popish prayers to saints were no more than asking them to pray for us, as one Christian friend requests the prayers of another, it would require to be explained how persons in this world can communicate their requests to persons in the other world. Christians on earth can express their desires to one another by word or writing; and they do enjoy the benefit of one another's prayers. But how can a Papist make a saint in heaven acquainted with his necessities, or request his prayers? A glorified saint is but a finite creature. He cannot be in more than one place at one time, any more than a sinner on earth can be. How then can he attend to the prayers that are addressed to him from all parts of the world? Persons who excel in devotion to the Virgin Mary are represented as saying five *Ave Marias* for one *Paternoster*. Papists boast that there are six millions of their communion in Britain and Ireland; and supposing each to say his prayers only once a-day, the Virgin Mary would require to give daily attention to thirty millions of prayers coming from the British Islands alone, not to speak of the countless millions that must be sent up every day from Spain, Portugal, Italy, and all the other countries of the world, in which Popery has obtained a footing. Religion out of the question, common sense assures us that it is impossible for any creature to do what Mary is here supposed to do; and if Papists are desirous of having credit for common sense, they will never offer another prayer to a creature, or so much as say, "Holy Mary, pray for us."

But it is not true that their addresses to the Virgin Mary merely request the benefit of her prayers. Let any man read the language of their authorised books of devotion, of which I have given copious extracts in this and my two preceding Numbers, and let him say if it be possible to use language of more direct address, in the form of prayer, to the divine Being himself, than is addressed to the Virgin Mary. She is declared to be worthy of the "*utmost duty*" of every Christian, which is as much as can be said of what is due to God. Mr Andrews himself holds her up as an object of *devotion;* and that he means it in a religious sense is evident from the blessings which, he says, this devotion will obtain. One of the most effectual means, "for acquiring virtue in youth," is, according to him, "devotion to the Blessed Virgin." Nay, Mr Andrews says expressly, "the prayers we *offer her for our salvation* bring to us all that we desire;" and he quotes St Bernard as saying, "That never any person invoked that mother of mercy, in his necessities, who has not been sensible of the effect of her assistance." See the whole chapter in my fortieth Number, pp. 185, 186.

The most copious book of devotion that has come in my way, is intitled "*Heures, imprimées par l'ordre de Monseigneur le Cardinal De Noailles, Archevesque de Paris.*" I could fill many sheets with prayers to Mary and other saints from this book; but I shall satisfy myself at present with the following translation from pages 395, 396:—

"Give us access to thy Son, Mary, who hast found grace before the Lord, who art blessed among women, who hast brought life into the world and art the mother of salvation. Let him who hath been given us by thee, receive us by thee. Let thy purity excuse to him our corruption; let thy humility which hath been so agreeable to God, obtain pardon of our vanity; let the abundance of thy charity cover the multitude of our sins; and thy glorious fruitfulness shed on us a happy fruitfulness of merits and good works. Thou art our Queen, our Mediator, our Advocate. Reconcile us with thy Son; recommend us to thy Son; present us to thy Son," &c. See again: "We come to thee, fruitful mother, mother without spot; to whom God, the master of the universe, who dwelleth spiritually in the other saints, hath also dwelt in thee bodily," &c. &c.

Though the style of this prayer is not so gross as some others which I have given, the sentiment is equally abominable and idolatrous. Christ alone brought life and salvation into the world; but here this honour is ascribed to Mary. No man can obtain the pardon of sin but through the merits or righteousness of Christ; but the deluded votary of the Virgin Mary is taught by his church to ask this blessing for the sake of a mere creature. The purity, the humility, and the abundant charity

of Mary, are supposed to be so meritorious as to make up for the want of these qualities in her devout worshippers. This is the great comprehensive sin of Popery. It is trusting in a creature, instead of trusting in the living God, and this, according to the word of God, brings down a curse instead of a blessing.

In short, Popish devotion consists, according to their approved liturgies, in little else than calling upon the Virgin Mary and other saints; that is, invoking and praying to mere creatures, which is downright idolatry. We are taught in the Scriptures, "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved; and then it is asked, "how shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?" Rom. x. 13, 14. From this it is evident that there can be no acceptable worship without faith in the object of worship. Those, therefore, who call upon the Virgin Mary, must believe in her; and unless they can show, from the word of God, some authority and warrant for believing in a mere creature, they must stand in the awful predicament of those who believe a lie, and who receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved.

No. XLIII.

SATURDAY, MAY 8TH, 1819.

No part of the word of God is more plain and explicit than the command to abstain from the worship of creatures. The Almighty himself spoke these words from Mount Sinai, "I am the Lord thy God;—thou shalt have no other gods before me." And when the devil tempted Jesus Christ to commit idolatry by worshipping him, he replied, in allusion to the above, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve." When, through mistake, the apostle John fell down before an angel to worship him, the heavenly messenger instantly rejected the proffered homage:—"See thou do it not:—I am thy fellow servant:—worship God;" Rev. xix. 10. If the fact of being a fellow servant was an argument in the mouth of an angel, that he should not be worshipped; how much more forcible would it be in the mouth of those who are fellow-creatures, as well as fellow-servants? This is the condition of all the saints in heaven, who are mere fellow-servants, and fellow-creatures with the saints on earth; that is, with all Christians: for to apply the title of saint to some Christians and not to others, is a Popish error, and one that has been retained too long in some Protestant churches. The sinner who believed in Jesus Christ yesterday, for the first time, is as really a saint as Paul, or Peter, or even the Virgin Mary. He is "washed, and *sanctified* (that is, made a saint), and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God;" 1 Cor. vi. 11. In times of primitive purity, the words Christian and saint were synonymous; and to use the words of an acute writer, it was not till after the churches had begun to depart from the faith and practice of apostles and evangelists, that, to make amends, they knighted these servants of God, and called them saints, by way of eminence and distinction. I am aware that the passages of Scripture, to which I have here referred, will be of no weight with my Popish readers, because they do not submit to the authority of the Bible alone; but I am sure my Protestant readers will be convinced by such authority, that I do the Church of Rome no injustice, when I charge her with both idolatry and absurdity.

For what can be more absurd, than fellow-creatures and fellow-servants worshipping one another? What can be more impious, as well as absurd, than praying to fellow-creatures, and requesting them to intercede and mediate with God for us, when we are assured by the word of God that there is "*one* Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus?" What can be more impious than to call on the name of a mere creature to save us, when we are assured that besides Jesus Christ there is no other name by which we can be saved? The Church of Rome is guilty of all this impiety, by teaching her deluded adherents to worship and call upon mere creatures.

I grant that those members of the Church of Rome, and of every other church, who are not Christians, are not saints. Let men call themselves by what name they please, if they are not subjects of that gracious and radical change, which is effected by the Holy Spirit upon all who are led by his divine influence to believe in Christ, and trust in him for the salvation of their own souls, they are not Christians. There is, therefore, an infinite distance between them and those who are properly called saints. They are sinners. This is their distinctive appellation. But as sinners, Christ makes them welcome to come to *himself*, directly and immediately, for the pardon of their sins, and the salvation of their souls. "Him that cometh to ME, I will in no wise cast out," is the language of the gracious and almighty Saviour; but he never required or encouraged any sinner to go first to Mary, or to any of the saints.

It was false humility that led men first to think of approaching to God through the medium of mere creatures. They professed to believe him too great, and themselves too unworthy, to admit of direct intercourse. This would have been true, if he had not, of his infinite mercy, provided and revealed to us a medium of intercourse, and declared that his throne of mercy was accessible to any sinner of the human race who should come to him

in the name of Christ. Having this revealed to us in the Scripiures, it is both our privilege and duty to come to him, in obedience to his invitation. He knows best what is suitable to his own glory, and to our circumstances; and as it is his glory to show mercy to the chief of sinners, they cannot honour him more than by coming to him as sinners, submitting to his righteousness, and accepting his overtures of mercy.

It is not humility, but pride, that prevents sinners from coming to God in the way which he has appointed. True humility would lead them to him in his revealed way; but pride will come only in its own way. Affecting to think themselves so very unworthy, and to believe God too great to regard them, Papists have devised a way of their own, by which alone they will come to Him, that is, through the medium of creatures, whom they call saints. For this they have not the shadow of a warrant from the word of God; but being a way of their own devising, they adhere to it most pertinaciously: rather than not come to God in this way, they will not come at all; and as he never promised to accept any who came in this way, they can have no ground to hope that they will be accepted.

In my late Numbers, I have shown that the Virgin Mary is regarded by Papists as the principal medium of intercourse with God; but there are innumerable others whom they regard as objects of worship, to whom they address their prayers, and who are supposed to have such interest in the court of heaven, that they can obtain whatever their votaries ask of them. Thus the Church of Rome is proved to be the Antichrist that should arise in the latter days, that should "depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;" 1 Tim. iv. 1.

The words which our translators have rendered "doctrines of devils," are, in the original, διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, doctrines of demons, or concerning demons. Devil is the English word for διαβόλος, not for δαίμων. The word here rendered devils, is the same that in Acts xvii. 18. is rendered *gods*. Οἱ δὲ Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι. "Others said, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange *gods*; that is, because he preached Jesus and the resurrection." The Athenians supposed these to be two new deities whom Paul wished them to place among their other objects of worship. Our translators saw the impropriety of rendering the passage, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of *strange devils*," and they deviated accordingly from their usual way of rendering the word δαιμονίων. Suppose them to have translated 1 Tim. iv. 1. the same way, it would have been "doctrines of, or concerning *gods*," * that is, inferior deities, objects of religious worship, which are yet allowed to be mere creatures. This was the error of the heathen, who deified the spirits of departed heroes and lawgivers, and made them objects of idolatrous worship, though still considered to be inferior to the supreme deity.

In this respect, Popery is nothing else than the ancient heathenism under a new name. Their saints occupy the very place in their worship that demons, or inferior deities, did in

* I make these remarks without intending the least disrespect to the memory of our translators, or wishing to detract from the merit of their labours. They did not give themselves out as infallible. They took advantage of the degree of knowledge which they possessed, to improve upon their predecessors; and they left their successors at liberty to improve upon them. It is worthy of remark, however, that in those passages of the Bible which relate directly to the way of salvation,—that is, those which are of vital interest and importance,—the fidelity and correctness of our authorised version stand unimpeached. That they have, in some instances, mistaken the meaning of a Greek or Hebrew word,—that they have translated δαιμονίων, *devils*, or any thing of a like nature, is comparatively of very little importance, seeing they have given us the gospel of salvation pure, and unadulterated by any inventions of their own.

"Mr Andrews, in some of his late Vindicators," says an anonymous Correspondent, "musters up a long list of passages from Protestant translations of the Bible, and takes it for granted that they are, and must be, errors, *because* they differ from the same passages, as translated by Catholics. Good honest soul! it never occurred to him, I suppose, that this kind of proof would be quite thrown away upon *us*. A Catholic is the last person in the world, whose word we would take for what *is*, and for what is *not*, in the Bible. But it is needless to waste time in addressing The Vindicator upon this topic. The two lists of passages which he contrasts may all be mistranslations, for any thing he seems to know about the matter. But although we admit that the passages he has quoted from Protestant translations are all and every one of them errors, the admission will be of little service to the Popish cause. Still we say that a translation of a book like the Bible, in which all classes are vitally interested, although it have many faults, is better than *no translation*. We might say that a perfect or faultless translation of any one book is no where to be found: we do say that a perfect or faultless translation of the Bible, now is, and probably will continue to be, a *desideratum*. We have no right to expect such a translation, because we have no right to expect that the same blessed Spirit who dictated the originals will ever be imparted to any translator, or body of translators, so as to make them infallible. In plain language, Papists are hostile to all translations of the Scriptures, whether they be good, bad, or indifferent. They are offended with ours, not because we have missed the meaning in a few passages, but because we have found it in all but a few; not because we have thrown too little light upon the Bible, but because we have thrown too much light upon it. It is the Bible,—the Bible they are against, and not the errors of our translations of it; and for this very good reason, *the Bible is against them*. But it will be replied, as indeed it has been, 'that Papists cannot be hostile to all translations of the Bible into modern languages, for they have made and published such translations themselves. Yes, indeed, they have; but such translations as literally tantalize the unlearned reader. He takes up one of them: he goes on a little way, and begins to feel interested; when lo! and behold! he comes to a passage, which, if properly translated, would expose some Popish dogma, or some Popish ceremony. To prevent the exposure, the prudent translator either retains one or more of the original words, or accompanies his translation of them by a note, which, to the insulted, abused reader, wrests the whole passage, or envelops it in impenetrable mystery."

that of ancient Rome; and as every country, and almost every city, had its own tutelar deity, so, in Popish countries, every city or province has its patron saint.

"The noblest heathen temple now remaining in the world, is the Pantheon, or Rotunda; which, as the inscription over the portico informs us, having been impiously dedicated of old by Agrippa to Jove and all the gods, was piously consecrated by Pope Boniface IV. to the Blessed Virgin and all the saints. With this single alteration, it serves as exactly for all the purposes of the Popish, as it did for the Pagan worship, for which it was built. For as, in the old temple, every one might find the god of his country, and address himself to that deity, whose religion he was most devoted to; so it is the same thing now: every one chooses the patron whom he likes best; and one may see here different services going on at the same time, at different altars, with distinct congregations around them, just as the inclinations of the people lead them, to the worship of this or that particular saint."—*Middleton's Letter from Rome*, 4th ed. p. 161.

"And what better title can the new demi-gods show to the adoration now paid to them, than the old ones, whose shrines they have usurped? or how comes it to be less criminal to worship images erected by the Pope, than those which Agrippa or Nebuchadnezzar set up? If there be any real difference, most people, I dare say, will be apt to determine in favour of the old possessors: for those heroes of antiquity were raised up into gods, and received divine honours, for some signal benefits of which they had been the authors to mankind; or the invention of arts and sciences; or of something highly useful and necessary to life: whereas of the Romish saints, it is certain, that many of them were never heard of but in their own legends and fabulous histories; and many more, instead of any service done to mankind, owe all the honours now paid them, to their vices or their errors; whose merit, like that of Demetrius in the Acts, was their skill of raising rebellions in defence of an idol, and throwing kingdoms into convulsions, for the sake of some gainful imposture.

"And as it is in the Pantheon, it is just the same in all other heathen temples that still remain in Rome; they have only pulled down one idol to set up another, changing rather the name than the object of their worship. Thus the little temple of Vesta, near the Tiber, mentioned by Horace, is now possessed by the Madonna of the sun; that of Fortuna Virilis, by Mary the Egyptian; that of Saturn, where the public treasure was anciently kept, by St Adrian; that of Romulus and Remus, in the *via sacra*, by two other brothers, Cosmus and Damianus; that of Antonine the godly, by Laurence the saint: but, for my part, I had sooner be tempted to prostrate myself before the statue of a Romulus or an Antonine, than that of a Laurence or a Damian; and give divine honours rather, with Pagan Rome, to the founders of empires, than, with Popish Rome, to the founders of monasteries."—*Ibid.* pp. 162—164.

Having adverted to these things in general, I shall proceed to give a particular account of one of these demons, or inferior deities, which are worshipped by Papists in our own island, and which is firmly believed by them to work miracles at the present day: at least the most unanswerable and most orthodox Dr Milner, Bishop of Castabala, and Vicar Apostolic, says so; and even certifies one of her miracles under his own hand. This is the tutelar deity of Wales; for, like the ancient heathens, Papists have their gods of the mountains, as well as their gods of the valleys. Her name is St Wenefride; and my great opponent, The Catholic Vindicator, has lately published an account of her life and miracles, with a recommendatory preface. The thing in itself is not of much importance. The story is in general extremely ridiculous; but Mr Andrews, who seems inclined to make his shop the receptacle of all the literary filth of the dark ages, has republished it, with a fine portrait of the *holy saint*. I give an abridgment of the story, not for the edification of my readers, but as a specimen of Popish literature, and of what will be generally read by our Masters and Misses, after Popery shall be re-established among us.

The work is entitled, "The Life and Miracles of St Wenefride, Virgin, Martyr, and Abbess, Patroness of Wales. To which are added, the Litanies of the holy saint. Printed by W. E. Andrews, 1817." It has for a motto, "God is wonderful in his saints," Psalm lxvii. 36. The editor begins his preface, or address to the reader, as follows:—"The following *excellent* little volume, printed in the year 1712, was, as the preface informs us, translated from the life of St Wenefride, written by Robert of Shrewsbury." "The work itself," he says, "is written in a style of such sweet and amiable simplicity, and possesses so much of that unction, which is best known by its effects upon the soul of the reader, but is incapable of being described, that the editor of the present edition has been careful to make no other alteration than the correction of a few inaccuracies of grammar, and some obsolete or quaint expressions. Many miraculous events are recorded in this volume, which the pious reader will know how to turn to proper advantage. The miracles of which we read in the lives of St Wenefride, and other saints, are not to be rejected merely because they are miraculous, and out of the ordinary course of nature. Upon this ground, the holy Scriptures, which, as to the historical part of them, are one continued series of miracles, might be rejected as incredible, or as fabulous.

"To the miracles which happened at the

translation of the relics of St Wenefride, in the year 1138, Robert of Salop was an eye-witness. The great veneration of our ancestors for this saint, is a proof of her eminent sanctity, and past ages are unanimous in their testimony of the extraordinary favours granted to those who have *invoked her intercession.* Some of these are faithfully recorded in the latter part of this little volume; and the pious reader will find that, even in this our age, Almighty God still honours the memory of the glorious St Wenefride, and verifies the truth of the address, which, in imitation of our pious ancestors, we make to her, in the litany of intercession for England, 'Holy St Wenefride, even in this unbelieving generation, *still miraculous,* pray for us.'"

Thus Mr Andrews holds up St Wenefride, as well as the Virgin Mary, as a deity to be invoked; and I suppose she is, at this day, most devoutly worshipped by every good Papist in Wales. This is one of the idle drones of godly virgins, of whom, in my seventeenth Number, I promised to give some account; and an idle drone this saint must have been, even according to the account of her devoted admirers; for it does not appear from her history that she was of any real use to her own age; and her example could not profit the ages which followed, but must have been extremely pernicious, if it be true that such a person ever existed:—

"In the seventh age after man's redemption, flourished many saints of both sexes. I shall only mention those chiefly concerned in this short history. St Beuno, the glorious instrument of St Wenefride's second life and sanctity, was born of noble parents in Montgomeryshire, at the fall of the river Rhyw into the Severn; therefore called Aberhyw. His father, Binsi, descended lineally from Caddel, prince of Glesiwig, and his mother derived her pedigree from Anna, (who was married to the king of the Picts) sister to the mighty and renowned King Arthur, who departed happily this life, and was interred at Glastonbury, in the year 542. His grandfather was St Gundeleius, and he was nearly related to several eminent saints; amongst the rest he was cousin-german to St Kentigern, bishop of Glasgow, who, forced from Scotland, founded the bishopric of St Asaph, from his disciple of that name, whom he left to govern that church."—*St Wenefride's Life,* pp. 20, 21. It would appear that as far back as the sixth century, bishops and saints were no favourites in Scotland, seeing such a holy man as St Kentigern was forced out of it. It is not said whether the Scots of that day, who were guilty of this outrage, were Pagans or Presbyterians; but as for the good citizens of Glasgow, they must have been very different from those of the present day, if they were guilty of any incivility to the holy saint, if he was willing to live and let live. But to proceed:—

"This zealous monk (St Beuno) having finished his monastery at Clynoc Vaws, in Caernarvonshire, found himself powerfully inspired to visit his relations in Flintshire. It is true, he had long before bid adieu to all ties of flesh and blood; but he understood this call as a voice from heaven. A rich and potent lord, in that part of North Wales where now Holywell is, had married the virtuous and noble lady Wenlo, sister to St Beuno. His name was Thewith, some write it Trebwith; but a manuscript now before me of one of the most learned antiquaries of the last age, says his name was Tyvid. These parents of St Wenefride, by an exemplary and truly Christian life, surpassed their high extraction. They reckoned solid virtue as the most distinguishing quality, and they pitied vicious potentates, who are contemptible in the eyes of the King of kings. Saint Wenefride, the glory of West Britain, was born in the troublesome reign of King Cadwallawn; and St Beuno made his visit to his brother-in-law's house, in the reign of King Eluith, the second of that name. The venerable monk, having much humility and great modesty, made himself known, told them that he was sent by Almighty God, to honour him there, as he had done in other places; and that he neither expected nor craved any other favour, than a small parcel of his large territories, sufficient to build a church on; where others, with myself, said he, will daily pray for your safety and happiness.

"Thewith (I shall stile him so for the future) was not in the miserable catalogue of those thoughtless, blind worldlings, who are prodigal in vanity and ostentation, but start and frown at the first proposal of parting with small matters for the advantage of their souls. No, he looked forward with other eyes, toward a more permanent being, than here upon sordid earth; therefore returned he the following answer:—'With good reason, holy father, I am obliged to give you part of the lands I now possess, for His sake and service who bestowed them all on me. You have pleasured me in asking this charity, which is more advantageous to me than to you who propose it. Therefore, from this very day, I do absolutely alienate from myself, and my posterity, this manor I now live in, and with joy I do surrender unto you all my right and title, and I put you into possession. I humbly beg a favour, that having one only child, a tender virgin, who is my special comfort, you will instruct her in heavenly documents, that her life and conversation may be holy, pleasing to God, and joyful to her parents.' After this generous settlement, the nobleman made choice of a dwelling seat, not far distant from the place he had given to St Beuno; where, on a hill, he could see the church, where the servants of God praised their Maker.

"As Constantine the Great, at the building

of St Peter's Basilick, divested himself of his imperial robes, took up the spade, broke ground, and carried twelve baskets of earth, in honour of the twelve apostles, to cast into the foundation, in testimony of his devotion to the primitive princes of Christianity; so, in imitation of this heroic pattern, the noble lord, Thewith, set aside state and birth, many times putting his own hands to the holy work. This he did to encourage others, and to contribute in some sort to the finishing of the fabric. The church being made fit to offer in it the divine sacrifice, he and his spouse, with their only child, were daily present at holy mass. They had this pious custom, to place their daughter at the saint's feet, at the time of his exhortations to the people, advising her to give attention to his excellent doctrine. This was not necessary, although religiously suggested by pious parents; for she was so much transported with a holy delight in hearing him preach, that she frequently visited him alone, to discourse of self-knowledge, and Christian performances."—*Ibid.* pp. 22—26.

For want of room I must defer the miraculous part of the story, which will appear in my next Number.

No. XLIV.

SATURDAY, MAY 15TH, 1819.

I PROCEED in the present Number to give some farther account of St Wenefride, whom I shall not describe as one who lived in a certain age of the world; but as one who lived in the world many years after her death.

"It was her parents' intention to marry her to some nobleman of the country, and to bestow on her a most plentiful fortune; but her ever blessed Redeemer, in those tender years, was disposing her sweetly for his service. By saint Beuno's frequent discourses, she understood, how great, how good, and how glorious, the Heavenly Spouse was; that voluntary virgins are like angels upon earth; that they follow the Lamb, wherever he goes. (Apoc. xiv.) That the honours of the world are vain, and its pleasures short lived; so that the very thought of an earthly husband became hateful unto her. Wherefore she resolved to keep herself undefiled, and to consecrate her pure virginity to the Lord of heaven and earth. One main difficulty occurred, how to render her parents favourable to this heavenly call. She burned with the love of God, and at the same time she resolved to fulfil the commandment of honouring father and mother. In this struggle betwixt divine vocation and Christian duty, the Bestower of all Lights put her into a method, how to prepare the way towards her happiness, by making use of St Beuno, as a glorious instrument.

"This holy man was honoured as a saint by her parents, and by consequence she knew very well, that he had great power and authority with them, and they would not reject any reasonable request made by him, such as she took hers to be. Impatient of losing time, for completing her design, having found him one day alone, and at liberty, she acquainted him with the holy fruits of his moving discourses, and after a very pathetic manner, humbly petitioned for his zealous concurrence, in preserving the rich treasure of her virginity, which she resolved never to part with, for all the offers the flattering world could make her. Saint Beuno was agreeably surprised at this most welcome news: for, as St Paul, he desired all to be like unto himself, (1 Cor. xi. 1.) He had unshaken confidence in God's power and goodness, that he who had begun the work, would give it the finishing stroke. Moreover, being no stranger to the singular piety of those he was to treat with, he cheerfully undertook the task, to the inexpressible satisfaction of the expecting virgin.

"We cannot read without flowing tears, how faithful Abraham, in obedience to God's command, had his hand lifted up to sacrifice his son Isaac, his only begotten son, whom he loved: (Gen. xxii. 2.) not so much as demurring at the first intimation of the Omnipotent; perhaps it may move to devotion, by a serious consideration, how the lord Thewith entertained this unexpected petition of his dear child. Besides the internal gifts of grace, the apparent virtues, which charmed her devout parents, her stature was well proportioned, her face was matchless, her modesty equalled her beauty, qualifications much admired by mankind. She was the agreeable object of their eyes, the support of their family, and the prospect of their happiness upon earth. Yet no sooner had saint Beuno delivered his sentiments, as to the nature of the offering; that it was a sort of holocaust to sacrifice their affections, and to bequeath to their God the dearest creature in the world, whom they loved more than they did themselves: with other persuasive reasons to the same effect, the holy man, I say, had no sooner ended his discourse, than contrary to the weakness of other fond parents, tears of joy came trickling down lord Thewith's cheeks, who with his spouse, broke out into the praises of Jesus Christ, for so highly favouring their only child. They then called for their daughter, and gave her full and free leave to forsake the world, wishing her a happy progress in the way of perfection. They likewise declared, that the Heavenly Spouse having made choice of her, they intended to make him heir of what they designed for her dowry, by disposing of the same, to his great honour, in pious and religious uses. They drew also this advantage to themselves, of renouncing the world, so far as was consistent with persons in their station.

They entered into a firm resolution of giving to the poor great part of their princely wealth, of retiring from worldly noise and hurry, that with an undepending freedom, they might be more absolute masters of short time, to provide, and send before them, never-ending treasures to heaven.

"The pious virgin receiving this coveted grant, concluded that she could never return sufficient thanks to God for the favour. She watched whole nights in the church, either kneeling or prostrate before the altar, where she imagined to herself that she was in her immortal Spouse's presence chamber. Contemplation raised her up into admiration of his infinite perfections; so that to hear Jesus Christ only named, brought joyful tears into her eyes from a flaming heart. Pure delights overflowed her soul; and looking towards heaven, the world appeared base and contemptible. To add fuel to this pleasing fire she procured a little oratory near unto saint Beuno's cell, to visit him with greater ease in the day time, and in silent night to practise her master's spiritual lessons."

The virtue of this holy virgin was, it seems, assaulted by a cruel Welch Prince named Cradocus, who found her at home, and alone, one day when the rest of the family were at church. My readers must excuse me from giving the particulars of the temptation with which she was assailed. I expect that Mr Andrews will find me guilty of many bad things for not giving the very words of this part of the book which he recommends so warmly; but if the very words must be given, he is welcome to do it; and I had rather that they should appear in his pages than mine. Suffice it to say, that by means of something very like a lie, at least a false pretext, the *holy saint* escaped out of his hands, and made the best of her way to the church; but Cradocus overtaking her, with sword in hand, renewed his wicked proposal, and gave her the choice of submission or death. I give the sequel of this part of the history in the words of the author:—

"As it happens sometimes, that despised carnal love turns into rage, so it fared with barbarous Cradocus, who seeing himself scorned, (as he thought) gave such a deadly blow to the virgin's neck, that the first stroke severed the head from the body: which falling upon the descent of the hill, rolled down to the church, where the congregation were kneeling before the altar. As they were terrified with the bloody object of her head, so they were astonished to behold a clear and rapid spring, gushing out of that spot of ground, her head had first fallen upon, which to this very day, is visited from all parts, by devout pilgrims.* The place of her martyrdom had before her death, the name of the Dry Valley, or Barren Bottom, which was changed into the title of Finhon, which, in old Welch, signifies a fountain or well. 'Twas also observed, that the stones of the well were tinctured with drops, as it were of blood, to perpetuate the memory of what she had shed for the love of Christ, and in process of time, it was taken notice of, that the moss growing round the well had a very fragrant smell, as an emblem of the odour of her angelical virtues.

"To close the last act of this inhuman tragedy, and to relate the dreadful stroke of divine justice on the cruel tyrant, we are to premise with brevity; that the just grief of the holy virgin's parents is not to be expressed, seeing their dear child so villanously butchered almost before their eyes. St Beuno's virtue was also put to the test, to bear with true resignation the loss of so devout a creature. Tears came trickling down his cheeks at the sight of the horrid murder. The afflicted people, with united voices, called upon Heaven for speedy execution against him who had committed that heinous outrage. Indignation accompanied compassion, when they beheld the unrelenting assassin wiping his bloody sword upon the grass, and glorying in the detestable fact, without any fear of God or man. Saint Beuno was preparing to offer the unbloody sacrifice of our redemption; but being inspired by him, who declared, Revenge to me, and I will repay it; (Deut. xxxii. 35.) he left the altar, and taking the blessed martyr's head in his trembling hands, he mounted the ascent towards Cradocus. He feared not such a blow as was given to the tender virgin; on the same account, for the love of Christ, he would have bid it welcome. Faithful servants of God dread nothing, sin only excepted. Being come up to him, he said: Thou wicked man! who without any regard to innocence, or beauty, has massacred a princely virgin, no less nobly born than thyself. Nor dost thou repent, or seem sorry, as thou oughtest to do, for this horrid sacrilege. I here beseech my heavenly Lord, that for an example to others, he will please to execute his divine judgment against thee, who has murdered his spouse, troubled his people, violated his sabbath, and besprinkled this holy house with blood, which I consecrated to his service.' As the earth swallowed up rebellious and perverse Corah, so some affirm, that at saint Beuno's last words Cradocus not only dropped down dead; but also that the

* I suppose Mr Andrews does not know that there is a similar story related of a French saint. Perhaps the one story is a mere echo of the other:—"A holy woman, named Reine, suffered martyrdom about Alise, a little village near Flavigny. When she was beheaded, at the very place where the head lighted on the ground, a spring bubbled up at that very instant, for a perpetual miracle, in witness of God's approbation of the confession of faith made by his handmaid." This spring is also remarkable for its healing qualities; and the monks of St Francis have a chapel beside it, as St Wenefride had for ages at her *holy well*.—*See Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests*, vol. i. p. 4.

earth opened, to give passage to the luxurious body to sink towards his monstrous soul, or that the master whom he had served, the devil, carried it off; for it is certain, that the carcass of the cruel murderer never afterwards appeared.

"The faithful glorified God in his justice, but could not curb their grief. Saint Beuno earnestly exhorted the parents and people to turn from lamentations, and to address the Creator of souls, and raiser up of dead bodies, that as he commanded back Lazarus to life, rotting in his monument, so, to his greater honour and glory, and for the comfort of the sorrowful parents, who had so generously dedicated this darling child to his service, he would graciously vouchsafe to restore her to life. He then joined the sacred head to the pale body, covering both with his cloak; after which, he offered up the holy sacrifice of our salvation.

"After mass was ended, he lifting up his hands to heaven, made the following prayer. 'O Lord Jesus Christ! for whose sake this holy virgin contemned the world, and languished after thee; by the tender bowels of thy mercy, love, and bounty, be graciously pleased to grant us the effect of our vows and prayers, humbly offered unto thee. We are fully persuaded, that this godly virgin, who lived holily, and died for thee with great constancy, is now highly exalted, and wants no more the society of us mortal and miserable creatures. Yet to manifest thy omnipotence and supreme dominion, which thou hast over our souls and bodies, which are never dead to thy power of reuniting them; as also to multiply the merits of that soul, whose body lies here before us: we crave a second life for her; to the end, that after a long and plentiful harvest, laden and enriched with new merits, she may return unto thee, her eternal Spouse, and the beloved of her heart; who with the Father and the Holy Ghost, rulest on earth, and reignest in heaven, for ever and ever.' The pious people, drowned in tears, having with sighs and moving sobs, answered devoutly, Amen; the virgin arose as newly awaked from sleep. She wiped her eyes and face, to clear away that glorious dust, which had settled on her lovely head, when it tumbled towards her dear saint Beuno. The decollation of saint Wenefride is celebrated on the 22d of June.

"Contemplate here, dear reader, the joy and admiration which then transported all present, at this wonderful miracle. Tears burst out more plentifully, but flowing from a different cause. They magnified and blessed the boundless goodness of her great God, every one resolving to rise with the saint, to a newness of reforming their past lives. One particular in this surprising resuscitation is very remarkable, viz., When her parents, and others, fixed their eyes upon her neck, they observed a pure white circle, no larger than a small thread, quite round it, denoting the place where the separation had been made; which always after remained. From this, the great veneration of the people for her, changed her name. which was Brewa, into that of Wenefride. Wen in the old British tongue signifies White, and other letters were by an alteration added to this syllable, to render more agreeable the sound of the new name. In the many apparitions after her second death, when she showed herself to her devout clients, they always took special notice of the aforesaid white circle, which intimated to them the indelible mark of her spouse's affection, for suffering that mortal wound so courageously for his sake."

We have next a few pages of what are meant for pious reflections: and certainly many of the words are such as are used in pious discourses; but considering that they are used for promoting the worship of an idol, they are nauseous as were the frantic devotions of the worshippers of the golden calf when they said, 'These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt:'—

"Whatever this incredulous age may think of this great miracle of our saint's return to life; it appeared so evident to the West Britons, and redounded so much to the honour of God's church, St Beuno's sanctity, and the power he had with his Creator, that many pagan people, remaining in those parts, came to hear the holy man's instructions in the Catholic faith, and to receive baptism.

"St Wenefride, according to her former practice, like Mary at the feet of Christ, sat on a low seat before him. She was never satiated with the heavenly manna, which fell from his angelic tongue. She counted as nothing what she had already done, or suffered, and restless to be more strictly united to her beloved Spouse, she aspired to the height of perfection. Wherefore she most humbly begged upon her knees, to be solemnly veiled (according to the custom of the primitive ages) that by entering into a religious course of life, she might put hell to great confusion, which had fiercely attempted to dishonour God and herself: but mostly, that she might pour forth her soul in the presence of her eternal Spouse, with a flaming and disengaged heart, entirely his, and say; Behold I have left all things and have followed thee. (St Matt. xix. 27.)

"St Beuno, with tears of joy, complied with this religious request, and performed the ceremony in a numerous assembly. He knew to what a degree of sanctity the Spirit of God would raise her, for his own glory, and the improvement of others; therefore he spent whole days in cultivating her soul, in what regarded a religious state. She, as an apt scholar, took in so fast the frequent lessons, and put them in practice so punctually, that it struck her master into admiration. He finding her so far advanced in an interior life, that she

was even able to direct and govern others in the way of perfection; one day called for her parents, and after the following manner delivered unto them his sentiments and resolutions.

"'As you (said he) have most liberally bestowed a church and house for the service of God, and for the help and benefit of the faithful, so his Divine Majesty has more than sufficiently requited your charity, by conferring on you spiritual favours, but more especially on your child, whom for the time to come you may follow as a safe guide, in our blessed Redeemer's service. I am called on by heaven to another place; and I leave you to the grace and goodness of God, and to the rare example of your daughter.' Then turning to saint Wenefride, he said, 'Our Lord, dear child, has appointed you to succeed in my labours. March on in the way of virtue as I have taught you, and guide others in the road to eternal life. Gather in this very place, for your heavenly spouse, many pure and devout virgins; but know withal, that here you shall not end your days; for after the term of seven years spent by you in prayer and austerities, for your own merits, and edification of others, our gracious Lord will summon you to another place, that strangers may be instructed by you, and come to the true knowledge and service of him for whose sake you fell a victim of purity.'

"When the ancients of Ephesus had heard saint Paul declare unto them, that they should see no more his face, (Acts xx. 25.) they fell upon his neck, and there was great weeping. In like manner, when saint Wenefride was acquainted by her admired master, that she should not see him any more in this world, a lawful grief seemed to overwhelm her. To comfort her in such deep affliction, saint Beuno took her by the hand, and led her to the crystalline fountain, the place of her martyrdom; where they sitting together on a stone, bearing to this day the name of saint Beuno's stone, and which lieth now in the outward well; 'You see (said he) the monument here of your sufferings. Behold also the stones, as tinctured with your blood, which was shed for the glory of your heavenly Spouse. Be you therefore attentive, and mindful of what I do foretell you, concerning three special favours, whereby your glorious spouse, Jesus Christ, will hereafter honour yourself, and by your prayers, benefit others. The first is, that these bloody spots shall never be washed off from the said stones, but ever remain, as triumphant signs of your blood, spilt in defence of your chastity. The second is, that any person who shall devoutly ask temporal blessings, or freedom from spiritual or corporeal distresses, to be obtained by your merits and intercession, the same shall compass his request, if it be to the honour and glory of God, by paying their devotions three times at this well. If what he petitions for be not for the advantage of his soul, and therefore is not granted; at his death by your prayers he shall reap more ample fruit, and in the next world everlasting blessings. The third, that after my departure into a more remote part of this island, God will give me a cell near unto the sea shore; so that whenever you send any letters or tokens to me, as I entreat you to do at least once every year, only cast them into the stream of this fountain, and they will come safe unto me. Which wonders will be gloriously divulged of you, to the end of the world.'

"He then conducted her back to the church; where he added: 'Behold this church and buildings round it, which have been raised by the munificence of your parents; these I leave unto you to be converted into a monastery of chaste and holy virgins, who moved by your pious instructions and exemplary life, may put in practice those divine lessons which I have often delivered unto you: that is, the contempt of the world, and an entire abnegation of themselves; which are the foundation of religious perfection. Strive therefore, dear child, in all things to exhibit yourself as a lively pattern of virtue. As to my poor self, I will go whither the Spirit of God shall direct me, and shall ever retain in my heart and soul, a most fatherly and loving memory of you.'

"It must not then seem strange, that the tender heart of this doleful virgin was ready to split asunder with grief, at the last adieu in this world. The more he attempted to sweeten this bitter separation, his charming words caused her swelling sorrow to float higher; insomuch, that when she saw him, with his staff in his hand, ready to depart, she rated the approaching loss as the heaviest cross upon earth, and could not forbear expressing thus herself unto him; 'Now, holy father, I am to be left alone, as a poor orphan child without a nurse, or as a silly sheep amongst ravenous wolves, without a pastor to defend me. I was always safe with you, always joyful in your presence, always instructed by your exhortations, and edified by your example." These words attended with flowing tears, so much oppressed saint Beuno's heart, that not being able to utter any answer, he blessed her with his hand, and hastened his pace in the beginning of his journey.

"Nothing now could comfort her, save only the fresh remembrance of all his pious instructions, and an earnest desire of executing obediently his commands. Accordingly, in a short time she associated to herself many noble and devout virgins, who observed such rules as she established for them. She ordered nothing but what first she practised herself, and miracles were not wanting to increase her authority and the opinion of her sanctity. Their love and respect towards her, caused each of them to contend who should be most forward

in the imitation of her rare perfections. They nauseated sordid pleasures, they undervalued wealth and honours, and they seemed to be inhabitants of a terrestrial paradise, in loving and serving their heavenly spouse, the Son of God. She governed her subjects with endearing commands, so that they obeyed with equal merit and content. She eased them in their difficulties and temptations, insomuch that they observing her rigid mortification, her angelical purity, and knowing the strict union she had with God in prayer, whatever she declared unto them was received as an oracle from heaven.

"The spreading fame of saint Wenefride was wonderfully dilated by miraculous cures of deceased persons. They were frequent and apparent, and divulged through other parts of Wales. Many flocked from distant places to hear her discourse and to receive instructions, whom she sent away with flaming hearts and ardent desires to be faithful and fervent in the service of their God. They regretted a return to their respective habitations. And as the queen of Sheba stood astonished at Solomon's singular wisdom, so these admiring strangers magnified the constant happiness of the virgins she governed, and blessed those who always stood before her (3 Kin. x. 8.) they having such a secure mistress, and so tender a mother."

No. XLV.

SATURDAY, May 22nd, 1819.

I am afraid my readers will think they are entitled to an apology from me for occupying so many of my pages with the ridiculous history of the idol and saint of Wales. I am ready to allow, that the story is both ridiculous and impious, as it is intended to promote the worship of a creature, and to encourage the diseased and the miserable to trust in her for relief. If we believed the author and the editor of this work, she has performed more miracles than Christ and his apostles did; and as she is represented as still continuing to work miracles, (a thing which apostles did not pretend to after their death,) the tendency of the work evidently is, to divert the minds of the people from the doctrine of Christ as declared by his inspired messengers,—to lead them away from Christ himself, as the hope of the miserable, and to encourage them to trust in a creature; and for any thing they know, the mere creature of a monkish imagination; for her worshippers have little better evidence that such a person ever existed, than the heathen have of the existence of their idols.

Having undertaken to exhibit the true character of Popery from the writings of Papists themselves, it is necessary that I give pretty large extracts from such writings. Some of these extracts are, indeed, disgusting for their impurity, and shocking for their impiety; but this I cannot help. To get acquainted with any thing, people must see it as it is. I know that many of my readers were quite ignorant of the true character of Popery. I have undertaken to show it to them. I have, I trust, been in some degree successful, so far as I have gone. There are many Protestants that did not believe Popery to be so bad as it is. They had a general idea that it was, during the dark ages, a system of cruelty, superstition, and idolatry; but they did not believe it to be so in the present day. Now it is my object to convince them that it *is* what it has always been. In establishing this point, considered abstractly, I have the concurrence of Popish writers themselves. They maintain that their religion is infallible and unchangeable. It cannot therefore be improved. There are many Protestants who charitably and liberally maintain that Popery is not so bad as it was; but Papists themselves spurn the compliment; and it argues a great degree of simplicity and good nature in Protestants, to persist in representing the Church of Rome as better than she wishes to be represented.

Notwithstanding all the evidence which is before the world, Papists maintain broadly that their church never was idolatrous, which is a piece of as barefaced effrontery as to maintain that she never was guilty of persecution. They believe things contrary to the evidence of their own senses; and they expect us to do the same. They believe, for instance, that what they see to be a round piece of bread in the form of a wafer, is the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and as such they worship it with divine honour: yet they say this is not idolatry, for the priest has changed the wafer into God, though they see, and feel, and taste it to be a wafer still. This is not merely an error of the dark ages. It is taught as plainly in their modern catechisms, and believed as firmly at this day, as it was in the tenth century, when St Dunstan preached it, and when Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, confirmed it by a miracle. (See *Prot.* p. 29.) Now as Papists give up their senses when they believe this, we must give up our senses when we believe them not to be idolaters.

In like manner they maintain that the worship of saints is not idolatry, upon no better authority, that I know of, than that the Pope has raised them to be gods and goddesses. But while we know that they are creatures; when we read the prayers and supplications that are addressed to them; and when we find that Papists actually trust and hope in them, we must give up, not our senses only, but our reason too, before we can believe that they are not guilty of idolatry. I confess it

would be extremely convenient for the cause of Popery if Protestants would be persuaded to make such a surrender;—if every one would give up his reason, and his senses, and his conscience, to the direction of holy church, Popery would soon appear among us in all *its glory*, that is, the solemn gloom of midnight darkness.

The Church of Rome in the darkest ages had its literature, such as it was. It has been held in contempt in England generally for two hundred years; but contemptible as it is, it has begun to revive. I have given extracts from the Life of St Wenefride, for the double purpose of proving Papists to be idolaters, and affording a specimen of their literature. We are indebted to Mr Andrews for this; and from the advertisements on the cover of his Orthodox Journal, * I see he has published some other works calculated for the midnight meridian of Popery; and it will not be his fault if these works do not soon become as popular as their Scotch cousin, "Old Mortality," in "Tales of my Landlord."

But leaving all these things for the present, I request the attention of my readers to some farther particulars relating to the idol of Wales, the far-famed St Wenefride. It will be recollected by the readers of my last Number, that she and St Beuno before they parted, had agreed upon a method of corresponding with each other, such as, I believe, never occurred to any two lovers whose adventures are recorded in either *profane* history or *pious* romance. When she had a letter, or any thing else to send to her beloved saint, she had only to throw it into the well, and it would reach him in safety, and free of postage, in whatever part of the world he might be at the time. Take the following proof of the fact:—

"Gratitude for received favours is not only a moral virtue, but the eternal employ of cherubims and seraphims, who are now adoring and offering never-ending thanks to the infinite goodness of their omnipotent Creator, who commanded them out of the chaos of nothing. St Wenefride had a most grateful soul; she honoured St Beuno as an eminent servant of God; she loved him as a father; she respected him as a master; and could never sufficiently acknowledge her duty to her greatest benefactor, after him who had made her. Saint Beuno delivered to her the first rudiments of perfection: he incited her to embrace a religious state; he obtained for her by his prayers a second life, and polished her interior, that she was amiable in the sight of God and men. To make some small return, she sent him every year a token, after the manner he had prescribed. In the beginning of May, almost a year after his departure, with the help of her religious sisters, she finished a curious embroidered vestment; and wrapping the same in a woollen cloth, she went down with her religious and others, to the well side, and casting the bundle into the water, she said, "Holy father, according to your command and my promise, I send unto you this small token of my love." To the great astonishment of numerous beholders, it passed down the stream into the river, then into the sea, and it landed near the monastery where saint Beuno then dwelt, many miles distant from the holy fountain.

"The holy man was then walking on the sea shore, and wondered what that bundle should be; but opening it, he remembered the charge he had given to saint Wenefride, and that, as he had foretold, it came miraculously to him, without the least sign of wet or moisture. This vestment he preserved with great care in the church, for the celebration of holy mass. He likewise received fresher lights of her present and future sanctity; how much Almighty God would be honoured by her, not only at Finhon, but in other places whither Divine Providence should direct her to go. The virgin never intermitted to send him a yearly present, till his most happy death was revealed unto her, and the glorious reward he was crowned with in heaven. This last passage may appear to incredulous persons the most surprising of all others in the history of St Wenefride's life. Therefore Divine Providence thought fit to authenticate the memory of it to this very day, and after this manner. In Carnarvonshire, eight miles distant from the town of Carnarvon, there is a little creek

* On the cover of his last Number are the following advertisements. I will do Mr Andrews the favour of giving them more extensive publicity, without expense to him, which I question if any other editor in the kingdom would do.

"A new edition of Bona Mors; or, the Art of Dying Happily, in the congregation of Jesus Christ crucified, and of his condoling Mother. To which is added, the Rosary of our Blessed Lady. Price Tenpence, bound in sheep." From the title of this work, we learn that the "Congregation," that is, the Church of Rome, is equally the property of Christ and the Virgin Mary.

"A half length Portrait of the Right Rev. Dr Milner. Engraved in the line manner. Proofs on India Paper, Two Guineas. Prints, One Guinea.

"Two beautiful small Prints of *our Blessed Saviour and the Virgin Mary*. Proofs 5*s*. the pair. Prints 3*s*.

"A very fine head of Our Blessed Saviour, crowned with thorns. 12⅛ inches by 16 do.—Proofs 15*s*. Prints 9*s*."

It would not perhaps be fair to infer that the prices which Mr Andrews sets upon these respective heads, indicate the comparative value of the originals in his esteem; but one thing is certain, that Dr Milner appears, in the Orthodox Journal, to be by far the most important personage of the three. I hope Mr Andrews will thank me for this hint, as it will furnish him with matter for declamation about my want of candour, for two or three Numbers of the Vindicator. This will be of the more value to him, as he must be at a loss for matter if he does not choose to answer me on the subjects of transubstantiation and idol worship.

As I am in the way of bestowing favours on Mr Andrews, I will inform him that I have made one real contradiction in this Number of THE PROTESTANT, which I hope he will be able to find out, seeing he is so quick-sighted as to find many contradictions where there are none.

where the sea runs up, called in Welsh, Porthy Casseg (corruptedly, as I could instance in other appellations) for Porthy Cassul, or the Port of the Vestment. Here the first present of our saint miraculously landed; and the place retains the name to this day. Near unto this inlet there stands a large parish church called Clynnog, in which saint Beuno was buried, his last founded monastery being there. His tomb is yet extant, and is had in great veneration by the inhabitants. The history of St Wenefride's life was curiously represented in the glass windows of Clynnog church; but has been so defaced, that little now appears. What can be more persuasive to obtain credit to this miracle, than so ancient and so certain a tradition, even to those who use their utmost efforts to destroy the memory of miracles? The Port of the Vestment solves the objection from the year 660 to this of 1712. As apostolical tradition is the unwritten word of God, and by it we receive the holy Scriptures, and the sacred interpretation and true sense of them, as what regards infant baptism, &c. let it be lawful for me to say, that, as to human faith, uninterrupted tradition from father to son for so many centuries, is a clearer attestation of fact, than if it had been recorded in written history."

If any of my readers should demur to the assertion of the author, that "uninterrupted tradition from father to son for so many centuries, is a clearer attestation of fact, than if it had been recorded in written history," I must refer them to Mr Andrews for satisfaction. He entertains, no doubt, great veneration for oral tradition, and it is evident that he believes all that is here recorded of the holy saint. He may therefore be able to satisfy others with regard to the ground of his belief, though THE PROTESTANT should plainly avow his infidelity.

St Wenefride is declared to have done wonderful things at the place of her martyrdom; but what were they? I believe this is more than any body can tell. She is represented as having collected a number of young women;—as having become their governess; as teaching them the way of perfection; and as acquiring such a degree of merit in the sight of God, as to be enabled to work miraculous cures: but still the question will recur, What was it that she did? and the answer must be, Nothing. Her perfection seems to have consisted in downright inanity, and in teaching other young women to be as idle as herself. "What are you doing there, Jack?" "Nothing, Master." "And, Tom, what are you doing?" "I am helping Jack, Master." This seems to express the whole history of those godly virgins, who were associated under the government of the holy saint. These young women would have been much more profitably employed in their fathers' houses; assisting their parents in the business of their respective families; in taking husbands, and rearing families of their own, than in devoting themselves to celibacy and idleness, to gratify the humour of a wandering monk. I say this upon the supposition that the story is authentic; but whether it be so or not, the revival and republication of it by Mr Andrews, seems intended to revive the monastic spirit among our countrymen, and to encourage young women to devote themselves to a single life, by representing this as more holy and more pleasing to God than the state of marriage, which is contrary to common sense, the law of nature, and the express declaration of the word of God.

St Wenefride, as was predicted by St Beuno, left the place of her birth and martyrdom, and set out a-wandering, she knew not whither, which would not, in our degenerate days, be reckoned very honourable in a young lady of noble birth; but these saints, it will be said, may do any thing. She settled at last in a place called Guitherin, where there was a monastery, where she surprised all by her wonderful knowledge of heavenly mysteries, and her extraordinary sanctity; yet after reading her history, nobody can tell wherein her knowledge or her sanctity consisted. Yet she was a person of uncommon *merit* in the sight of God, insomuch that while living, and after death, she could procure by her prayers whatever she asked of him. This is the bane and the poison of those books which Mr Andrews is reprinting for the instruction, I should rather say the destruction, of the rising generation. They are not only calculated to conceal the truth of God's word from the mind of the reader, but by making use of certain expressions borrowed from the word of God, they convey sentiments directly opposed to it. They exalt the merits of a creature; they put an idol in the place of the Saviour; and then they pervert and prostitute his own word to give credit to the imposture.

My readers must excuse me for occupying so much of their time with such stuff as St Wenefride. Had I found her history in some old musty volume, which was not likely ever to be reprinted, I would have made shorter extracts, and have dismissed her with little ceremony, under an apprehension, perhaps, that the world would never hear of her again; but since the organ of English Papists in London has reprinted the work in a cheap form; seeing it has the sanction of Dr Milner, Bishop and Vicar Apostolic, so far as to allow his name to be used as a voucher for a miracle lately performed by the holy saint, who died for the second time above eleven hundred years ago; seeing this work is strongly recommended by the editor, and is likely to obtain extensive circulation among English Papists, and perhaps Protestants, I think it of importance to my readers to be acquainted with

the nature of the work, and the doctrines which it inculcates, which are throughout impious and idolatrous, yet expressed in language that wears an air of piety, and therefore more likely to deceive the simple and unwary. This is the sort of reading which Papists are providing for the many thousands of their children, who, at the expense of Protestants, are learning to read; and unless they are furnished with something better; unless the Bible is put into their hands, it may turn out that all our efforts to educate the Popish youth will have the effect of making them more subtle and confirmed idolaters.

I could tell how the bones of this saint were dug up and transported to Shrewsbury, some hundreds of years after her death;—of the miracles which these bones performed at the time of their translation, of which Robertus Salopiensis was an eye-witness; but I must pass over these trivial matters, and come to things of more importance.

Christians, whose religion is derived from the Bible, believe that saints who have departed this life are at rest with their Saviour in heaven, and that they have done with worldly cares. They believe that Christ himself has all power in heaven and earth, that he alone is intrusted with the management of his church, and that he takes a particular interest in the happiness of every individual member. But the poor slaves of Rome cannot look so high for protection and comfort. They are taught to trust in some fellow-creature of a saint, or in a company of saints, whose souls are supposed to be still ready to go about any business which their worshippers have in heaven: and their bodies, even to the least of their bones, nay their very clothes, and even the thongs which have tied their shoes, can perform wonderful cures on earth.

But as no one saint, except the Virgin Mary, can do every thing, and be in all places at the same time, the Church of Rome has made a very convenient distribution, and as distinct a division of labour among the saints in heaven, as any manufacturer on earth can make among his artificers. By this imaginary distribution, they first divide their saints into countries. St James is appointed to take care of Spain: St Sebastin has the charge of Portugal: St Denis of France: St Mark of the Venetians: St Nicholas of the Moscovites: St Ambrose of Milan: the three kings of the electorate of Cologne: St Barbara of Germany, &c. Before the Reformation, St George had the charge of England, St Andrew of Scotland, and St Patrick of Ireland.

Secondly, they subdivide the employment of the saints in these and other countries, after the several sorts of trades and professions of the people. St Nicholas and St Christopher have the oversight of seamen; St Catherine is over the scholars; St Austin takes care of the divines; St Luke of the painters: St Ivo of the lawyers; St Eustachius of the hunters; St Crispin of the shoemakers; St Magdalene and St Afra have the charge of those unhappy women who are no better than they should be. Some are even put to the most vile and degrading services; for instance, St Anthony has the charge of swine; St Pelagius of cows; St Eulogius of horses; St Vendeline and St Gallus have the care of both sheep and geese. What mean ideas must the poor Papists have of heaven, when they suppose the saints would leave it to drudge after such matters!

The division of labour among the saints which is appointed by the Church of Rome, is very much like that of the servants in a great house or palace, such for instance, as Holyrood house in Edinburgh, where one servant is not allowed to show the whole building to a stranger; but where different persons are in waiting, with the keys of their respective apartments; one shows you a suite of rooms, receives his fee, and turns you over to another, who shows you the great gallery of paintings; he having received his fee, turns you over to an old woman, who shows you the ruins of the chapel, and the shank-bone of Darnly, and she also must have her fee;—such at least was the practice twenty years ago; and such is the *canonical* practice of Romish saints in all ages. *Non omnia possumus omnes*,—one cannot do all, says one of their learned men; (Gab. Biel. in can. lect. 32.) and therefore they will sometimes direct clients to other saints; as once St Peter sent a woman to a sacrist he had at Rome, for the cure of her palsy; and it is upon this ground, that devout persons are directed to several saints for their several exigencies, to the end that every saint may have his share in the worship. This they call a discreet variety, honourable to the church and advantageous to her poor members. One prays to St Peter for the gift of submission: to St Agnes for continency: to our Lady St Ann for wealth: to St Margarite for child-bearing: to St Rochus against the plague: to St Petronilla against the ague: to St Apollonia against the toothach: to St Liberius against the stone: and so to every saint for the help that is in his way. Bachelors must not go to St Peter, because he was a married man; nor married men to St John, because he was a bachelor: but let every one go to a saint of his own tribe; a widow to a widow saint, and a soldier to one of his trade, for this is the humour of Romish saints, to favour their own companions.

According to this economy, there is not one Romanist but may pretend to march under the colours of several saints. For example, a native of Paris has as fair a title as Rome can give, to the protection of St Michael, St Denis, and our Lady, who are understood to rule that kingdom: of St Genevieve, that more especially looks to Paris; of St Germain, or St Thomas,

or St Sulpice, if he either be born or reside in these parishes: of St Cosmus, and St Damian, if he practise physic: of St Ottilia and St Lucia, when his ears and eyes trouble him; and of St Mathurin also, if he be troubled with folly. Over and above these, he may be sure of other saints, St Dominick, St Celestin, St Francis, and twenty more, by matriculating his name into their confraternities, which he may do for a small matter. See *Bel. de Sanct. Beati.—Gab. Biel.—Salmero* 1 *ad Tim.—Salazer, Prov.* cap. 8. v. 18. &c. &c. as referred to by Brevint in *Saul and Samuel at Endor*, pp. 72—74.

No. XLVI.

SATURDAY, MAY 29TH, 1819.

WHAT the Church of Rome calls a discreet variety in her objects of worship, could produce nothing but confusion and distraction in the minds of those who know what real religious worship is. It is the glory of Christianity, as opposed to all idolatry, that it teaches the worship of one living and true God, and that it makes known to the guilty children of men the way of access to him, by one Mediator, who has made atonement for the sins of his people; who is worthy to stand between an offended God and his offending creatures,—to make intercession for the latter, and to bring them into the blessed state of reconciliation with their Creator. Christ having made peace by the blood of his cross, came and preached peace to the Gentiles who were far off, as well as to the Jews who were nigh; for through him, both Jews and Gentiles have access by one Spirit unto the Father, Eph. ii. 17, 18. Those who believe in Christ, that is, those who are really Christians, are brought into this state of peace and reconciliation with God. They trust in God, and hope in him. They are instructed, in every thing, by prayers and supplications, to make their requests known unto God, Phil. iv. 6. Nay, they are invited to come boldly to the throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy and find grace to help them in time of need, Heb. iv. 16. They possess a confidence and steadfast reliance upon him as their Almighty Saviour, and all-sufficient portion. Their confidence is that of children in a father whom they love, and whom they know loves them. To send them to a creature for help, be that creature ever so exalted, would be to seduce them from their allegiance to their God and Father;—a crime that can find a parallel only in the successful attempt of the devil against our first parents; and a crime in which the Church of Rome has been deplorably successful, to the ruin of millions of immortal souls.

Popish worship is not the affectionate approach of a child to a gracious father, but the sullen averted look of a slave, who dares not approach his master but through the medium of some fellow-creature, who, he supposes, stands higher in favour than himself, and whose good word, he thinks, will promote his interest with his master. I need not tell those who understand the Bible, that this is not the worship of the true God at all. To say that God is too great to admit of direct approach in the name of Christ, and that he is accessible to sinners through the medium of mere creatures, is a false representation of him; and to worship the true God under a false character is as really idolatry as to worship a false God. Of this the Church of Rome is notoriously guilty; and this is not merely a human error grafted upon a divine religion, as some of their fooleries are supposed to be. It is a radical and fundamental error, which declares Popery to be quite a different, and an opposite religion:—to be, in short, that Antichrist that should come into the world.

In lieu of that spiritual divine worship which is enjoined by the word of God, Papists are taught to worship they know not what; and they are so madly set upon their idols, that they have multiplied to themselves gods, more than the heathen whom they have supplanted. Not satisfied with those who are known to have been saints on earth, and who we believe are now glorified in heaven, such as the apostles of Christ, they have added multitudes of names whose saintship and whose very existence is doubtful: to these they address their idolatrous prayers and supplications; and in these they put their trust for preservation from evil, and for obtaining both temporal and spiritual benefits.

That Papists are taught to worship they know not what, is evident from their worshipping certain saints of whose existence there is not the shadow of evidence, which comes directly under the apostle Paul's description of an idol,—that it is nothing in the world.

"The Spaniards, it seems, have a saint held in great reverence, in some parts of Spain, called Viar; for the further encouragement of whose worship, they solicited the Pope to grant some special indulgences to his altars; and upon the Pope's desiring to be better acquainted first with his character, and the proofs which they had of his saintship, they produced a stone with these antique letters S. VIAR which the antiquaries readily saw to be a small fragment of some old Roman inscription in memory of one who had been *Prefectu*S VIAR*um*, or overseer of the highways." *Middleton's Letters*, p. 173.

This St Viar, or Viarius, was, notwithstanding, worshipped for I do not know how many ages. "Over the bishop's sepulchre is a table of stone, upon which the mass was wont to be

sacrificed in honour of his saintship, whom they call Viarius; and hither came all persons who were pained about the loins, and were invariably cured. When Ressendius, who designed to publish his life along with those of the other saints, visited the spot with a view to pick up information, he inquired of the priest if they possessed any records or inscriptions respecting St Viarius. Upon this he was directed to the table over his sepulchre: which was inscribed with a Latin epitaph of considerable length. But Ressendius, who happened to be better acquainted with Latin inscriptions than the priests, soon discovered that the celebrated tomb of St Viarius contained only the heathenish carcases of two menders of Roman highways. Information was immediately sent to Cardinal Alphonsus, at that time Bishop of Evora, who ordered the place to be shut up, to the great discontent of all the simple faithful who were pained about the loins." *M'Culloch Pop. Cond.* p. 345. "Such legendary lore drew from a learned man of the Romish Church the following complaint. 'There is also another error not unfrequent, that the common people, neglecting in a manner the ancient and known saints, worship more ardently the new and unknown, of whose holiness we have but little assurance, and of whom we know some only by revelations; so that it is justly doubted of several, *that they never existed at all.*'" *Cassand. Consult.* p. 971. *operum in folio Parisiis* 1616. quoted by M'Culloch, p. 346. This is an important concession by a Popish writer. He speaks as if it were universally admitted that the ancient and known saints should be worshipped; he finds fault only with the prevailing practice of worshipping those upstart saints who were unknown, and of whose existence there was no evidence.

"We have in England," says Middleton, p. 174, "an instance still more ridiculous, of a fictitious saintship, in the case of a certain saint called Amphibolus; who, according to monkish historians, was bishop of the Isle of Man, and fellow-martyr and disciple of St Alban: yet the learned Bishop Usher has given good reasons to convince us, that he owes the honour of his saintship to a mistaken passage in old acts or legends of St Alban: where the Amphibolus mentioned, and since reverenced as a saint and martyr, was nothing more than a cloak, which Alban happened to have, at the time of his execution; being a word derived from the Greek, and signifying a rough shaggy cloak,which ecclesiastical persons usually wore in that age." *Middleton,* p. 174.

"They pretend to show here at Rome," says the same author, "two original impressions of our Saviour's face, on two different handkerchiefs; the one, sent a present by himself to Agbarus, prince of Edessa, who by letter had desired a picture of him; the other, given by him at the time of his execution, to a saint or holy woman named Veronica, upon a handkerchief which she had lent him to wipe his face on that occasion: both which handkerchiefs are still preserved, as they affirm, and now kept with much reverence; the first in St Sylvester's church; the second in St Peter's; where in honour of this sacred relic, there is a fine altar, built by Pope Urban VIII. with a statue of Veronica herself."* "But, notwithstanding the authority of the Pope, and his inscription, this Veronica, as one of their best authors has shown, like Amphibolus before mentioned, was not any real person, but the name given to the picture itself, by the old writers who mention it; being formed by blundering and confounding the words Vera Icon, or *true image,* the title inscribed, perhaps, or given originally to the handkerchief, by the first contrivers of the imposture."—P. 176.

Thus, in their rage for multiplying objects of worship, Papists have set up some that never had any real existence. This is no less impious and absurd than the conduct of the grossest idolaters among savage tribes, who worship a piece of wood or a piece of stone. These worship the works which their own hands have made; Papists worship the creatures which their own imaginations have formed: and there is this difference in favour of the savages, that they have not the means of knowing better; while the Papists continue their idolatries notwithstanding the enlightened state of Europe, and the repeated exposure which has been made of their absurdities and impieties.

But I cannot allow Papists even the small advantage of being more intellectual in their idolatries than the untutored savage; for they do worship wood, and stone, and paste, which their own hands have made. They have not only set up idols which they call saints, but they have set up images of these saints, and they fall down and worship before them. Nay, so far do they degrade themselves, that they worship "cast clouts and old rotten rags," if they can persuade themselves that these were part of the clothing, or had touched the body of any of their idols. But as the subject of worshipping images and relics deserves the honour of a Paper by itself, I shall not enter upon it here.

I have just said that to worship the true God under a false character, is as really idolatry as to worship a false god; and I intend to dilate a little on this subject, as it is one of great importance; and as I am afraid many, who are not Papists, will be convicted of this error.

* There is a Latin inscription which it is unnecessary to quote here. The following is a note by the author.—"There is a prayer in their books of offices, ordered by the rubric, to be addressed to this sacred and miraculous picture, in the following terms.—'Conduct us, O thou blessed figure, to our proper home, where we may behold the pure face of Christ.'"

All true and acceptable worship proceeds from the true knowledge of the object of worship. He that cometh to God must not only believe in his existence, but must believe that of him which he has been pleased to reveal in his word, he must know his true character as it is there exhibited; and if any man profess to approach to him without this knowledge and belief, he is not approaching to the true God, but to an idol of his own fancy. He may form in his own mind an idea of that great Being to whom he addresses himself; but if his idea of God be not that which is declared by his own word,—that which is exhibited in such endearing characters in the gospel of Christ, it is not the God of the Bible whom he is worshipping; and as there is no other living and true God, he is worshipping an idol,—a thing that has no existence.

It is only in the gospel of Christ that God is represented in such characters as to warrant and encourage us to approach to him, and to worship him with the hope of being accepted. We must not forget that we are estranged from God, and enemies to him; and that he is justly offended with us. In this state of estrangement there can be no friendly intercourse between heaven and earth. We cannot approach to him as holy angels, who never offended him, do; nor will he accept of the homage or worship of enemies and rebels. This is the state in which the gospel finds the whole human race; and this message of mercy makes known the expedient devised by infinite wisdom for effecting our reconciliation. This was no less than the gift of his own Son; he gave him up to the death to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness. Every man who believes this on the authority of the divine record, and submits to the righteousness of God, has his sins forgiven; he is reconciled; he receives a new heart and a right spirit; and in the exercise of faith and cordial repentance on account of his many transgressions, he is enabled, by divine grace, to worship God in simplicity and godly sincerity. Such worship is graciously accepted. Jesus Christ is the only medium of it. He is the one Mediator between God and man. His righteousness alone is the footing on which our persons and services are accepted; and his intercession alone is available to our spiritual advantage.

I am aware that every Papist, and many a nominal Protestant, will cry out against this as cant and nonsense. No matter: It is just what the plain truth of divine revelation has been from the beginning of the world, in the esteem of those who did not like to worship God in the way which he himself had prescribed; who in fact did not like to retain God in their knowledge, in those characters of infinite holiness and righteousness, under which he had revealed himself, and which would not admit the approach of any of the race of Adam, but by confession of guilt over a sacrifice of atonement.

Sinners, as such, never did like this view of the divine character; and yet if they profess to worship God under any other character, they are worshipping an idol, and not the true God. Cain seems to have been the first avowed idolater; and his idolatry consisted in presenting an offering to the true God under a false character. The divine appointment of worship by sacrifice, was a sufficiently plain intimation, that God was so offended with men on account of sin, that no man should ever approach to him but upon the footing of an atonement. But Cain did not believe that God was so offended with *him*, that he might not come to him as a friend, without a sacrifice,—without a reconciliation. It was not therefore the true God that Cain was thinking of; it was an idol of his own imagination; and this I take to be the origin of all the idolatry that has been in the world.

It was long, perhaps, before the impression of the revelation which God made of himself to the first family, and before the religion of that family, were so completely forgotten, that idolatry acquired the grossness of avowed creature worship; yet we know that in process of time the earth was filled with it. So after God was manifest in the flesh; after the great atonement had been made; after all men were invited to confess their sins, and come to God for pardon upon the footing of that sacrifice; and after many churches had been gathered by the preaching of apostles, built upon the foundation of the truth which they preached, and professing to worship God in the name of Jesus Christ; it was some time, I say, after this, before idolatry began to appear in the grossness of creature worship. It soon appeared in its more refined and intellectual form, when some Jewish converts began to make an idol of their conformity to the law of Moses, and when others became ashamed of the doctrine of Christ, and began to corrupt it by inventions and traditions of men. This, though perceptible at first only to the keen spiritual discernment of inspired men, became by degrees palpable enough; and in the course of a few ages, it issued in the gross idolatries of the Church of Rome, and the scarcely less gross superstitions of the Eastern churches.

There is in the mind of every real Christian a representation of the true God in his revealed characters of goodness and truth, justice and mercy. This is produced by the gospel which he believes; and, continuing in the faith of it, this representation, or image of the living God remains within him. But there are many who receive the gospel only in theory, not in the love of it, and without any experience of its power and sanctifying influence; and there are many, called Christians, who do not know

the gospel even in theory. In the minds of both these classes of persons, there is an image of something else than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: it is the image of an idol which they have set up in their own hearts; and all the worship of such persons is no better than idolatry. For instance, if a man shall imagine that God will accept him upon the footing of his own merits; that God is too good to be strict in marking his failings and imperfections; that he will kindly pass over these, without putting him to the disagreeable necessity of confessing and forsaking his sins, and imploring mercy in the name of Christ;—such a man is thinking of an idol; his heart is as far removed from the true God as that of the deluded Papist, who worships a fragment of the handkerchief of the Virgin Mary, or the poor Hindoo, who falls down before the image of Juggernaut.

I have a good deal to say on the conformity of Popery with heathen idolatry; but the design of the present reflections is to show its conformity with the state of the carnal mind; and that it rises out of that alienation of the heart from the true God, and dislike of his revealed character, which exists in the heart of every man until he is converted to God by the power of the Holy Spirit, and the instrumentality of the gospel.

But when persons have obtained the name of Christian, they do not like to give it up. In countries where Christianity is not persecuted, especially where it is the prevailing and established religion, men may depart from the faith of Christ, and still be called by his name. They call themselves Christians, and their children will be called Christians, though not united to Christ by the faith of the gospel. The living image of Christ is wanting in the hearts of such persons, and they must have something external and visible to supply its place; such, for instance, as a dead image of him, which they set up in their churches. They abandon the doctrine of the cross of Christ; but they find a substitute in the timber or image of the cross. Not aware of the necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit to regenerate and sanctify them, they rest satisfied with the act of baptism and the application of holy water. Not receiving Christ by faith in the ordinance which commemorates his death, they are content to receive an image of him in the form of a wafer. The light of the divine word no longer shining from their pulpits, they supply its place by a number of wax candles, even in the face of the sun; and the priests, no longer exhibiting the character of heavenly purity, they clothe themselves with an image of it in the form of a robe of white linen. In this way the doctrines and ordinances of Christ were not merely corrupted, but totally supplanted, by a system of idolatries, and superstitions, and will worship, which continues to this day to obstruct the progress of the gospel, and to enslave the minds of many millions of the human race.

Now I wish to be understood as distinctly maintaining that there is a tendency to these things in the minds of all who are Christians in name, and not in reality. Where the living spirit of Christianity is a-wanting, men will take up with a dead image of it. If they receive not the gospel in its heavenly simplicity, they will be led away by some earthly representation of it. If they receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved, they may be abandoned to the fatal delusion of believing a lie. The first speculative error may appear small and trifling, but nobody can tell how far it may lead one astray. One degree of obliquity extended, will lead to an infinite distance from the right line. Rome was not built in a day. Admit but the principle, that any thing beside what is contained in the word of God is to be a rule in religious matters, and this, in the course of time, will lead the minds of men entirely away from the word of God, as it did in the Church of Rome, and issue in a system of direct opposition to the divine record.

Let such of my readers as are alarmed for the growth of Popery attend to the root of the evil. It lies in the opposition of the carnal mind to the holy and humbling doctrine of Christ crucified. It is highly probable that if Popery shall regain the ascendency among us, and become the fashionable religion, the worldly part of the community will fall into it; because the fundamental principles of Popery and mere nominal Christianity are the same. If any of my readers ask how the growth of Popery is to be prevented; I confess I know no proper means of prevention, but by every one receiving and holding fast the truth of the divine word; and by communicating the knowledge of it to all around him. It is only by the word of truth, and the armour of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left, that Christians can effectually oppose the progress of error; and such opposition, by the blessing of God, will ultimately be successful, even if Popery should gain the ascendency for a time.

No. XLVII.

SATURDAY, June 5th, 1819.

"Beatification," says Dr Johnson in his Dictionary, "is an acknowledgment made by the Pope, that the person beatified is in heaven, and therefore may be reverenced as blessed; but is not a concession of the honours due to saints, which are conferred by canonization." If this be a correct definition of the word,

which I have no reason to doubt, it appears that the Pope professes to have the faculty of knowing who are in heaven, and who are not, which must excite as great a degree of astonishment, as that of the village rustics at their learned schoolmaster, "That one small head could carry all he knew." It appears farther, that every saint in heaven *may* be reverenced as blessed, that is, honoured with an inferior degree of worship; but that to those whom the Pope has canonized a higher degree of worship *is due*. It is not then a matter of mere choice; it is a matter of *obligation;* it is the bounden duty of every good Papist to worship the idols which the Pope has *set up;* that is, the saints to whom he has given places of distinction in heaven. Mr Andrews very earnestly inculcates this duty in his school book, as it regards the Virgin Mary; and in his edition of St Wenefride's life and miracles, he is little less earnest in recommending devotion to her. At least he holds her up as an object of religious worship; as one that is able to bestow the greatest temporal blessings, such as the cure of diseases which no human skill can cure; and he furnishes suitable prayers for the use of her devout worshippers, on whom she has not bestowed the ability to make prayers for themselves.

Those who have marked the correspondence that there is between heathenism and popery, have been struck with the resemblance of Popish canonization to heathen deification. "The ancient priests, in order to the credit of their system, felt it necessary to persuade the people, that certain characters, many of whom had, however, been the most ambitious and sensual of mankind, were honoured by the special favour of heaven; were deep in its mysteries, and even worthy of being placed among the gods themselves: in consequence of which, their public deification took place with all the pomp and circumstance so well calculated to impose upon a gross and idolatrous people. In order, however, to this ceremony, some miraculous intimation of the favour and will of Heaven, as to the individual in question, was required to be duly attested as necessary to the ceremony. Thus in the case of Romulus, one Julius Proculus took a solemn oath, 'That Romulus himself appeared to him, and ordered him to inform the senate of his being called up to the assembly of the gods, under the name of Quirinus.' *Plut. in Vit. Rom. Dionyss. Halicar.* l. ii. p. 124. and in the deification of the Cæsars, some of whom were little less than monsters, the established proof of their divinity was an eagle flying out of the funeral pile towards heaven, which was supposed to convey the soul of the deceased, and was also required to be duly attested." *Dio. Cass.* p. 598, 842. The Papists, in imitation of this Pagan original, consider it necessary to their credit, to canonize or beatify certain individuals of their communion, some of whom have, like their heathen prototypes, been of infamous and scandalous lives; and in order to this act, they also introduce the machinery of miracles, although with some difference as to the mode of its operation. In this case, the miracles are alleged to have been performed by the saints themselves, and there is as little difficulty in procuring the necessary attestations in modern as in ancient Rome. The creation of saints has in consequence become almost as common as the creation of cardinals, there having rarely been a Pope who did not enrich the calendar with some fresh specimens. Benedict XIII. canonized eight in one summer, and his successor Clement XII. four more. Innocent XIII., who succeeded him, beatified Andrew Conti, a member of his own family: and this is another main source of saintship, when, to gratify the ambition of the reigning Pope, this honour is conferred on some of his name or family. The present Pope has canonized five saints, all of whose banners are at this moment waving in one of the chapels of St Peter's. The Papists consider this rite as so essential a part of their religion, that they have even perverted the sacred Scriptures for the purpose of giving sanction to the practice, having translated the passage in St James, v. 11, not as it ought to be: 'Behold we count them happy who endure,' but, 'Behold how we *beatify* those who have suffered with constancy;' in like manner as, in order to give a sanction to their religious processions with the host and with relics, &c. they translate the passage in Heb. xi. 30, 'The walls of Jericho fell down after they were compassed about seven days,' 'after a *procession* of seven days.'

"It costs an immense sum to be made a saint, but pious relatives are sometimes content to bear it. Proofs of the miracles wrought by the deceased must be adduced in due form, in a judicial way. Witnesses are examined, and in order that full justice may be done, counsel are appointed on both sides, one undertaking to establish the miracles, and the other combating them; and thus the matter is solemnly argued *dans les formes, et selon les regles,* and not determined until after a long and expensive process. It is farther remarkable, that some miracle must have been performed by the deceased *after his death,* as well as during his life; one of these, by the way, being quite as easy to the saint as the other, and each being equally capable of proof. It is unnecessary to observe, that these judicial inquiries invariably terminate in favour of the saint and his family; since the Pope and his council are equally interested in the successful issue of the suit: indeed, as an atheistical Pope once observed, 'What a profitable fable has that of Jesus Christ been to us!'"—*Ignotus, Letter* V. *originally published in the Times Newspaper.*

Whence is it that Mr Andrews has not tried his hand in answering this able writer, who has made such an exposure of the wickedness of Popery, and its dangerous tendency, under his own eye?

One of the most usual miracles which saints are said to perform after their death, is to impart to their carcases a good smell; and it is so much the better if they can preserve this for ages, so that on opening their graves all present should be sensible of it. I have before me a number of particulars of the life and miracles of St Mary Magdalene of Pazzi, whose Bull of canonization "begins not without good reason," as the author says, "with that incorruption and good odour of her body which continues to this day." It is easy to imagine how a parcel of artful monks, by the use of perfumes, might deceive the simple, and impart fragrance to the body of one recently deceased, and even to a chestful of dry bones; and thus it was in their power to lay a foundation for the canonization of any person they pleased. The following is one of the miracles which procured this honour for the idol of Pazzi:— "Then, when her virgin body was after her death exposed in the church, there was a concourse of people of all ages, sexes, and qualities to see it, touch it, and pay veneration to it. Among others, a young man of an irregular and licentious life, advanced towards the body to touch it. The saint, as if she had been alive, had a horror of that dunghill, and turned her head on the other side. This action touched the young man so to the quick, that he made a firm resolution to amend. This miracle was attested by a reverend Jesuit, who was an eye-witness of it, with many others." I dare not give more particulars of this saint, lest my readers should throw my Paper aside with disgust. Suffice it to say that the story is much more gross than St Wenefride. St Mary Magdalene of Pazzi, however, has a distinguished place among the idols of Papal Rome; and I have received from an intelligent correspondent an impression of a little image of her, such as her devotees wear about their neck.

I related in my last Number how St Viar was unsainted when it was discovered that he had been no better than a mender of roads, though I believe few of the saints were so honourably and usefully employed. I shall now give an account of one who was in danger of being deprived, and struck from the calendar, had the credit of his saintship not been established by the smell of his bones. The relation is given by one who was an eye-witness of this, and of innumerable other Popish tricks to deceive the people, and who afterwards was so convinced of the iniquity of the system that he renounced it and embraced the Protestant faith. This, of course, will overthrow his credit with every good Papist, and every fact of his will be called a forgery, though he relates nothing worse than what can be proved by a hundred other witnesses. It is a rule with writers of controversy on the Popish side that nothing is to be believed that is written by a Protestant, unless he be such a one as Heylen, the companion of Laud, who was more than three-fourths a Papist.

"I can give you on this subject," says the writer in a letter to a friend, "the result of a conference, at which I was present myself, sometime ago, at Blois in France, upon occasion of several relics kept in the parish of St Victor, two leagues distant from that city. These relics were much out of order, in old wooden cases, all worm-eaten and rotten with age, which hindered them from being carried in procession, and exposed to public view. The concern, therefore, was to have them more modishly accommodated, and transported into new cases. To this end the Bishop of Chartres was petitioned to perform the translation, who presently sent his order to the Archdeacon of Blois for that purpose; who assembled several of the clergy to consult with the curates and priests of St Victor about the precautions to be observed in that translation. The resolution was, that to avoid the scandal that might happen, if nothing should chance to be found in the old cases, and to prevent the declining of the good opinion and devotion of the people, in case only some few bones should be found in them, the transportation of them into the new ones should not be done in public, but as private as possibly might be, in the presence of only some prudent persons, who might be ready to remedy all sorts of accidents upon occasion: I was desired by some friends of the Archdeacon, to be present with them; and I can assure you, sir, that the resolution was taken, if it should chance that nothing were found in the cases, to maintain peremptorily *that the bodies of the saints were there whole and entire.* And to allay somewhat the scruples that might start by occasion of this proceeding, a canon of St Saviour's church of Blois, a man resolute and of a small conscience, maintained in the face of the assembly, that no difficulty ought to be made of asserting such a thing, though altogether false: that in a case where the interest of the church was concerned, all manner of respects and sentiments whatsoever were to be given up; that the mysteries of the Catholics were not to be exposed to the raillery of the heretics (so they call the Protestants), who would not fail to mock at them, as soon as they should understand that nothing had been found in the cases of St Victor, which for so long a time had been the object of the people's adoration; besides, that the devotion of laics, in assisting the clergy, was already so far cooled, that scarce any thing now was to be got from them, but by some pious fraud or holy artifice. The Archdeacon heard all his discourse without contradicting him in the least;

and the curate of the parish, as being the person most concerned in the case, very officiously returned him his most hearty thanks. This done, they proceeded to the opening of the cases; and the truth is, bones either of saints or no-saints were found in them. In the mean time, a monk of the Abbey of St Lomer in Blois, who was present, cried out at the very instant, that he felt a very sweet odour which proceeded from them, wherewith he was so strongly seized, that it was like to overcome him. A young religious (his companion) seconded him immediately, and some country people of the parish protested the very same thing. The Archdeacon, and the rest of the company freely declared, that they smelt nothing: yet forasmuch as it might be, that those persons having some more particular merit before God, he might think them worthy of receiving the like favours; it was ordered that their attestation should be received, and set in the margin of the verbal process which was then making of that translation, the original of which was to be shut up with the relics in the new cases. I had the curiosity some weeks after, in the time of vintage, to examine some of these persons about the odour they pretended to have smelt, of what kind it was; whereupon some of them said it was the scent of a rose, others of jessamin, and others of violet: but finding that they faultered in their expressions, and smiled withal, I took occasion to press them more seriously, so that at the upshot they confessed, that the good opinion they had of the two monks, which first started the matter, had drawn them in, and in a manner forced their imagination to believe that they smelt that which they never had smelt indeed."—*Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests*, vol. i. p. 8—10.

The author has a round about way of telling his story, on which account I will give the sequel in my own way. He got the young monk to confess that he had smelt nothing of the miraculous odour; but being ashamed to be supposed less gifted with heavenly favours than his brother, he had pretended to be sensible of it. He acknowledged, (being a young inexperienced man) that he had had some qualms of conscience on account of what he had done, that he had consulted his superiors about the matter, and that they told him the rule in such cases was, to consider whether the thing was for the glory of God, and the advantage of the order to which he belonged. They did not hesitate to affirm "that it was not against the glory of God to advance the honour of one of his saints, especially when some circumstances that were both glorious and profitable to that order, engaged the doing of it; and that all the evil that could be supposed in the case, came but to this, to say, that God had done what he might have done, and which he hath done on many other occasions; which at the highest could be no more than a small venial sin; as, they say, all lies are, that do not infringe justice, that is to say, that do nobody any harm." It was impossible, however, to make the old monk depart from his first declaration. He persisted in maintaining that the odour had not only been smelled by him at the opening of the chest, but that it had followed him every where so long as a particle of the dust of the relics remained upon his clothes. Thus St Victor's saintship was confirmed; and he remains in the calendar an object of worship to all the simple faithful who cannot raise their minds to a higher object.

I give the following as a specimen of the process of canonization. I could produce a number of such cases; but let this one suffice. "On the 12th of May, 1707, a general congregation to confer upon the rights of the church, having been summoned by the Pope's order, wherein Cardinal Pamphilio required their approbation of the miracles wrought by Andrew Avellino, of the order of the Theatines. These miracles were eight in number; of which, after a full and serious disquisition, the three following were solemnly ratified by the general consent and concurrent votes of the whole congregation, viz. The third, which was the first in order, being a cure performed on the person of Jacob Giovio, who was miraculously restored to the entire use of his limbs by the said Andrew Avellino, though his sinews had been shrunk, and a deadly palsy had seized one side of his body. The next was the fourth in order, namely, the healing a dangerous wound John Battista Corrizo had received in his head; and that without the appearance of the least mark or scar. The last was the restoring Scipio Arleo's child to health, by curing it of a great bruise in its forehead, and of a wry neck.

"As these miracles were the fruits of his most exemplary piety and heroic virtues, the holy assembly being authorised to it by the consent and directions of His Holiness, declared, that in conformity to the customs of the holy Roman Church, and by the authority of the same, the forenamed Andrew Avellino might and ought to be deemed a saint, and be canonized accordingly."—*Romish Ecclesiastical History of late years*, p. 6.

This Andrew Avellino was accordingly canonized, along with several others, with much pomp and ceremony; and became of course an object of that religious worship which is *due* to those idols which the Pope has set up. It is, indeed, only that sort of worship which they call Dulia; but as I have shown in a former Number, the distinction between this and Latria is absolutely unintelligible to the unlearned, and perhaps also the learned themselves. Let them say what they will in theory, this is practically the adoration of a creature; it is trust or confidence in a creature, which is, in scripture, condemned as a departing from the living

God. Let a person go into one of their great churches, where there are a number of altars: before one altar he will see a group of prostrate worshippers praying, Holy Jesus, have mercy upon us; before another altar, a group praying, Holy Mary, have mercy upon us; before a third altar, the prayer is, Holy St Peter, have mercy upon us; and so on, before all the altars that are dedicated to all the saints: nay, the same individual will pay his devotions at several altars the same day, not sure that he will succeed in his suit at any one altar, or by addressing one saint; he makes it as sure as possible by addressing as many as he can, or as many as he can afford to pay, for no one must approach an altar without a gift. Now when the same words are addressed to the different objects of worship, with the same apparent devotion, who is able to distinguish between latria, dulia, and hyperdulia? Nay, let any man consider the following extract from a prayer which Mr Andrews has provided for the devout worshippers of St Wenefride, and say if stronger words can be used in addressing the supreme Deity. "O blessed St Wenefride, hear the prayers and receive the humble supplications of thy devout pilgrims, and obtain, that by thy pious intercession, God of his infinite mercy will be pleased to grant us a full pardon and remission of our sins, and a blessing to this our pilgrimage; and that we may increase and persevere in God's grace, and enjoy him eternally in heaven. *This we beg of thee, O blessed virgin and martyr*, for Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour's sake. Amen." In the beginning of this extract, the saint is addressed as mediator with God, to procure blessings by her pious intercession; at the close of the prayer, Jesus Christ is represented as mediator with her, and she is intreated to grant the blessings for his sake, which is actually putting her in the place of God the Father. My readers, I am afraid, will scarcely believe that such impiety exists in the present day, but I assure them that the above are the concluding words of a book printed in 1817, and strongly recommended by W. Eusebius Andrews.

I have met with no Popish writer who can explain to me how they get their prayers conveyed to the saints in heaven, or how they know that they reach that place. As I conferred several favours on Mr Andrews in my last Number but one, I request of him the favour of a Paper or two on this subject. I must suppose, that he very piously makes use of the prayers which he has composed for the worshippers of his favourite idol, St Wenefride; and he must know that a number of pilgrims are every day paying their devotions at her holy well: now I ask him seriously, how she can attend to all the prayers of these pilgrims in Wales, and at the same time hear his prayers in Drake Street, Red Lion Square, London? Or, supposing her to be in heaven, how she can attend to either the one or the other? If Mr Andrews shall make this intelligible and credible, he will show himself to be as great a man as the unanswerable Dr Milner himself.

For want of Popish authority on this subject, I take the following from The Protestant Advocate, in the Anti-Jacobin Review, for April last. "1st, The saints know the prayers of men by the agency of angels, who are always passing backwards and forwards. 2d, The saints themselves are always passing backwards and forwards. 3d, The saints view all things in God from the moment of their beatitude. 4th, That this is not the case, but our prayers are then only revealed to them by God when they are made. The first two have lived their day, and although they once blinded the minds of the weak, they are now generally allowed to be nonsense. The third fast approaches the same fate; for the expression, *view all things in God*, begins to be regarded as words without meaning."—"Hence, the last, is the one at present depended upon."

My readers will agree with me that this is not a proper subject of levity; and yet it is difficult to treat it with becoming reverence. It is no doubt possible with God to communicate to the saints in heaven the prayers of their friends on earth; but it may be asked for what conceivable purpose? The grossest idolater will not say in plain words that the saints are upon a footing of equality with God, and that he must consult them whether it be proper to grant all or any of the petitions which he is supposed to communicate to them; or that he must suspend the granting of such petitions as he approves till the saints express their approbation. I know it is alleged that God grants the petitions that are addressed to the saints, and which he makes known to them, in consideration of the singular merits of the saints; but this only leads to other, and equally fatal errors: it is putting the merits of mere creatures in the place of Christ's righteousness; while, in point of fact, there is not a particle of merit to be found among all the saints in heaven. Their unceasing acknowledgment, in common with that of the saints on earth, is, "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Tit. iii. 5.

No. XLVIII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 12TH, 1819.

A WRITER in the Anti-Jacobin Review for April last, informs us, that "a native of India, lately in London, very much censured the want of images in our churches; he said, the worshippers had nothing upon which they could

fix their attention, and hence they were often gazing at each other, and often at mere inanity. We, says he, have in our temples an image of the Deity to look at, with large eyes, huge ears, great hands, and long feet. Not that we believe this very image to be the Deity, but we use it only to fix our attention, and to remind us that the Being which it represents, can see every thing, hear every thing," &c. I make use of this anecdote as an introduction to what I have to say on the subject of worshipping images, as practised in the Church of Rome.

There can be nothing more explicit than the divine command, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them." In my seventeenth Number, I convicted the Church of Rome of mutilating the ten commandments, by leaving out the whole of the second. To make up the number, they divided what we call the tenth into two; but this reduced them to a difficulty which required some cunning to get over. In the second edition of the commandments, in the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, the arrangement of the tenth is different from that of Exodus xx. The one is, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *house*, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *wife;* the other is, Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's *wife*, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's *house*. Thus, according to the Popish arrangement, what was the ninth commandment in the one passage, would be the tenth in the other. It required no less than the wisdom of the Council of Trent to remedy this evil, which they did by uniting the two; and thus it stands in the Douay Catechism to this day:—"The ninth and tenth commandments. Say the ninth and tenth. A. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods." From Deut. x. 4. we are sure that the WORDS or commandments were ten. Nothing can appear more natural than the Protestant division of them; and it is evident that the Popish division cannot be the right one, seeing it requires them to blend what they call two into one.

"This inversion," says Mr Cunninghame, "of the two first clauses of the tenth commandment, has, as will be seen afterwards, been providentially the means of detecting the fraud of the Romish Church, in blending the two first commandments together, for the purpose of subtracting the second, and then dividing the tenth into two, to make up the complete number. If, in the catechisms of that church, it had been usual to insert the commandments at full length, no end could have been served by blending together the first and second commandments, and the fraud would probably never have been attempted; but when it is known that it was customary only to insert, in the public formularies of instruction, the first sentence of each commandment, the reason will at once appear for uniting the first precept of the decalogue with the second; for by this expedient, and by inserting only the first sentence of the two united commandments, the Romish Church has, in many of her catechisms, got rid of the commandment against image worship altogether, and effectually concealed the knowledge of its existence from the minds of the ignorant common people."—*Apostasy of the Church of Rome*, p. 60. I wish Mr Andrews, or some other Papist, would undertake to answer this book. Until something of the kind be done, I shall continue to believe that Papists themselves consider it unanswerable.

Mr Cunninghame might have said that the divine commandments were thus mutilated, not in *many*, but in *all* the catechisms of the Romish Church, until they were shamed out of their villany by the light of the Reformation: and indeed he has said that this mutilated copy of the commandments, which he gives in pages 61, 62, was the only one to be found in the Manuals of the Romish Church, before the Reformation, and even at a later period; and he quotes Dr Stillingfleet, as challenging a Papist, as lately as 1658, to tell him in what public office of their church the second commandment was to be found.

Indeed, when the priests had made up their minds to deceive the people, it was necessary that they should have recourse to fraud. It was not possible to reduce men and women altogether to the rank of brute beasts, though it was determined to rule them as such. The thinking and reasoning faculty was not quite extinct in the darkest ages. The priests could not inscribe on the wall behind the altar, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath," and then lay down upon the altar an image, or crucifix, to be worshipped. They could not insert the same words in any of their catechisms for the instruction of the people, and then exhort them to come and pay their devotions before an image of the Virgin Mary. In short, it was quite necessary that they should give up the worship of images, or conceal the divine command which forbids it. They chose to do the latter; and thus, by suppressing a part of the divine law, they took upon themselves the condemnation of all those who, through ignorance, should be guilty of breaking it.

The priests, however, have not yet been entirely shamed out of this piece of fraud and imposition; for the second commandment is still omitted in such of their catechisms as are used in Ireland, and other unenlightened parts of Europe. They have restored it to its place in the catechism which is used in Glasgow, because they have not the face to conceal it.

where every child might detect the imposture. See this subject more fully discussed in my seventeenth Number.

Image worship is not publicly practised by Papists in Glasgow, therefore they have restored the commandment to its place; but where the practice exists, the commandment is concealed. This is an unequivocal admission, on the part of the priests, that the practice and the commandment cannot stand together; and they have presumed to exercise the dispensing power, in its highest possible degree, by setting aside an entire precept of the law, which God himself pronounced upon mount Sinai, in the hearing of the whole congregation of Israel.

I proceed now to give the high authorities which sanction image worship in the Church of Rome; and I appeal to every reader, whether they do not, though there was nothing else against her, clearly convict that church of the grossest idolatry. The following constitution was established by Thomas Arundell, Archbishop of Canterbury, in his provincial council, held at Oxford, in the year 1408; and if Popery were restored in England, this would be found the law of the church there, as really as it was in the fifteenth century. I have the Latin original before me, but I will content myself with Archbishop Usher's translation:—"From henceforth let it be taught commonly, and preached by all, that the cross and the image of the crucifix, and the rest of the images of the saints, in memory and honour of them whom they figure, as also their places and relicts, ought to be worshipped with processions, bendings of the knee, bowings of the body, incensings, kissings, offerings, lighting of candles, and pilgrimages; together with all other manners and forms whatsoever, as hath been accustomed to be done in our, or our predecessors' times."

The following authority is higher than that of any one branch of the Romish Church. In the Roman catechism, authorised by the Council of Trent, the parish priest is required to instruct the people as follows:—"Not only that it is lawful to have images in the church, and to give honour and worship unto them, (forasmuch as the honour which is done unto them, is referred unto the things which they represent,) but also that this hath still been done to the great good of the faithful; and that the images of saints are put in churches, as well that they *may be worshipped*, as that we, being admonished by their example, might conform ourselves to their life and manners."

With regard to the nature of the worship which is offered to images, we are taught that "it must not only be confessed that the faithful in the church do adore before the images, (as some peradventure would cautelously speak,) but also *adore the image itself*, without what scruple you will: yea, they do reverence it with the same worship wherewith they do the thing that is represented thereby. Wherefore, if that ought to be adored with *latria*, or divine worship, this also is to be adored with *latria*; if with *dulia* or *hyperdulia*, this likewise is to be adored with the same kind of worship. And so we see that St Thomas Aquinas doth directly conclude, that the same reverence is to be given to the image of Christ, and Christ himself; and, by consequence, seeing Christ is adored with the adoration of *latria*, or divine worship, that his image is to be adored with the adoration of *latria*."—*Usher's Answer*, p. 497, 498, with the Latin originals, as quoted by him.

Let it be remembered that St Thomas Aquinas is one of the highest authorities in the Church of Rome. He is called the Angelic Doctor, because, in his theological speculations, he rose above the rank of ordinary men, and was understood to approximate that of angels; and Pedro de Cabrero, a great divine in Spain, has declared that "the doctrine delivered by St Thomas—that the image, and the sampler represented by it, are to be worshipped with the same act of adoration, is most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith. This, he saith, is the doctrine, not only of St Thomas, and of his disciples, but also of all the old schoolmen almost."—*Ibid.* 499. It was then the doctrine of almost all these great divines that an image of Christ was to be worshipped with the same adoration as Christ himself; and as Papists were impious enough to make images of God the Father, and of the Holy Spirit, it follows, of course, that these images were all to be worshipped with the same degree of adoration, as that which was offered to the God and Father of all.

I could fill this sheet with the testimonies of other great divines, all to the same purpose; but that I may not rest on the authority of mere individuals, however great and renowned in the Church of Rome, I proceed to give the solemn authentic canon of the Council of Trent:—"Sess. 25th. That the images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin Mother of God, and other saints, are to be kept and reserved, especially in churches, and due honour and veneration to be given to them; not for that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any confidence to be placed in them, as was anciently done by the heathens, who put their trust in idols, but because the honour which is exhibited to images, is referred to the prototype, or thing represented by them: so that by the image which we kiss, and before which we kneel, or put off our hats, we adore Christ, and reverence his saints, whom the said images represent."

Such is the solemn decision and authentic canon of the last general council that was held in the Romish church. To the decrees of this council every Popish priest is bound by solemn

oath to conform in every respect; and if it were not that a certain priest does not keep his oath, "the images of Christ, and of the blessed Virgin-mother of God, and other saints," would be set up and worshipped, even in our own city, so truly Presbyterian, and so distinguished for its opposition to the abominations of Rome, ever since it received the light of the Reformation. Justice, however, requires me to say, that the Pope has the power of dispensing with such oaths as cannot be conveniently kept: and, therefore, the priest above referred to, may have received a dispensation, freeing him from the obligation of setting up images in his church, until he shall have brought our good citizens to a more exact conformity with Rome.

The grave council enacts it as a law of the church, that "due honour and veneration is to be given to them," (*i. e.* the images.) Now those who are acquainted with human nature, especially those who have studied the human character as it appears in a state of gross ignorance, know, that the due honour and veneration here enjoined to be paid to images, will be the highest veneration and honour of which they are capable; that, in short, all the worship which they have to give, will be given to the images which the church has set up. To say that no divinity or virtue is in the image, or that nothing is to be asked of it, is saying no more than the heathen would say of their images. They did not regard the block of wood or stone as God, any more than the Papists do. The Hindoo mentioned at the beginning of the present Number, did not regard the great image as the deity, but only as reminding him of the deity; and I suppose there are few Papists so extremely stupid as to mistake a block of wood, or a piece of stucco, for the real Virgin Mary, though they are guilty of equal stupidity in believing a piece of bread to be really their Saviour. When, therefore, they give due honour to an image, as representing Christ or the Virgin Mary, they are guilty of the very same idolatry as the Pagans were, who honoured the images of their gods, on account of that which they represented.

In short, Papists cannot use a word in defence of their image worship, which was not used by the heathens before them. The heathen declared that the worship of their images was merely relative; and that it had respect to the being whom the image represented. For instance, they worshipped, in one place, Jupiter Capitolinus; in another, Jupiter Olympius; and they understood these to be merely different representations of the same god, not that the image itself was the god. They never could imagine that the sculptor made the god who made himself. This absurdity was left for the darker ages of counterfeit Christianity; but they supposed the divinity used the image as an occasional place of abode, and they invoked it as residing there. In short, the image worship of the Romanists is as idolatrous as the calf-worship of the Israelites, and the worship of Venus by Horace and the old Romans. —See *Antijacobin Review for April last*, p. 71.

In Deut. iv. 15, 16. we read as follows: "Take good heed to yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude in the day that God spake to you in Horeb out of the midst of fire; lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female.* Here the making of any figure as a representation of the God that spoke to them, is declared to be a corrupting of themselves; and a reason is given, namely, that God did not appear to them under any similitude. When he spoke to them out of the midst of the fire, they saw no resemblance of any thing in heaven, or in the earth, or in the sea. Any figure, therefore, which they could make, would be a creature of their own fancy, and, according to their gross and carnal conceptions, would have been dishonouring to that God who is a Spirit, invisible, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. To attempt to make an image, or any resemblance, of the eternal and invisible God, indicates a state of mind the most grossly estranged from the knowledge of the true God; yet this state of mind actually exists among our Glasgow Papists; and it is avowed by AMICUS VERITATIS, who speaks of the material building called the Catholic Chapel, as resembling the majesty of that God to whose service it is dedicated. He means this to be understood of the true God; but it is evident he was thinking of an idol, and of a material one too, seeing it could find a resemblance in timber and stone, cut into figures as ridiculous as any which our Pagan ancestors worshipped in the valleys or upon the mountains.

The image by which Papists would represent God the Father, is that of an old man, to denote wisdom and eternity; * though to represent eternity by the utmost period of mortal life, is a thousand times more absurd than to represent the ocean by a drop of water; and as for the greatest wisdom of the aged among men, it is as far from that of God, as a few years are from eternity. The image of Christ is usually that of a human body extended

* "That Church," says Mr Cunninghame, page 71, "is chargeable with the toleration of images even of the first person of the Godhead, the Eternal Father. I myself saw a picture of this kind in one of the churches of Antwerp, about twenty-five years ago; and the existence of such abominations is acknowledged in an Abridgement of Sacred History by L'Abbe Fleury, which is in my possession. 'The images,' says he, 'which represent the divine persons *are drawn from the sacred Scriptures*. God has sometimes appeared to his prophets under the form of a venerable old man, to signify his eternity.'" Mr C. justly remarks on the words printed in *italics*, "This is one of those instances of daring falsehood, whereby the Romish church deceives the people."

upon a cross: and they represent the Holy Spirit under the image of a dove, from a mistaken apprehension, I suppose, of the meaning of those passages in the gospel history which describe the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus Christ. It is said, John i. 32, "I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him." God was pleased to point out the Saviour to John the Baptist, by a sign from heaven. This sign was the descent of the Holy Ghost, in a bodily or visible form, as in Luke iii. 22. But we are not told what that form was. It descended like a dove, that is, as a dove descends, slowly hovering over the object on which it is about to alight. If to represent the Holy Ghost under the figure of a dove be a Popish error, candour requires me to admit, that it is one in which they have been followed by most of those Protestants who carnalize the Bible by the unnecessary accompaniment of pictures.

It is evident that Jesus Christ never intended that his people should have any picture, or visible representations, even of his human body, for no means were used either by himself or by his disciples to preserve the likeness; much less could it be his intention that they should have a visible representation of the divine nature, as subsisting in Father, Son, or Holy Spirit; yet Papists have gone to such a length in impiety as to make an image of the Trinity, in the form of a man with three faces.

It would appear that the Church of Rome cannot put her hand to any religious matter without corrupting it. Though they have given the second commandment in the Douay Catechism, blending it with the first, yet they have mistranslated one phrase in it, so as to conceal the prohibition of their practice of prostration before images. Their translation is, "Thou shalt not *adore* nor worship them," which ought strictly to be rendered, "Thou shalt not *bow thyself* to them, and shalt not serve them." The commandment, as given in the Douay Catechism, therefore, does not prohibit the kneeling before images, or any other mark of worship, provided it be not *adoration*, or worship, in the highest sense. One of their questions on the commandment is as follows: —"Is it lawful to honour the images of Christ and his saints? A. Yes, if rightly understood; because the honour given them, is referred to the things they represent; so that by the images, or crosses, which we *kiss*, and before which we *kneel*, we honour and adore Christ himself." This is precisely such an answer as an ancient Roman would have given, had he been interrogated as to his worshipping the image of Jupiter.

Now we shall see that the words *bowing* and *kissing* are the very terms used in Scripture to denote divine worship: and the giving of which to any creature or image is declared to be idolatry. In the 72d Psalm, the worship which shall be paid to Messiah himself is expressed by the words,—"They that dwell in the wilderness shall *bow before* him;" and, in the 95th Psalm, it is said, "Let us *kneel before* the Lord our Maker." "In both these passages, bowing before, and kneeling before God and Christ, are expressive of the worship paid to them. In like manner," continues Mr Cunninghame, p. 70, "the worship to be paid to the Son of God, by the kings of the earth, is expressed in Psalm ii. 12, by the words "Kiss the Son;" and the seven thousand in Israel, who had not been partakers of the sin of idolatry, are designated as *all the knees who had not bowed to Baal, and the mouths which had not kissed him.* But this very worship, so far as the external acts are concerned, the Papists pay to the images of saints. Therefore they do thereby grossly and palpably violate the commandment which forbids the worship of images."

The strong language of Job (chap. xxxi. 26—28.) is decisive on this point. If he had looked upon the sun or the moon, and merely kissed his own hand, in token of respect, he says this would have been denying the God that is above. In Hosea xiii. 2, to kiss the calves, the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, is represented as the most heinous idolatry; and yet Papists are taught by the Douay Catechism to kiss and bow down before images of wood and stone. I have been told that the great toe of the image of Peter in Rome has been actually kissed away, by devout citizens and strangers, in the course of ages. It would require some skill in calculation to say how many kisses would consume two or three inches of marble or bronze.

I shall conclude this Number with the prayer used in the consecration of images, as it is found in the *Rituale Romanum*, authorized by Pope Urban VIII. "Grant, O God, that whosoever before this image, shall diligently and humbly, upon his knees, worship and honour thy only begotten Son, or the blessed Virgin (according as the image is that is consecrating) or this glorious apostle, or martyr, or confessor, or virgin, that he may obtain, by his or her merits, and intercession, grace in this present life, and eternal glory hereafter." "Now," says Mr Cunninghame, from whom I quote, "if this be not gross idolatry, let the Church of Rome show wherein the worship of Jupiter and Apollo was idolatry."

I expect to finish, in my next Number, this subject, and that of worshipping relics. I also intend, in my fiftieth Number, to insert the declarations of three credible witnesses, which completely prove the story which Mr Andrews has so often called a forgery. These declarations were taken down by a Notary Public, and are offered to be verified by oath. Two Papists were present during part of the examination of my first witness; and they were

invited to wait and hear the whole, and cross-examine them all, which, however, they did not do.

No. XLIX.

SATURDAY, JUNE 19TH, 1819.

I BELIEVE it is generally supposed, that the children of Israel took the idea of making and worshipping the image of a calf, from the Egyptian Apis; but it is not so generally understood, that Apis was probably no more than the image which the Egyptians made, and afterwards worshipped, in honour of Joseph, their great preserver. I learn from Pere Lamy, who, upon the authority of Jewish Antiquities, gives the banners, or standards of the twelve tribes, that that of Ephraim as constituted the head of the house of Joseph, was the figure of an ox. Perhaps it is in allusion to this banner of the tribe, exhibited in the midst of the congregation, that Moses says concerning Joseph, Deut. xxxiii. 17, "His glory is like the firstlings of his bullock," &c. denoting the strength and vivacity of that tribe.

Considering the general prevalence of idolatry, it was not to be wondered at that the Egyptians should give divine honours to Joseph after his death; and Julius Firmicus tells us expressly that they did so. "The Egyptians," says he, "after his death, according to the appointment of their country, built temples to him. And again, this man is worshipped in Egypt, he is adored, &c." St Augustine, or whoever else was the author of that book which bears his name, *De Mirabilibus Scripturæ*, was of the same opinion, as also Ruffinus, l. 2. *Hist. Eccles.* c. 23. They say that the Egyptians "set up the symbol of an ox over the sepulchre of Joseph, in memory of their deliverance;" and these writers, together with Suidas, add, that "his statue was set up with a bushel upon his head, to denote the plenty of corn which he provided for them."—See *Discourse concerning Idolatry*, anon. p. 28.

To this let me add, as a conjecture of my own, that the idea of representing Joseph under the figure of an ox, might have been taken from the fat and lean kine which were the subjects of Pharaoh's dream, the interpretation of which suggested the measures which were taken for the preservation of the whole nation. Be this as it may, if there be any truth in the opinion expressed by the above writers, it accounts for the readiness with which the children of Israel fell into the sin of worshipping the calf or young bullock. Joseph had been the preserver of their nation as well as of the Egyptians; and such was the grossness of their conceptions, that they expected, perhaps, that he would preserve them again, when they thought Moses had left them; or perhaps they looked for deliverance from God through the intercession of Joseph, for they had not altogether disowned the true God, any more than Papists do when they worship images. They called the feast of the calf, a feast to the Lord; and they might consider him as somehow dwelling in the image of their great patriarch, who, as a Papist would say, had such great merit before God, that he could procure from him what he pleased; for they said, "These be thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." It is worthy of remark too, that Jeroboam, who set up the golden calves of Dan and Bethel, was descended from Joseph by Ephraim, which may account for his preference of this idol.

From the time that Jeroboam set up these calves, the ten tribes, to use a vulgar expression, had not a day to do well. Every thing went wrong with them. They were made to suffer all the calamities of war and famine, and every species of misery that can affect the human race, in the present life. This was because they had set up idols, a crime of which God had declared his abhorrence, and against which he had pronounced the heaviest judgments.

What was declared to be so great a crime under the Old Testament, cannot be considered less, but rather more heinous under the New Testament. To make an image of the Virgin Mary, or any saint, and set it up even as a representation of some object of worship, cannot be less offensive to the true God now than the making the golden calves, or the image of Baal was in former times. Throughout the Old Testament history we find that God never forgot, and never ceased to remind the people, of the sin of Jeroboam, wherewith he made Israel to sin; and can we suppose that he overlooks the gross idolatries of the Church of Rome? He does not send prophets to reprove them as he did to Jeroboam; but he has given the complete volume of his word, which declares his abhorrence of idolatry, and that it shall not go unpunished. Neither does he, in such a visible and sensible manner, connect the punishment with the sin, as he did in the case of Israel; but the punishment is not on that account the less certain; and it will be so much the more dreadful that it has been long delayed.

Deceit and falsehood are necessary accompaniments of image-worship. The system is founded on lies, and supported by all deceivableness of unrighteousness. This has impressed a character upon the general body, which appears in almost every thing that they say and write on the subject of their religion and worship. Nay, some of their great casuists have declared a lie to be no sin, or only what they call a venial one, if it be to promote the glory of God, or one's own advantage. This system of falsehood and deceit appears in no-

thing more than in the lying wonders which they relate concerning their images. Every one knows what foolish stories are related of the miraculous house of Loretta, and of the miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, which is the idol of the place. Middleton tells us "that in the high street of Loretta which leads to the holy house, the shops are filled with beads, crucifixes, Agnus Deis, and all the trinkets of Popish manufacture: where I observed printed certificates, or testimonials, affixed to each shop, declaring all their toys to have been touched by the blessed image: which certificates are provided for no other purpose, but to humour the general persuasion, both of the buyer and the seller, that some virtue is communicated by that touch, from a power residing in the image." "For what else," says he, "can we say of those miraculous images, as they are called in every great town of Italy, but that some divinity and power is universally believed to reside in them? Are not all their people persuaded, and do not all their books testify, that these images have sometimes moved themselves from one place to another; have wept, talked, and wrought many miracles; and does not this necessarily imply an extraordinary power residing in them?" *Preface*, p. xxvii.

"In one of the churches of Lucca, they show an image of the Virgin, with the child Jesus in her arms, of which they relate this story. That a blaspheming gamester, in a rage of despair, took up a stone and threw it at the infant; but the Virgin, to preserve him from the blow which was levelled at his head, shifted him instantly from her right arm into the left, in which he is now held; while the blasphemer was swallowed up by the earth upon the spot, where the hole, which they declare to be unfathomable, is still kept open, and enclosed only with a grate, just before the altar of the image. The Virgin, however, received the blow upon her shoulder, whence the blood presently issued, which is preserved in a crystal, and produced with the greatest ceremony, by the priest in his vestments, with tapers lighted, while all the company kiss the sacred relic on their knees." *Wright's Travels at Lucca*, quoted by Middleton, pref. xxviii: on which the Doctor justly remarks, "Now, does not the attestation of this miracle naturally tend to persuade people, that there is an actual power residing in the image, which can defend itself from injuries, and inflict vengeance on all who dare to insult it?"

St Dominic, it is well known, was the founder of the Inquisition; and he has been, of course, a great favourite with the high authorities in the Romish church. "One of the most celebrated images in Italy," says Dr Middleton, "is that of St Dominic, of Surriano in Calabria, which, as their histories testify, was brought down from heaven about two centuries ago, by the Virgin Mary in person, accompanied by Mary Magdalene and St Catherine. Before this glorious picture, as they affirm, great numbers of the dead have been restored to life, and hundreds from the agonies of death; the dumb, the blind, the deaf, the lame, have been cured, and all sorts of diseases and mortal wounds have been healed: all which facts are attested by public notaries; and confirmed by the relations of cardinals, prelates, generals, and priors of that order; and the certainty of them so generally believed, that from the 9th of July to the 6th of August, the anniversary festival of the saint, they have always counted above a hundred thousand pilgrims, and many of them of the highest quality, who come from different parts of Europe, to pay their devotions, and make their offerings at this picture." *La vie St Dominic, p.* 592, 4*to. a Paris*, 1647, as quoted by Middleton.

Aringhus, touching upon the subject, in his elaborate account of subterraneous Rome, observes, "that the images of the blessed Virgin shine out continually by new and daily miracles, to the comfort of their votaries, and the confusion of all gainsayers. Within these few years, says he, under every Pope, successively, some or other of our sacred images, especially of the more ancient, have made themselves illustrious, and acquired a peculiar worship and veneration by the exhibition of fresh signs; as it is notorious to all who dwell in this city. But how can I pass over in silence the image of St Dominic; so conspicuous at this day for its never-ceasing miracles; which attract the resort and admiration of the whole Christian world. This picture, which as pious tradition informs us, was brought down from heaven, about the year of our redemption, 1530, is a most solid bulwark of the Church of Christ, and a noble monument of the pure faith of Christians, against all the *impious opposers of image worship*. The venerable image is drawn indeed but rudely, without the help of art or pencil; sketched out by a celestial hand; with a book in its right and a lily in its left hand; of a moderate stature, but of a grave and comely aspect; with a robe reaching down to the heels. Those who have written its history, assert, that the painters, in their attempts to copy it, have not always been able to take similar copies: because it frequently assumes a different air, and rays of light have been seen by some to issue from its countenance; and it has more than once removed itself from one place to another. *The worship*, therefore, of this picture is become so famous through all Christendom, that multitudes of people, to the number of a hundred thousand and upwards, flock annually to pay their devotions to it, on the festival of the saint: and though it be strange, which I have now related, yet what I am going to say is

still stranger, that not only the original picture, made not by human but by heavenly hands, is celebrated by its daily miracles, but even the copy of it, which is piously preserved in this city, in the monastery called St Mary's, above the Minerva, is famous also, in these our days, for its perpetual signs and wonders, as the numberless votive offerings hanging around it, and the bracelets and jewels which adorn it, testify." *Mid. pref.* p. xxxi. &c.

If Papists are pleased to believe all this, I cannot help it; but I hope few arguments are necessary to convince every Protestant reader that the whole story is made up of lies and imposition. It is a curious fact, that those who are trained to lying, as Papists are, are the most inclined to believe lies, which is accounted for from their being given up to strong delusion. No doubt, then, they believe very firmly all that their priest tells them about these miraculous images, and that miraculous picture, which, though they say it was made in heaven, is yet such a daub that no artist on earth would own with it. The circumstance, however, of hundreds of thousands of pilgrims coming to it, accounts for its popularity. It is a gainful imposture, and therefore the priests use all their art, and forge many stories to keep up the credit of it.

The worship thus paid to the image of St Dominic, is, I think, one of the worst features in the character of modern Rome. The characters of men may be known from the object of their worship, or from the qualities which are supposed to reside in that object. Thus the worshippers of Bacchus and Venus were notorious for all manner of licentiousness; the worshippers of Moloch caused their children to pass through the fire in honour of their idol. Dominic was the Moloch of the Church of Rome; and the adorations paid to him at this day, show the bloody intolerant character of modern Papists; that, in fact, they are what they have always been, whenever they have the opportunity of exhibiting their true character.

Dominic was appointed the first Inquisitor, by Alexander III. the bloodiest of all the Popes. I give the following account of him from Limborch, who quotes from Popish writers as his authorities, as indeed he generally does. Then Dominic had received the Pope's letters, appointing him to the holy office of Inquisitor, "Upon a certain day, in the midst of a great concourse of people, he declared openly, in his sermon, in the church of St Pruillian, that he was raised to a new office by the Pope; adding, that he was resolved to defend, with his utmost vigour, the doctrines of the faith; and that if the spiritual and ecclesiastical arms were not sufficient for this end, *'twas his fixed purpose to call in the assistance of the secular,* to *excite* and *compel* the Catholic princes to take arms against heretics, that the very memory of them might be entirely destroyed." The history of the thirteenth century shows how horribly faithful he was to his promise. That he was a bloody and a cruel man, is confessed by writers of his own order: thus, for instance, Camillus Campegius, a Dominican, and also an Inquisitor, having recited certain letters of his founder, says, "I have the more willingly annexed to this treatise of punishments, these letters of St Dominic, our father, who first exercised the office of Inquisitor, that all may be able to make a comparison between the *ancient severity* made use of to stop the progress of these crimes, and the present *moderation* and *tenderness* of this holy tribunal.' What must the Inquisition, in the thirteeth century, have been, when that of the sixteenth was declared to be, in comparison of it, moderation and tenderness! St Dominic's "mother, before she conceived him, is said to have dreamed, that she was with child of a whelp, carrying in his mouth a lighted torch; and that after he was born, he put the world in an uproar by his fierce barkings, and set it on fire by the torch which he carried in his mouth. His followers interpret this dream of his doctrine, by which he enlightened the world; whereas others, if dreams presage any thing, think that the torch was an emblem of that fire and faggot, by which an infinite number of men were burnt to ashes." *Limb. Hist. Inq.* cap. X. The standard of the Inquisition at Goa, has, under a portrait of the saint, this figure of a dog, with a torch in his mouth, setting fire to a figure of the globe.

Now the devotions which Papists pay to the image, and to the memory of such a man, make it evident that his character and conduct are not only approved, but applauded by them. What, therefore, are we to expect from Papists any where, but the imitation of his conduct, whenever providential restraints are removed? The late atrocities in the south of France, and during the Irish rebellion, are no more than what might naturally be expected of persons who worship such a fiend as St Dominic. The great business of his life was extirpation. His favourite employment was to persuade and compel princes to tread under foot and destroy heretics, as venomous adders, who ought not to be suffered to live on the earth; and he was much more of an honest man than modern Papists, for he did not affect to conceal, but openly avowed what his object was; whereas his followers, of the present day, insidiously conceal and deny what their own principles would necessarily lead them to, if they had the secular power in their hands. Their venomous hatred of heretics is not the least abated; and it would be childish to expect that where such a principle exists, it would not show itself by actual violence, whenever it could do so with impunity.

I have been led away a little from the subject of image worship, but these reflections will be found not unconnected with it; for it may be received as a general principle, that according to the representation of an object of worship, in the mind of a worshipper, such will be the character of the worshipper himself. It is no objection to this general principle, that some of the objects of Popish worship were really saints,—holy men and women; for it is not their character of gospel holiness that has a representation in their minds, or that is the foundation of their worship. It is not, for instance, Peter as a zealous and affectionate preacher of the gospel of the grace of God, but Peter the Prince of Apostles, and the first of the Popes, whose image they worship in Rome. It is not Mary, the humble follower of Jesus, but an idol, who, they suppose, can protect them from evil, and who will connive at their crimes, that they worship under the title of the blessed Virgin: but when they worship such a one as St Dominic, they do it under his true character, of which there is a resemblance in themselves.

I hope it will appear, from what I have said on this subject, that the Church of Rome is convicted of the gross idolatry of image-worship. It was my intention to have followed up this immediately with an account of their doctrine concerning relics, and the worship which is given to them; but I must leave this for another number. I shall fill up the remainder of the present sheet with an account of the mode of imposition practised in our own country, in former times, in order to support the credit of an image, and how an imposture was detected. I am indebted for it to Scott's History of the Lives of the Protestant Reformers in Scotland: Life of John Row. *

"About the year 1549, a poor friendless boy, of whose birth probably his parents had been ashamed, tended the sheep belonging to the nuns of Scienna, or Sciennes, about a quarter of a mile south from Edinburgh. It was one of his childish amusements to turn up the white of his eyes, and, in doing it, he succeeded so well, as to be able, at his pleasure, to make himself appear perfectly blind. The nuns observed him in his amusement, and spoke of it to some priests and friars who were their visitors. It immediately occurred to them, that if proper care was taken of this young person, he might, in course of time, become the fit subject of a miracle.

"The innocent child was secreted from public view, it has been said, seven or eight years, and mostly in one of the cells, or some retired apartment in the convent. At the end of that number of years, his stature and features were so much altered, as that he could not easily be recollected by the very few persons who formerly had known him. He was now judged to be of a proper age to be sent forth as a blind mendicant, and to receive instructions how he should behave. A person was hired to conduct him, who believed him to have been born blind, and to have been hitherto supported chiefly by charitable contributions from the ladies of Scienna.

"The simple young man, who scarcely knew any other people in the world than those under whose tuition he had been held, readily promised to obey their injunctions. They bound him by a solemn, but rash vow, to affect blindness, and to beg alms, till they should advertise him to the contrary. He kept his promise, and, for a considerable space of time, was led through the country, receiving such alms as benevolent people were pleased to give him.

"At last the period arrived when those priests and friars who were in the secret of his not being really blind, thought it expedient that he should be relieved from his hard condition."

"At the east end of the village of Musselburgh, in Mid-Lothian, was a celebrated chapel, dedicated to the honour of the Virgin Mary. Its proper name was Loretta, but it was vulgarly called Alareit, or Lawreit. There was also a chapel of the same name in Perth; and many credulous people in the Lothians, and at Perth, as well as the people of Loretta, in Italy, believed that their chapel contained within it the identical small brick built house in which the blessed Mother of our Lord had dwelt when at Nazareth; and that it had been miraculously conveyed and upheld entire, from its original seat, by the ministry of angels."

It was in the well frequented chapel at Musselburgh, "and where miracles were most commonly expected to be seen, that the pupil of the nuns was to receive his sight. Public intimation of the miracle to be performed, was given in Edinburgh, and in the neighbouring parts, and on the day appointed, a prodigious number of people were assembled. They found that there was a stage erected on the outside of the chapel. Having waited a little while, they beheld, led forward upon this stage, the seemingly blind young man, whom many of them knew, and whose blindness they had probably often pitied. He was attended by priests and friars, and, no doubt, also by Thomas, the Hermit, (a famous worker of miracles,) if he was then alive. After some time spent in the use of prayers and ceremonies, his eyes, to the satisfaction of the multitude, appeared to be perfectly restored. The young man, who had long been restricted from employing honest means for his subsistence, now sincerely re-

* Quoted also in M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. I. pp. 321—324. Edinburgh, 1831.

joiced. He returned thanks to the priests and friars; and when he came down from the stage, was caressed and congratulated by the people, and some of whom gave him money."

A Protestant gentleman who was present, detected the cheat, and took the young man into his service.

No. L.

SATURDAY, JUNE 26TH, 1819.

ON the 2nd of June, I was waited upon by two gentlemen of the Romish Church, and one Protestant, "in pursuance," as was stated in a card from one of them, "of the requisition contained in the 24th Number of The Catholic Vindicator." Relating to the story of the man in the Wynd, I had said, in my 42d Number, "If any of my readers, Protestant or Popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement." Mr Andrews quotes these words, partly in great capitals, to show his admiration of my boldness; and he adds, "Well, then, I have no doubt but THE PROTESTANT has many readers, both Popish and Protestant, who doubt his tale. I most earnestly request that some of them will call upon my adversary, and require to be furnished with that satisfactory evidence which he has pledged himself to furnish them with."

The hour having been fixed the day before, I had three women in waiting when the gentlemen called, ready to give their evidence upon oath, and a Notary Public to take it down. To my surprise, however, I found they did not want the evidence of witnesses, but that they came on purpose to examine me: and they presented me a string of questions, most of which, so far as I recollect, I could have answered; but I declined submitting to be interrogated, while I did not see what end it could serve, or to what discussions it might lead. I had a friend or two present, who, as well as myself, endeavoured to convince them of the absurdity of their demand. They professed the utmost respect for my character as a gentleman, and declared their willingness to receive *my* testimony, but as for my witnesses they would not believe *them*. Mr Simeon, who appeared to be the principal person of the party, made some unhandsome and cruel insinuations against the character of my witnesses, of which I shall say more hereafter; and positively declined hearing their evidence, but insisted on receiving from me answers to their written interrogatories. This appeared one of the most marvellous things I had ever seen. I had been repeatedly, and by handbills posted on the corners of the streets, accused of forgery, and of fabricating a certain story. I had publicly pledged myself to prove, by sufficient evidence, that the story was true. The gentlemen came to me on purpose to receive this evidence, or they did not come for the purpose of receiving what I had promised to furnish, and what they themselves professed to seek; but they would take no evidence but my *own word*, while my own veracity was the very point in question. The Protestant gentleman who came along with them was a stranger to me, but I learned that he was a respectable lawyer, who fills a civil office under the Sheriff. This rendered the procedure more surprising, as he could not but know what ought to be received as evidence, and what not. I intend, however, no reflection against him. He managed the business with the utmost politeness, and with as much liberality as was consistent with the part he had to perform; and I am persuaded he was not acquainted with the real state of the case. Had he known that the only point to be proved was, that, in a certain matter referred to I had stated the truth, he would not have supposed that my bare word would be considered evidence; because, if persons would not believe what I had written, how could they believe what I should say?

Finding that they persisted in demanding of me answers to their questions, I protested before the whole company, in which were only two friends of my own, besides the Notary and his clerk, that I was ready to do all that I had promised to do; that is, that I would prove, by these three witnesses, that the story which Mr Andrews called a forgery, was true in every material point; and I told the gentleman who came to receive the evidence which I had promised to furnish, that I would proceed in taking the declarations of my witnesses: that I would be glad if they would stay, and hear, and cross-examine them; but that if they would not *hear*, they might *read*, as I would publish the whole matter.

They then consented to hear what the witnesses had to say, but they would have no hand in examining them, or so much as allow their names to be taken down, as present at, or parties concerned in the examination. It was not convenient at the time and place to get a justice of the peace, but supposing the professional gentleman who came as the legal adviser of the other two, from the office he holds, to be qualified to administer an oath, I requested him to swear the first witness, which he declined. She was therefore admonished to speak, as upon oath, as she would probably be required to repeat her declaration, and swear before a magistrate.

At Glasgow, the second day of June, Eighteen Hundred and Nineteen years, compeared the following persons, and freely and voluntarily emitted the following declarations, viz:—

"Margaret King, *alias* M'Murray, wife of the deceased John M'Murray, late labourer in Glasgow, a Protestant,—Declares, That she was married about thirteen years ago, to the said John M'Murray, who was a Catholic, by one of the Justices of the Peace of Glasgow, whom she supposes to be a Mr Menzies; but she is possessed of a certificate to that effect, which she can produce: That her husband and she lived in the utmost friendship, except upon the point of religion, and that her husband continued for many years before his death urging her to become a Catholic, which she always declined: That her said husband has repeatedly threatened her with death and destruction, and sworn by the Holy Trinity that he would do so unless she became Catholic; and for the same purpose upon one occasion offered her money, which she resisted and refused: That her said husband left her for the purpose of going to Ireland, as he said, about three weeks before his death, although he continued to lurk in Glasgow: That he sent for her the day before he died at the foot of the Saltmarket, in a friend's house, who kept lodgings, but the name of the person she does not know, but that he is a Catholic, and a brother-in-law of Patrick Thornton, a member of the Roman Catholic chapel in Glasgow; from which house she had her husband removed to the house of Elizabeth King, a cousin of the declarant's: That when her said husband was so removed as aforesaid, to her cousin's house, he declared his sorrow for having deserted her, but that it was by the advice of his priest, who had advised him, as he said he could not live with a woman with whom he could not associate on account of her religion, and being a heretic: That, when her husband died in the declarant's cousin's house, he was removed to her own house; and that after his death, the Letter quoted in the twenty-fifth Number of the Protestant, for January the second, 1819, was found in his pocket, and that it is fairly quoted in the said Number of the Protestant: That the said Letter is not wrote by her husband, as he could not write, but that she believes it was written by some person for him, at his request, and that it contains what she believes to be the real sentiments of her said husband at the time it was written, as it contains the sentiments she had repeatedly heard him utter in her presence: That her said husband was buried in the High Church-yard at the public expense. That, previous to her husband's death, she never knew who the author of THE PROTESTANT was, or that such a work ever existed. That she believes her husband knew nothing of the author of that work: That, to her knowledge, there was no person of the Protestant religion in attendance upon her husband on his death-bed, who could forge the letter above-mentioned without her knowledge: That the said letter was found in her husband's coat pocket, in the Catholic lodging house above-mentioned, and that it was the coat he usually went to church with, and that he was not in the daily habit of wearing: That when the said letter was found as aforesaid, the following persons were present, viz., Elizabeth King, her cousin before-mentioned, and Mary Watson, tambourer in Glasgow, now residing in Greenock. Six words scored and one interlined before signing, and all this she declares to be truth, and that she cannot write; and that she is willing to attest the above on oath, if required.

"Mary M'Millan, wife of Archibald M'Donald, residing in Glasgow, who being examined, declares, That she knew the deceased John M'Murray referred to in the preceding declaration, as well as his wife, also before-mentioned: That the said John M'Murray and his said wife, lived together as married persons, in the declarant's immediate neighbourhood, for the space of twelve years; and that the said Margaret King lived in her neighbourhood as aforesaid, as the reputed wife of the said John M'Murray, although he was absent for some years: That she knows that the said John M'Murray, when at home, repeatedly maltreated and abused his said wife, on account of her religion, and used threats against her to make her become a Catholic, and said that her kind would all go to hell. And all this she declares to be truth, and that she cannot write, and she is willing to attest the above on oath, if required.

"Elizabeth King, tambourer in Glasgow, cousin of the first declarant, declares, That John M'Murray mentioned in the preceding declarations, died in her house, and that she was present in the Catholic lodging house, when the letter mentioned in the twenty-fifth Number of the Protestant was found in his pocket, when she went to get his clothes, and that the said letter is correctly copied into the said 25th Number of the Protestant, which she has now read over and compared with the original letter now shown to her. And all this is truth, and declares she cannot write.

"Compeared the preceding witness, Elizabeth King, who being further interrogated, declares, That John M'Murray before-mentioned, was in the declarant's house with his wife the day before he died, when the declarant heard him beg pardon of his wife, for his cruel conduct towards her in deserting her, but that he laid the entire blame upon his priest. Farther declares, That the said John M'Murray and Margaret King, were publicly known to reside together as married persons, and that she has

known them for about thirteen years, during which time she always considered them to be man and wife, although the said John M'Murray was at one time absent from his wife for some years; and farther declares, That she has seen, what she was told to be, a certificate of the said John M'Murray and spouse's marriage, which was in the possession of the latter, and which she once heard read over, but does not recollect who it was signed by. Farther declares, That she heard the said John M'Murray, on the morning of the day on which he died, and in bed, again ask pardon of his wife for his conduct towards her, and that she then, sitting by the bed-side weeping, freely forgave him, and wished that her Saviour might also forgive him; and, that after this happened, M'Murray died in the course of a few hours. (One word interlined.) And all this she declares to be the truth, and that she will attest what she has declared upon oath, if required."

When the first witness had proceeded about half way in her declaration, the three gentlemen remarked that her examination was likely to occupy a long time, and that as it was not necessary that they should hear it all, they would withdraw. They requested, however, a meeting in the evening, that they might hear what the two others had to say, which was agreed to, and they went away. Margaret King's declaration did indeed occupy a long time; and detailed many particulars of her husband's conduct towards her, on account of her heresy, and the hand which he said the priest had in it, but not bearing directly upon the point which I had to establish, they were not taken down. The whole story would occupy a large space in THE PROTESTANT; and she told it with such an appearance of sincerity, as left not a doubt of its truth in the mind of any gentleman who heard it to the end. The following certificate of her character, which is in my possession, is subscribed by a gentleman well known in this city, and whose word will go as far as that of any man in it. It is in the form of a letter addressed to myself. "Sir, I have known the bearer, Margaret King, about four years, and have every reason to believe, that she is an upright, simple Christian, and would abide by the truth. I remain, &c. June 4th, 1819." I have other certificates of the good character of my other witnesses, such as will convince any impartial person that their testimony would be received in any court in the kingdom; but, from motives of delicacy, I do not choose to thrust forward upon the public, the names of respectable individuals, in a controversy in which they have no personal interest, which might involve them in some degree of trouble, and expose them to a portion of that hatred with which our Papists regard THE PROTESTANT. Those who were willing to take my own word as a proof of my own veracity, will not perhaps believe that I have such certificates. I will not promise to satisfy such persons, but I am ready to satisfy every body else. I do not know that my visitors had any specific objection to the two other witnesses, except that they took them, I suppose, for Protestants, and Margaret King having maintained for years a good character among her neighbours, I would not have thought of procuring any other evidence on her behalf, had not Mr Simeon attempted to traduce her character. Thus, it seems, Papists are doomed to the fatality of contributing by every step they take to their own exposure, and the confirmation of my statements. The gentleman who certifies the character of Margaret King, assures me that he was well acquainted with her and her late husband; that he was often in their house within the last four years; that he endeavoured to persuade M'Murray to allow his wife the exercise of her religion, and that he was equally urgent in exhorting her not to hinder him in the exercise of his. He authorises me to say farther, that M'Murray frankly confessed to him one day, that Margaret was a much better wife since she became religious. From his conduct, however, it did not appear that he liked her the better for her religion. Every Christian knows that true religion makes the best husbands and the best wives; and since it is proved that she has behaved as a Christian since she gave evidence of being one, though our Papists could prove that she was not so good a wife before, it would not invalidate her present testimony.

The two last declarations were taken down immediately after the first, because it was found the women could not conveniently return in the evening. When the gentlemen called at the hour appointed, they were informed of this, and another meeting promised, if they wished to cross-examine them. The declarations were exhibited, which they looked at, but they expressed no desire to see or cross-examine the witnesses.

Now, I leave it to every impartial reader to say whether my case is not fully made out; that is, whether I have not proved the truth of my story in every material point. The man used every means in his power to persuade his wife to become Papist. Because she would not comply, he left her, with a view to go to Ireland. He was taken ill, I said immediately, and it turns out to have been within three weeks of his leaving his wife, that he died. I did not say that this took place in Glasgow, but I said nothing contrary to it; and the use of the word "immediately," implied, that he could not be far off. His wife had him removed from the house where he was taken ill, to the house of a cousin of her own, where she could more conveniently attend to him; and in this house he died. I did not mention this circumstance before, but I said nothing inconsistent

with it. I did not say that his wife nursed him in his last hours;—that he confessed and deplored his cruel conduct towards her, especially in leaving her; that almost his last words were to crave pardon of her, and to lay the blame of his cruelty upon his priest, who, he said, had advised it. I did not say this, for which I hope Mr Simeon and his friends will forgive me. The omission was not inconsistent with my other statements, and I am sure it was not injurious to their cause. I said his wife brought his body home and had it decently interred. This also is true, though I did not say she did it with her own hands, or that she had not the assistance which the public provides for persons in her circumstances. The letter, of which I gave an exact copy, is proved to have been found in the coat pocket of the deceased, and in such circumstances as to render improbable, if not impossible, that I had any hand in putting it there. It turns out that this letter was not of his own hand-writing, for he could not write; but happily for me, I did not say that he *wrote* it; though if I had said so, it would not have been an error, according to the common understanding of men on such a subject. A man is said to do that which another does for him at his request. I suppose nobody would think he told an untruth by saying that Paul wrote an epistle to the Romans; and yet we know that the epistle was not written by Paul, but by Tertius in his name; chap. xvi. 22. The original letter was exhibited; it was identified, and proved to have been found in the coat pocket of the deceased, when his wife went to get his clothes in the "Catholic lodging house." I used an expression which, in ordinary conversation, would be considered synonymous,—found on his person. In the present case, there is a considerable circumstantial difference, because the person and the pocket were in different places. This, however, does not in the least affect the truth of the story. Nay, it rather goes to confirm it; for had it been a fabrication, the author of it could easily have managed to have had the person and the clothes in the same place.

In short, the sum and substance of my statement was, that the man left his wife, because she would not renounce her religion, and embrace his; and that in a letter addressed to her, he avowed this to be the cause, and the only cause of his leaving her. This fact is clearly proved by the preceding declarations, which, I think, would be esteemed sufficient to establish a thing of far more importance.

The witnesses are ready to depone to their declarations whenever called upon; but really I do not think the matter is worthy of the solemnity of an oath. It regards neither life, limb, nor property. I have put myself and some friends to the trouble of witnessing, and taking down the preceding evidence, in consequence of the idle and incessant clamour of a poor creature in London, who has undertaken to defend the cause of Popery, and of another creature here, who puts himself forward at his instigation; both of whom seem to be "gnawing their tongues with pain," because they find their system of superstition and idolatry exposed to just abhorrence and contempt; and have not the power of defending, or of withdrawing the public mind from the contemplation of its deformity, but by raising an outcry and endeavouring to fix public attention upon a private anecdote, which is of no importance whatever in relation to the general question at issue between the Church of Rome and the Protestant.

Though I was willing to examine my witnesses upon oath, merely to satisfy those who came to demand the evidence which I had promised to furnish them with, since they would not make themselves parties to such examination, or even submit to hear the whole of it, I think the subsequent interposition of an oath would be *improper*, because *unnecessary*. My Papists may satisfy themselves in any way they please, since they refused the evidence which I offered to give them; and it was not twenty-four hours till I learned that they did attempt to satisfy themselves with the most false and unfounded accounts of the interview which was had with me. They had obtained, they said, a complete triumph. THE PROTESTANT could not maintain his ground. They had frightened him almost out of his wits, &c. I would easily disprove all this, and have disproved it partly already, but it is needless to exhibit truth to persons who are trained to lying, and to the belief of lies. I am ashamed of such language, it is so like their own; but it is sometimes proper to answer a fool according to his folly. My little experience in dealing with Papists has confirmed what a friend, who knows them well, said to me at an early period of this controversy: "You will make nothing of them; for though you should convict them of a hundred lies in a day, they would, with the most hardened effrontery, assert them all over again."

Agreeably to their request, a meeting was held with the same gentlemen in the evening, when they again insisted upon putting questions to me; and their legal adviser presented the following in writing, with a formal demand of an answer, which he was ready to take down. "Mr M'Hardy represented that he and the other gentlemen who accompanied him, waited upon Mr M'Gavin, in terms of an appointment, for *the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to him*, in relation to the letter and statement therewith connected, published in the 25th Number of THE PROTESTANT, and to be furnished with *sufficient* evidence of the truth of the averments therein published. Mr M'Hardy stated his readiness to put the interrogatories which he held in his hand, and now called upon Mr M'Gavin to answer."

This paper, though presented by a Protestant, was evidently the fruit of Popish cunning. I believe no Jesuit; perhaps not even the father of Popery himself could have contrived a more artful snare to entrap the poor PROTESTANT. If they had got me, by surprise, or by any other means, to admit that the meeting was appointed for *the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me,* they would have had good cause of triumph in my refusing to answer their questions. They would then have maintained, and published to all the world, through their organ, Mr Andrews, that I had refused them the evidence which I had promised to give; though it would have rested with them to say what evidence my word could be in my own cause. But it is not true that the meeting was appointed for the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me. No such purpose was ever avowed by me, or avowed to me, till after we had met. The words of Mr Simeon's letter to me are,—"Sir, I take the liberty of informing you, that in pursuance of the requisition contained in the 24th No. of The Catholic Vindicator, a Protestant gentleman, another Catholic, and myself, will wait upon you this day between the hours of 3 and 4, P. M. Should this hour prove inconvenient to you, be pleased give me early information what other would suit you better. I am, Sir, Yours, &c. St. A. Simeon." Having to go out of town that day, I fixed the same hour of the day following. But I quote this letter to show that the proposed meeting was not for the purpose of putting questions to me. If Mr Simeon intended this, he did not avow it; it was, he says, "in pursuance of the requisition contained in the 24th No. of The Catholic Vindicator." Now the words of this requisition are, "I most earnestly request that some of them (my readers) will call upon my adversary, and require to be furnished with that *satisfactory evidence which he has pledged himself to furnish them with.*"—No. 24, col. 375. I do not believe that it ever occurred to Mr Andrews himself, that this satisfactory evidence was to be nothing but my own word, or my answers to certain questions; but this it seems, was all that my Popish gentlemen wanted. For the word *sufficient,* in my offer of evidence, Mr Andrews substitutes *satisfactory,* well knowing that no evidence, however sufficient, will satisfy those who are determined not to be satisfied.

Though they would not allow themselves to be entered upon the sederunt as present at the examination of my witnesses, or as at all parties concerned in it, they did, with singular inconsistency, demand an extract, or copy of the declarations, and were instantly promised it. I had nothing to conceal; I had no trick prepared to ensnare them. I did not require that they should constitute themselves parties concerned in the examination, before they had a right to demand an extract of it; but I believe that, virtually by their demand, and my compliance with it, they have made themselves parties; and their not complying with my request to cross-examine my witnesses, proves that they had no hope of setting aside the force of their evidence.

They waited upon me, they said, in terms of an appointment, for the avowed purpose of putting certain questions to me. Now, they might as well have said that they came to hear me say that a piece of bread is the Saviour of the world. Had they handed me this in writing, and all joined in asserting, that I had professed my belief in transubstantiation, at 4 o'clock that day, it would have been as true as the assertion which they persisted in making with regard to the avowed purpose of our meeting.

Papists deal much in double meanings, and mental reservations. They have a sort of double oath, half of which they express outwardly by the voice; the other half they express inwardly to themselves; and the latter is usually considered the best half, or that which is most binding. Now, I doubt not, my Papists have a private meaning of their own attached to the words, "avowed purpose," which will render the expression literally true; that is, it was avowed to one another, and perhaps also to their lawyer. But when they connect the expression with that of "in terms of an appointment," and give out that this appointment was made by me, or with me, the words express a downright falsehood. I use no ceremony with the agents and correspondents of Mr Andrews, who has many times applied the last word of the last sentence to me. I know it is wrong to render railing for railing; but I know also, it is right to call things by their own names.

I declared that I would have nothing to do with any paper that contained such an assertion; but I dictated the following to Mr M'Hardy, which he took down. "Mr M'Gavin stated, that if any person, Protestant or Popish, doubt the truth of the story, or join with Mr Andrews in calling it a forgery, I shall be ready, whenever required, to furnish them with sufficient evidence of the truth of my statement." (This was all I had promised to do.) "And I have now done so in the declarations of Margaret King, Mary Macmillan, and Elizabeth King, all therein designed, now exhibited, which declarations were begun in presence of Mr Simeon, &c.; but these gentlemen declined cross-questioning them, and left the room before the first was finished; of which declarations a copy will be furnished by my man of business. I do not admit the relevancy of any questions asked of me, and will answer none, but simply that question, "Where is your evidence of the truth of your statement in THE PROTESTANT regarding the story of the

man in the Wynd?" To which the above, with the documents referred to, is my answer, and I do not consider that the present conference was understood to be for the purpose of putting any other question to me; and that it was not the purpose avowed in the requisition, but merely for taking the evidence which I had to produce.—(Signed) W. M'G." In the copy furnished me by Mr M'Hardy, the word *for* is introduced in the last sentence, which makes the sense different from my meaning. I have omitted that word, and said what I did say, that *it* (viz. the putting of questions to me), was *not the purpose* avowed in the requisition. He has it, not *for* the purpose, &c., which does not make sense; but whether the error be in my dictating, his writing, or his clerk copying, I cannot say.

On receiving my answer, as above, Mr M'Hardy read the first of the following memorandums, with a short preamble as follows: "Upon Mr M'Gavin's answer, and his refusal to answer any questions, Mr M'Hardy for himself, and in behalf of those who accompanied him, represented, 1st, That in receiving from Mr M'Gavin any written documents, which he might think proper to furnish, they did so without in any shape admitting the correctness of these proceedings, and particularly of the paper called Declarations: against which they have many good objections in respect of the admissibility and credibility of the persons by whom these declarations are said to have been emitted, as well as the form and shape in which they have been taken. 2d, Mr M'Gavin is now waited upon in consequence of the call he gave to Protestants and Catholics, doubting his statements in the Forty-second Number of THE PROTESTANT. The hour of meeting is his own fixing; and the public will judge of Mr M'Gavin's candour, in refusing to answer any questions, and of the respect and credit due to what he is pleased to call the evidence of the truth of his statement."

Certainly the public will judge of my candour in refusing to put myself forward as a sufficient, and as the only evidence in my own cause. I shall suppose that I had been so simple as to be caught in the snare; that I had dismissed my witnesses, and honestly answered all the questions put to me; and Mr Simeon had sent off my answers to Mr Andrews, as sufficient evidence to rebut his accusation of forgery, and to prove my own innocence, we should have had some whole pages of capital letters, and notes of admiration, exclaiming against the effrontery of the "charlatan," one of the polite names which Mr Andrews gives me, who could suppose that *his* word would be taken in proof of his innocence, after the Vindicator had convicted, and proved him guilty of falsehood, forgery, and I do not know how many crimes.

The paper last quoted seems to be intended for a protest against their being considered parties in the examination of my witnesses; but they would have acted more consistently by not asking, or declining to receive, an extract. They say "they have many good objections against the admissibility and credibility of the persons by whom these declarations are said to have been emitted." So far as appeared, they did not know any of the persons, except the widow of their late *zealous* and *worthy* brother in the faith of Rome; and I learned by some hints, and half sentences, that their objection to her was, that she was not really M'Murray's wife. "What would you think," said Mr Simeon, in the first conversation, "of a woman who should live so many years in adultery with a man who had a wife and a family in Ireland? What credit would you give to her testimony?" "I would," said I, "consider her innocent, if she was ignorant of the fact; but I would regard the husband as a very wicked man indeed, and not worthy to be a member of any church."

I learned by this, that our Papists were going to rest the defence of their church, at least of their late brother, and perhaps of their priest, on the alleged illegality of the marriage of the parties, and of course, in their opinion, its invalidity: but it is by no means the business of THE PROTESTANT to enter into a controversy on this point, though every body knows that, in Scotland, such a marriage is as valid as if Mr Scott had made a sacrament of it. It is enough that I have proved by two witnesses, besides the widow's own declaration, that she and the deceased were known and acknowledged for many years in Glasgow as man and wife; that, during the years of his absence, she lived as his wife, and that when he returned, she received him as her husband. She declares that she never knew of his having another wife. If he had one, which she does not believe, it proves nothing but his own wretched depravity; and my Papists must not only prove that he had a wife living when he married Margaret King, but that she knew the fact, before they can invalidate her testimony on the plea of adultery. And though they could prove this fact, which I am persuaded they cannot, I would as soon receive her testimony as that of a man who came to assert in my face what I knew to be a falsehood,—who could say, and persist in saying, that he came for a certain *avowed purpose*, when I knew that no such purpose had been avowed. If Papists attempt to invalidate the testimony of a witness on the vague suspicion of a crime, they may find the testimony of some others invalidated on the conviction of a crime; for I hold that a violation of the ninth commandment will go at least as far to set aside the credibility of a man's testimony, as a violation of the seventh commandment; nay, without regarding the latter crime as a light matter, I

am persuaded there are many guilty of it, who would scorn to tell a deliberate lie, and whose testimony would go farther than that of another man who had once been convicted of an untruth.

But with regard to the case in hand, I have ample testimony in behalf of my witness, that she is a person of Christian character, whose word may be believed; and if any one attempt to injure her, either in her person or good name, she will receive the protection which the poorest individual enjoys by the laws of this country, which happily are not administered by Papists.

It will be a work truly worthy of Mr Simeon and his friends, to persecute an industrious woman; to exaggerate, and even to invent, stories to her prejudice. I doubt not, while I am writing this, they are engaged in what Papists will consider the honourable work; and Mr Andrews will give the story all the effect which capitals and notes of admiration can give it. There are, however, some stubborn facts proved by my witnesses, which neither our Glasgow Papists, nor their organ, The Vindicator, will be able to set aside by all their quibbling.

It was some days after my conference with Mr Simeon and his friends, before I could imagine what could be their design in coming to pose me with a series of questions; but when I recollected that the Inquisition had lately been revived, it occurred to me that they wished to make an experiment to ascertain whether the establishment of the holy office might not be attempted in Glasgow. In that tribunal, as every one knows, the accused person is usually made the principal witness against himself; and by flattery and cunning, they can bring the most innocent man in the world to say something which they can distort into the confession of a crime. This seemed to be the object of my Inquisitors. They tried flattery first: They had the utmost confidence, they said, in Mr M'Gavin, as a gentleman, and would believe what he would say, though the very point in question was my own veracity. Afterwards, by cunning, they wished me to acknowledge, that I had concurred in the appointment of a meeting for the *avowed purpose* of being put to the inquisition, that is, to answer questions relating to charges against myself. Had I been seduced by their flattery, or ensnared by their cunning, to submit to their interrogatories, from want of experience in dealing with serpents, I might have been bitten; I might have said something which, however honestly meant, would have been turned to my disadvantage.

I never considered the story of the man in the Wynd as worth a farthing in support of my general argument. I gave it merely as a recent anecdote to illustrate the Popish character. I believed it to be true from the credibility of the persons through whom it came to me, for I did not go to seek for it; and it is now proved to be true by credible witnesses. But from the clamour which Mr Andrews and his friends have made about it, they seem to consider it the most important point in the whole controversy; and they have used every species of abuse in order to bring me to a discussion of it, with a view to divert me from exposing the idolatry and wickedness of their religion. They have at last succeeded so far as to get me to devote a number of pages to the subject; but they will find they have gained nothing by it, as I shall return to lay open more and more of Rome's abominations.

I request my readers to remember that the controversy is between Popery and real Christianity; not between the personal characters of Mr Andrews and myself. Mr Andrews has laboured through many a tiresome page to bring it to a mere personal matter; and no doubt those who read only his papers will consider it such, because he has carefully avoided entering upon the more vital parts of the question. Now the personal character of parties is a matter of no consideration in a controversy about historical facts, and publicly avowed principles. If I professed to have come from Spain or Ireland, and to describe what I saw and heard of the wickedness of Popery, then, no doubt, the credibility of my testimony, so far as not corroborated by other evidence, would rest upon my personal character. But this is not the nature of my work. I speak not of what I have seen and heard, but of what I read; and I usually refer to the volume and page of my authorities, that every reader may judge for himself. Supposing I were as bad a man as Mr Andrews represents me to be, it would not be the less true that he teaches his readers to worship the Virgin Mary and St Wenefride; and that he and his correspondents consider his "Catholic School book" as so much better than the Bible, that it will impart more knowledge of religion by one reading, than the Bible will do in the course of a whole life. If I gave this upon my own sole authority, and declared that I heard Mr Andrews say so, perhaps some people would not believe me; but when I give the very words which he has printed, and the pages in which they stand, every man may prove the truth of the matter for himself. When he charges me with falsehood and forgery in numerous instances, he does it for the avowed purpose of telling his readers that what I write is not to be believed. Now though I were guilty of these things, it would not in the least affect the truth of what I have quoted from saints, and fathers, and Dr Milner, and Mr Andrews, and a host of Popish writers equally respectable.

I could easily rebut all his charges of falsehood, as I have done that of forgery; but I

must defer this till I have gone through the remaining parts of the system, which will take a long time. But I give the following, in the meantime, as a specimen, to show how easily his charges are repelled. In his 19th Number, column 300, he says, "I now charge him (THE PROTESTANT) with asserting in his last Number a palpable falsehood, in accusing me of swearing in column 108, 7th Number of the Vindicator. I challenge him to produce *one* word, or all of them together in that column, of my writing, which either he or his admirers, can twist or turn into *an oath*, and I refer my own readers to that Number, to satisfy them of the turpitude of this evangelical writer." In relation to this, the hand-bill on the corners of the streets contained these words, "THE PROTESTANT charged with falsehood in his 38th Number." Now let the reader judge of the truth of this accusation, and of the Vindicator's impudence in making it. I referred to the following sentence, which begins with an oath, and shows that the poor man must have been writing in a passion;—"Faith, I do not wonder this writer looks so far as to perceive something more than human agency on her side;" &c. All that I have to do with this at present is with the first word; and if there be any of my readers who do not think that it stands as an oath, and a great one too, I refer them to the words of Jesus Christ, Mat. v. 33—37. and xxiii. 16—22. "He that sweareth by the temple sweareth by it, and him that dwelleth therein," &c. The meaning of our Lord's words evidently is, that he that swears by any thing, swears by all that is implied in it. Faith, therefore, is the greatest oath by which a man can swear, unless he be an atheist. It is to swear by all that he believes; and it is a greater oath in the mouth of Mr Andrews than in that of a Protestant, for besides believing in one God, which he at least professes, he believes in the Virgin Mary, and St Wenefride.

The reader will see that I attach very little importance to the accusations of this writer, seeing I have delayed for weeks and months the easy task of repelling them. I know his object is merely to divert me, as seamen are said to throw out a tub to the whale. This artifice indicates a conviction in his own mind that his cause cannot be maintained by fair argument. I can repeat with confidence, what I wrote some months ago, that he has not invalidated a single fact in any of my statements; has not pointed out one real contradiction, or detected a single sentence which I would wish to alter if it were to be written again. He vaunts incessantly of the great things which he has done, and of the pain which he supposes he has made me feel. I need not tell him that his boasting is vain; but I can assure my readers that his "lashes," as he calls them, have had no more effect upon me than those of Sancho Panza had upon him, when he applied his whip to the trees instead of his own back. The fact is, Mr Andrews overdoes his part. He throws out his abuse in such quantities, and so thick, that none of it will stick. It is known in a very extensive circle that I am not the monster of wickedness which he represents me to be; and people knowing that his abuse is unmerited, are the less disposed to attend to any thing that he writes.

Before I have done I must have a word or two with Mr Simeon, who is better known to my readers under the name of PAX. It was never my intention to descend to personalities; and those who have forced me to speak of them personally have themselves to blame. Mr Simeon knows what hand he had in originating this controversy; and had he and his brother AMICUS VERITATIS received with becoming humility, a gentle rebuke for representing a Protestant assembly as worshipping their chapel, the world would not have been favoured with such a work as the present; and Papists would have been spared the agony which they have suffered from the lucubrations of THE PROTESTANT. I would not, even now, have mentioned Mr Simeon by name, if he had not thrust himself forward, as if with a view to make himself a conspicuous agent of Rome, and of Mr Andrews. Had he come to me as an honest man, to receive the evidence which I had promised to give, and which he professed to seek; to weigh that evidence, and give a candid opinion upon it, I would have thanked him for his pains. But he came to inveigle me with ensnaring questions, not to ascertain the truth, but to endeavour, by artifice, to convict me of falsehood. I know nothing of that French politeness, which says, "My dear friend," to my known enemy. Mr Simeon must not therefore be surprised by my rudeness, when, at any time, I shall speak of him as I think of him.

No. LI.

SATURDAY, JULY 3RD, 1819.

ON entering upon a second volume,* I may be permitted to take a short retrospect of what is past, and to glance at what may be expected to follow. I find that I am engaged in a greater undertaking than I at first contemplated. Originally, I had no object in view but to expose the misrepresentation contained in a single paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle, supposed to be written by one of our Papists. The defence of that paragraph by two writers of the Romish communion, led me to enter more fully

* The original edition was issued in 4 vols.

into the subject than I at first intended; and the attack made by one of them upon the principles of the Reformation, and the character of the Reformers, determined me to devote a part of my time to the investigation of a subject, which I considered of great importance, and which I knew to have been much neglected by all classes of the community for the last thirty years.

I thought I would be able to accomplish my object in the course of a few months, by a series of weekly Papers; and I touched at first but slightly on certain prominent parts of the Popish system, having, at the time, little more in view than to expose the errors and misrepresentations of my newspaper antagonists. This will account for the very cursory manner in which I passed over some very important matters, such as the doctrine of transubstantiation, the supremacy of Peter, the term Catholic, as claimed by the Church of Rome; and the bloody wars and persecutions which have been excited by that church, within the last fifteen hundred years.

Finding, from the high degree of approbation with which my Papers were received, that the public were willing to receive such information on the subject as I was able to give, I formed the idea of taking a more extensive range; and of writing a treatise on every one of the points by which the Church of Rome is distinguished from the true Church of Christ. I have not yet discussed more than four of these points; namely, church discipline, commencing with my nineteenth Number; the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, commencing with my twenty-fourth; withholding the Scriptures from the people, which is discussed in Numbers thirty to thirty-eight inclusive; and the idolatry of the Romish Church, which I have not yet finished. While discussing the first of these four points, The Catholic Vindicator made his appearance; and, as he seemed to attach to my work the importance of a national concern, I was induced to enter still more fully into the subjects of difference between the Church of Rome and the Reformed.

The subjects slightly touched upon in my earlier Numbers will probably come again under review; and besides these, there are some which I have not yet touched upon at all, which will furnish matter, I hope, for a volume at least as large as the first. These are, the idolatry of the mass, Purgatory, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, clerical celibacy, extreme unction, cruelty of the Inquisition, villany of the Jesuits, &c. &c. together with doctrinal errors, such as justification by works, merits of saints, works of supererogation, &c. &c. When I have gone over these subjects, which I do not promise to do in the order here enumerated, I will, *Deo volente*, take some notice of The Catholic Vindicator; and prove, from his writings, that the very worst features of Popery are exhibited to view in the present day; I shall endeavour to vindicate our Reformers from the aspersions of this writer, and AMICUS VERITATIS; and last of all, as of least importance, I shall vindicate myself and my writings from the numerous misrepresentations of The Catholic Vindicator.

There is one thing which I desire not to lose sight of, and which I wish my readers to keep always in remembrance; it is, that the foundation of the controversy lies deeper than any thing that meets the eye in the external fooleries and superstitions of the Church of Rome. The grand fundamental question at issue is no less than, Who is the Saviour of sinners? I call the Church of Rome the Antichrist, because she is opposed to Christ on this fundamental point. There is no truth more clearly revealed in the word of God, than that Christ alone is the Saviour; that our salvation is entirely of him, without the assistance or co-operation of any creature whatever; that our justification before God proceeds entirely upon the ground of his merit, or, what is a more expressive word, his righteousness, to the absolute exclusion of all merit or righteousness whatever on the part of creatures. This is so distinctly laid down in the holy Scriptures, especially in Paul's epistles to the Romans and Galatians, that I hold it as a first principle of divine revelation, that Christ is to a sinner a whole Saviour, or he is not his Saviour at all; that if we do not trust in him *alone* for salvation, we do not trust in him at all; and that if a sinner puts the smallest degree of trust in any thing else, be it what it may, though he should still profess to put greater trust in Christ, he is in fact completely turned away from Christ, and he is making a saviour of that something else in which he places his little trust.

Now Papists openly and avowedly trust, at least in part, in their own merit, and the merit of saints; and though they profess also to trust in Christ, or perhaps to put greater trust in him, yet they do most effectually renounce him, by dividing their confidence between him, and themselves, and other creatures. What Papists consider their own merit, consists in some fancied conformity to the whole, or to some part of the divine law. Now the apostle tells us plainly, that if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain, Gal. ii. 21.; a most horrible supposition; but it is realized in the mind of every man who expects to contribute in the smallest degree to his own salvation, by his obedience to the law, that is, by his fancied righteousness; and the same apostle tells us, Gal. v. 4, that whosoever is justified by the law, he is fallen from grace. The very attempt to seek justification in this way, is to renounce Jesus Christ as the Saviour, and to make a saviour of their own merit; and hence it is that I maintain that my controversy with the Papists involves no less than this fundamental question,—Who is the Saviour of sinners?

I do not intend to enter at present upon a discussion of this subject, but I allude to it, in order to remind my readers of what I consider the root and origin of all the errors of Popery. It is the self-righteous bias of the human heart, and its deep-rooted hatred of the grace of the gospel. From this proceeds all the idolatry which I have been describing, and intend yet farther to describe; for creature-confidence leads us naturally to creature worship, as confidence in God leads to worship him: and though we could persuade Papists to give up transubstantiation, and all their mummery and nonsense, they would stand upon no better footing with regard to a future life, unless they gave up also their fundamental doctrine of human merit,* and were led to trust in that of Christ alone for the salvation of their souls.

It was the glory of the Reformation and of the Reformers, that notwithstanding their imperfections and mistakes on some points of order and discipline, they clearly apprehended, and publicly taught, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, upon the footing of Christ's perfect righteousness; that is, that men are justified and saved not by what they have done, or can do, but by what Christ has done and suffered in their stead; and that they become interested in this by faith; that is, by believing the testimony of God in the Scriptures concerning his Son. On this point Luther, and Calvin, and other leaders of the Reformation, were entirely of one mind, though they differed on some subordinate articles; and the German Reformer had such a deep conviction of the fundamental importance of this truth, that he called it the article, by holding or rejecting which, a church would stand or fall. It was some time before Luther could reconcile the doctrine so clearly taught by Paul, with that of James in his epistle, which led him to doubt the divine inspiration of the latter; but as his mind opened to the understanding of divine truth, he perceived, what every Christian peasant now perceives, that the doctrine of the one apostle is perfectly consistent with that of the other.

But the Scripture doctrine respecting justification, or, which is the same thing, the way by which alone a sinner can be saved, is absolutely unintelligible to our Papists. They will rather go without salvation than accept of it in the way of divine appointment. Like the Jews, in the days of the apostles, they will not submit to the righteousness of God: that is, they will not receive salvation as a free gift through the righteousness of Christ; and their masses, their pilgrimages, their penances, are nothing else than a going about to establish their own righteousness, as the Jews did by their ceremonial observances.

Now it is a great mistake to speak of this as if it were merely one of the many modifications of the Christian religion; for, besides the error of representing the Christian religion as having many modifications, which it has not, the system of seeking salvation by human merit is not only not of Christianity, but is absolutely inconsistent with it. It has no more to do with the religion of Christ, than darkness has with light; than the service of Baal with that of the true God.

I know it is fashionable in certain Protestant circles to speak of Rome as a true church, nay, as the mother church, from which it was, indeed, lawful to separate, on account of her many corruptions. Nay, if the public journals give a fair report of the speeches of some of our senators on a late discussion of what are called the Catholic claims, it was distinctly maintained, that, unless the religion of Rome were admitted to be a true religion, we could not maintain the truth of our own. It is the design of my present remarks, to show that this is a great and a dangerous error. If our own religion be, that we can contribute to our own salvation by our own merit, then, indeed, it is the same as that of Rome; but if our religion be that which Christ and his apostles taught,—"By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast," Eph. ii. 8, 9; then our religion is not the same, but the very opposite of that of Rome. It is the very opposite, not merely in modes of worship, and subordinate points of doctrine, it is radically and fundamentally another religion; and that of Rome is as much opposed to that of Christ, as any system of heathen idolatry practised in ancient or modern times.

It is time to have done with that spurious liberality that confounds right and wrong, in matters of divine revelation. Let not our Protestant population, especially let not our Protestant senators, halt between two opinions. If Baal be God, serve him. If Popery be Christianity, let them go over to it. If it be not Christianity, let it be regarded as it ought, as a system of delusion, invented by the devil, for the purpose of counteracting and opposing the religion of Christ, which gives the most glorious display of divine mercy for the recovery of a ruined world.

One main argument which Papists use to show that theirs is the true religion, is, that if it were not so, God would not have allowed it to prevail so extensively, and to continue so long;

* The following epitaph is inscribed upon a monument in one of their chapels, in the city of Cork:—"I. H. S. Sacred to the memory of the benevolent Edward Molloy, the friend of humanity, and father of the poor; he employed the wealth of this world only to secure the riches of the next; and leaving a balance of merit on the book of life, he made heaven debtor to mercy. He died 17th Oct., 1818, aged 90. R. I. P." *Philanthropic Gazette, June 16th*, 1819. This is the Popery of the 19th century. The Editor justly condemns the daring impiety of making the Creator debtor to his creature; but this is inseparable from the doctrine of human merit.

and this argument has some weight with our Protestant politicians. They suppose that surely that must be Christianity, which alone appeared in the world as such, for more than a thousand years; and they are seduced by the vague use of the word Christendom, a term which will be found to have no meaning, if we attempt to explain it upon Christian principles.

But there is a fallacy in the argument, which might be detected by any child who reads his Bible. How does it appear that God would not suffer a system of error to prevail extensively, and continue for hundreds of years? Has he ever promised to force the human mind, so that those who love error shall not be allowed to embrace it? Certainly there is no promise to this effect in the word of God; but there is a threatening that the very contrary shall take place. "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world; and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil," John iii. 19. The light of the gospel shone in Rome for a time, as well as in many other places. The first believers there were distinguished for the steadfastness of their faith, which was spoken of throughout the whole world; Rom. i. 8. These were either murdered by their heathen persecutors, or died a natural death. The same happened to their immediate successors; and, after two or three generations, the Christians in Rome, like those in other places, began to depart from the faith and the holy practice of their fathers. This arose from the corrupt bias of their hearts. It was because they loved darkness rather than the light. They made their choice of error, and God left them to the influence of that which they had chosen. Now this is precisely what he said he would do in such a case, and what he would do to the Church of Rome; for it is evident that the passage applies to her almost as clearly as if she had been mentioned by name:—"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day" (the day of Christ's second coming) "shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not that while I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he that now letteth (or preventeth) will prevent, until he be taken out of the way:"—that is, the Pagan imperial power must be removed, ere the papal antichristian power can be established. "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be condemned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness," 2 Thess. ii. 3—12. They were first guilty of the wickedness of not receiving the love of the truth. The expression implies positive hatred of the truth; that is, of the gospel. It was a positive dislike of God's method of salvation by Christ alone, without regard to merit on their part. This is the most heinous wickedness; but having chosen this fatal error and refusing to be reclaimed, God inflicted the righteous punishment of leaving them to the influence of the father of lies, who seduced them to believe one delusion after another, till he brought the Church of Rome to that monstrous height of wickedness which she exhibited to enslaved Europe, at the period of the Reformation; and which she still exhibits in every country in which the spirit of delusion has room to operate at his pleasure.

Thus we see, that instead of promising security against such an apostacy as that which is justly ascribed to the Church of Rome, it was declared by the inspired apostle, that such should be the consequence of certain errors which began to be broached in his own time, but which were more extensively propagated after the death of all the apostles; which soon affected all the churches, and prepared the way for that man of sin, and son of perdition, who established his dominion, not only over the churches, but also over the kings of the earth.

The fallacy of the argument, if argument it may be called, may be shown in another way. It is urged, that if the Romish religion were not the true one, God would not have suffered it to prevail so extensively, and continue so long. But the same argument will apply to the religion of Mahomet, which has existed nearly as long, and been as widely diffused as that of Rome. I believe there are more Mahometans than Papists in the world; and though Popery appeared a little sooner, the two systems were perfected nearly about the same time. A Mussulman, therefore, may argue, that if my religion were not the true one, it would not have been so extensively propagated, or so long maintained in the world.

But both must give way to pure heathenism. She has a better claim to antiquity and universality, than either Mahomet or the Pope. These are mere upstarts in comparison of Fohi and Zoroaster, and the other fathers of Pagan worship; and as for the number of their adherents, I am persuaded Rome cannot muster one to ten of the heathen. Rome boasts of holding the catholic, or universal religion; and she

holds forth this as a proof of her being the true church; but heathenism has ten times a better right to the term catholic; because it was for many ages the religion of the whole world, with the exception of a small country, not so large as Scotland; and because it is at this day the religion of at least three-fourths of the human race. A heathen, therefore, might use the argument which I am combating, with much more force than any one else:—"If my religion were not the true one, God would not have suffered it to prevail over the whole world, and continue for four or five thousand years." Our modern Papists, and their Protestant advocates, will, I hope, answer this heathen argument, before they again attempt to defend Popery on the ground of its antiquity and universality.

I shall ascend a step higher, in order to expose the folly of this Popish argument. It is known that the whole world lieth in wickedness. All flesh hath corrupted its way. Wickedness prevails universally in the earth, and has done so ever since there was a race of men upon it. The sect of sinners, if I may use the expression, is more ancient than even heathenism, and also more extensive, as they are to be found in every other sect, not excepting the Protestant part of the world. If, therefore, antiquity and universality will prove the truth of a system, the wicked of all nations and sects have a better plea than the Church of Rome.

It will be replied, that Christ has promised to preserve his church from fatal error, and final apostacy; that he has given no such promise to Mahometans or heathens; and therefore that his church having this promise, can appeal to it, as well as to the fact of her existence for many ages, in proof of her divine origin. It is true, Christ has promised to preserve *his* church, and to be present with her to the end of the world; but this is not the Church of Rome, nor the church of any other city or nation, nor all the churches in the world put together, unless they hold by Christ as the Head, and do what he has commanded. Any company, however great, or however small, is his church, if they hold fast the confidence, (or faith in him,) and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end, Heb. iii. 6, 14.

There is a promise, that Christ shall have a seed to serve him in all generations. These he will keep by his mighty power, through faith unto salvation. But there is no promise of perpetuity to the Church of Rome, or any other church known by an earthly name. Nay we know in point of fact, that churches which were planted by apostles, and favoured by their personal ministry, have perished from the earth; and we find in the New Testament, that the standing of any church is connected with their holding the faith of the gospel, which, if they let go, Christ will fulfil his word by leaving them to all the consequences of their apostacy. It was to the Church in Rome that the apostle Paul said, "Thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches (the church of the Jews), take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rome did become high-minded, and has been long, not only cut off from the spiritual body of Christ, but has actually become the enemy of Christ, and has a name given her by divine authority, "Mystery, Babylon, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth."

Having occupied this entire Number with introductory matter, I shall proceed, in my next, to that branch of Popish idolatry that consists in worshipping relics.

No. LII.

SATURDAY, JULY 10TH, 1819.

THE PROTESTANT has not the privilege of being, like the man with the short face who wrote the Spectator, entirely unknown by person. He has, however, sometimes been placed in situations in which he could hear what people said of him, without being known to be present. He was much gratified one evening, in the shop of his publishers, by hearing a decent looking man tell the shopman, that he was so much taken with THE PROTESTANT, that he had given up the use of tobacco that he might be able to buy it, for he could not afford to indulge himself with both.

On entering into conversation with this man, I found he was well acquainted both with Popery and Papists; and to use his own expression, he was "unco chief wi' some o' them." He told me that one day he looked into their chapel in a neighbouring town, which had recently been opened; that the beadle very kindly showed him all the excellencies of the *sacred* building; and feeling, no doubt, the importance attached to his own person, while he had the charge of the *holy place*, he said, "We have all things very complete here, except one thing which we want, that is relics, —we have no relics." This officer, no doubt, spoke the mind of his superiors; and from this we learn the important truth, that relics are considered necessary to the completeness, or perfection, of a Popish chapel. How near Mr Scott has brought his to perfection I cannot tell.

By relics we are to understand certain remains of the bodies, or of the dress or furniture of persons who were renowned in their day; and also of some who were renowned only after their death. It is not easy to define the precise degree of worship which devout Papists give to relics. The objects themselves are so multifarious, and the degree of value which is attached to each, depends so much

upon the fancy of the worshipper, that it can scarcely be reduced to a system. As my friend Mr M'Culloch observes, "a great deal must be left to the judgment of the simple faithful. Thus, for example," says he, "there must be some difference in the worship offered to the parings of St Edmund's toes, and that given to the coals which roasted St Laurence, or to the stones preserved among the Glastonbury relics, as the identical stones which the devil tempted Christ to turn into bread. Some we know are to receive divine worship, for, says Aquinas, 'if we speak of the very cross upon which Christ was crucified, it is to be worshipped with divine worship; both as it represents Christ, and touched the members of his body, and was sprinkled with his blood: And for these reasons, we both speak to the cross, and pray to it, as if it were Christ crucified upon it.'—P. 3. Qu. 25. Art. 4. But others, intended merely to terrify the witches, cure the diseases of cattle, kill vermin, and serve other little necessary purposes, must receive a veneration suited to the nature of their uses."—P. 368.

There is no part of Popery that depends so much upon downright lying and imposition, as that upon which I am now entering; and there is no part of the system that gives such an humbling view of the beastly prostration of human intellect. When the prophet Ezekiel saw in vision, (chap. viii.) the idolatrous Jews worshipping "every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel," he saw little more than what is practised every day in Popish countries, where the wretched and deluded people pay their devotions to rotten rags, to the decayed bones of human carcases, and to all manner of nastiness, the very mention of which would fill with loathing the mind of every human being that is not brutified by an abominable superstition.

I have before me a catalogue of some hundreds of relics, which are objects of Popish devotion in several churches, in France, Spain, and Italy. Many of them are too gross to appear in a modern publication, though the Editors of a periodical work (The Philosophical Library), have lately polluted some pages of very fine paper, by inserting several articles, which, for decency's sake, they might have omitted. The least offensive, are the arms, fingers, legs, and toes of certain saints; and some of them must have had as many limbs as a centipede; for in Flanders, Spain, and France, there are no fewer than eight arms of St Matthew, which would of course produce forty fingers, and these would enrich as many churches. The author of one catalogue in my possession, assures his readers, that he himself had seen three arms of St Luke; and he could not tell how many St Thomas à Becket had.

Such relics are considered the treasure of the churches to which they belong; and in fact they bring no small gain to the church, as great sums are received annually from devout pilgrims, who come hundreds of miles to feast their eyes and warm their devotion by looking upon those limbs, which would have been more honoured by being allowed to rest quietly in the earth.

They have, however, many things besides fragments of human bodies: and some articles are of great antiquity, which one would think could not possibly be in existence, or find their way into what is called Christendom; but when the Pope has said that they are what they are called, the simple faithful have nothing to do or say, but to believe what they are told. For instance, they have in the church of Lateran, in Rome, the ark of the Lord which Moses made in the wilderness, together with the rod of Moses; and they profess to show in the same church the identical table on which our Lord ate the last supper with his disciples. Though this table is shown entire in Rome, there are pieces of it in both Spain and Flanders. I suppose no Papist doubts that a thing may be entirely in one place, and partly, or even wholly, in another at the same time. For instance, they believe that the whole body of Christ is in every place where the mass is celebrated, and in every particle of every consecrated wafer, though it were broken into a thousand pieces, and scattered to the winds. There is, therefore, nothing incredible in the story of the miraculous table, which has done many wonderful things, if we may believe the Jesuits.

Upon the high altar in the said Lateran church, there stand the heads of the apostles Peter and Paul; and whenever these are shown to the people, there are so many pardons and indulgences granted. Though the heads be in Rome, there is a great piece of the skull of Peter in the possession of the Augustines in Bilboa, and of that of Paul in the possession of the Franciscans in the same city; and I believe Peter has an entire head somewhere else.

It is by no means my intention to disgust my readers with a complete catalogue of the trumpery in which the wealth of many a church consists. I shall merely mention a few of the most harmless, and then proceed to describe the use which is made of them. The Augustine friars in Burgos are said to have the Virgin Mary's chamber-pot, which they regard as a very precious relic; but whether they honour it with hyperdulia, that is, the same degree of adoration as they give to the Virgin herself, I cannot say. In St Peter's church they have the cross of the good thief, somewhat worm-eaten; Judas's lantern, a little scorched; the dice the soldiers played with, when they cast lots for our Saviour's garment; the tail of Balaam's ass; St Joseph's axe, saw, and hammer, and a few nails he had not driven; St

Anthony's mill-stone, on which he sailed to Muscovy. These are taken from a catalogue dated 1753; and I presume the articles remain there still, though I cannot prove the fact. The same catalogue contains the following, among hundreds more, which enrich different churches; part of the wood of the cross a little decayed; and a nail of the same. There are said to be as many pieces of the timber of the true cross in different parts of Europe, as would supply a town with fuel for a winter. Part of the manna in the wilderness; and some blossoms of Aaron's rod. The arm of St Simeon, ill kept. The image of the blessed Virgin drawn by St Luke, the features all visible; one of her combs; and twelve combs of the twelve apostles all very little used. Some relics of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The arm and some part of the body of Lazarus; ill kept, and smells. A part of the body of St Mark; and a part of his gospel, of his own hand-writing, almost legible. A finger and an arm of St Ann, the blessed Virgin's mother. A piece of the Virgin's veil, as good as new. The staff delivered by our Lord to St Patrick, with which he drove all the venomous creatures out of Ireland. Some of St Joseph's breath, which an angel inclosed in a phial, as he was cleaving wood violently; which was so long adored in France, and since brought to Venice, and from Venice to Rome. The head of St Dennis, which he carried two miles, after it was cut off, under his arm, from Montmartre to St Dennis. A piece of the rope Judas hanged himself with. Large parcels of the blessed Virgin's hair. Great quantities of her milk; some butter, and a small cheese made of it, which never decays, &c. &c.—*Phil. Lib., June,* 1818.

These precious relics are solemnly certified to be what they are said to be; and many of them have proved themselves genuine by most stupendous miracles; all which is piously believed by their devout worshippers. I appeal to every man of common sense, whether he can imagine a system of more palpable and abominable falsehood than that which is here exhibited? It is impossible that any one of the articles which I have enumerated can be verified or proved to be what it is called. There is not one of them entitled even to the credit of probability, few of them to that of possibility; and yet the priests of the churches in which they are deposited, will assert their authenticity with more confidence than they will maintain any article of divine revelation; and the Pope himself is not ashamed to lend the sanction of his pretended divine authority to support and recommend the imposture.

The great matter with the Pope, and his army of priests, is, to get the poor deluded people to believe that some miraculous virtue resides in the relics which, on certain occasions, are exhibited to their view; to get them to come and pay their devotions to these relics, and pay their money for the sight of them: for, as I have often said, and proved, there is no blessing to be had from the Church of Rome without money.

After all, to let my readers into a secret, it is not necessary that the bones which are actually worshipped as the relics of any particular saint, should really have belonged to that saint. It is enough that the worshipper has an intention of honouring the saint whose bones he supposes them to be; and though they should not be really his, yet if they were dug out of the ground in which he was buried, all the merit which his body possessed is communicated to them. I quote the following from a work entitled, "Observations on a Journey to Naples." It is by the author of "The Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests," who was himself, at one time, a good Papist, and who relates what he knew from personal observation.

"To speak the truth, these are the very reasonings which the gentlemen of Rome, I mean the Pope and cardinals, make use of every day, with regard to the holy bodies which they fetch out of the catacombs, and which they send so boldly, and so frequently, to places of their communion to be worshipped there. These catacombs, in the sense they take them in, are subterranean places, where believers assembled themselves in the times of persecution, and where they buried the corpses of their martyrs; but they also indifferently buried there the bodies of all Christians; so that as these places served them for temples, or places to meet in, so they served them also as church-yards to bury their dead. The Popes having, in these last ages, taken into mature consideration, the great gain they reaped from the bones of their saints, had recourse to these places, as to inexhaustible mines, and indifferently seized all the bones they met with there. Yea, their avarice lasht out to that degree, that either not knowing, or not being able to distinguish, the true catacombs, they have gone to search for dead bodies in the common sewers, or subterranean vaults, which were the sinks to carry off the filth of the city, and where, in ancient times, they were used to fling the bodies of malefactors, after their execution. True it is, that amongst them were found the bodies of martyrs, which escaped the knowledge of Christians. The Popes not having the power to distinguish the one from the other, and to spare themselves a trouble, which besides would have been pure labour lost, by the power of God himself, which they professed themselves to have, metamorphosed them all, *dictum factum,* into saints. The heathens had also caves and vaults, where they caused themselves to be interred with their whole families; and the greatest part of all these bones are now upon the altars of the Papists, under the name of saints, taken up out of the catacombs. And forasmuch as

the Popes are ignorant of their names, they baptize them anew, and give them a name as best pleaseth them, which is the cause of so many contests and trials between the priests and the monks, who all pretend, in good time, to be the sole possessors of the primitive saint, of this or the other name. These trials are to be determined at Rome, by means of money, which still inflames the Popes with a greater zeal to send as many as they can of these saints into all parts, which one day or other will not fail to furnish them with matter for trials so gainful to them; yea, we may affirm, that there be almost as many trials at Rome, about relics, as about beneficial matters. Now the doctrine which serves to quiet the consciences of the Romanists, from the checks that might torment them, for having exposed, and still daily exposing, such abominable filthinesses upon their altars, is this, that they believe that what St Paul saith, that the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband, ought also to be understood of their relics, forasmuch as all the bones, which are found in one vault, are sanctified by their neighbourhood with those of one saint. Or at least, if this wont do, they betake themselves to their last shift, which is this, that a good intention is an abundant excuse for all these petty irregularities in those who continue in the bosom of the Church of Rome; so that it is enough, according to them, to have a right intention of honouring such a he saint, or she saint, and to receive with reverence and obedience the instruments proposed to them, for to honour them.

"Now the use that the priests and monks of the Church of Rome do make of these principles, is this, that there are no bones whatsoever, no, not the bones of an ass, or horse, but they may make relics of them; they need only break a piece of them, and tell you that it is a relic of one of the eleven thousand virgins that suffered martyrdom at Collen, or else one of the soldiers of the Theban legion, who were all cut in pieces at the passage of the Alps, for refusing to sacrifice to Mars, the traveller. They may show you the rib of a sucking pig, and tell you it is a relic of one of the little innocents, who were massacred at our Saviour's birth; or, lastly, tell you that it is the bone of a saint taken out of the catacombs.

"I was once in the abbey of the Trinity at Vandome, in France, when they exposed their treasury of relics. They showed us among other things a jaw-bone, which the monks told us was that of St Magdalene; and a very able physician, who was present at the same time, was ready to maintain to their face, and would forfeit his head, if he did not prove to them, by the texture, scaling, and largeness of the bone, that it never belonged to a human body, but it was a piece of the jaw-bone of some beast or other. But the fathers were so far from desiring him to disabuse them in the case, that they presently pop'd up another relic, to put him by his displeasing discourse. This relic was that they call the holy tear, which is so famous in that country. The tradition they pretend to have concerning it runs thus, that when our Saviour wept over Lazarus, an angel gathered up his tears, in a small crystal phial, and that having preserved them a long time, he gave them to St Mary Magdalene, who was then doing penance at a place which is called *La Sainte Baame*, near to Marseilles; that, in process of time, this relic was carried to Constantinople, where it continued during the reign of the Greek emperor; and being afterwards fallen, together with all the riches of that great city, into the hands of the Turks, a Turkish emperor presented it to Godfrey, earl of Vendome, who deposited it in this abbey. It seems by this tradition, that it took many turns before it came thither, and above all, that which I consider is, that it passed through the hands of infidels and enemies to the name of Christ. But for all this the Roman Catholics, and, above all, the monks of that abbey, have not the least doubt or scruple concerning it; but bestow upon it the worship of *latria*, even the same they give to Jesus Christ himself." "We viewed this crystal very attentively, holding it up against the light, and afterwards took a view of it at the light of a wax taper, but we could discover nothing of what they were pleased to tell us. They have recourse to this relic in all maladies of the eyes, and upon this account, it brings a vast income to these fathers.

"If all the false relics, which at present are adored in the Church of Rome, had voices and could speak, what strange stories should we hear! Some would say, we are the bones of heathens, or of malefactors; others of horses, asses, dogs, &c. And yet I question, after all this, if they would quit them. They would say, "It is like that these voices were only the allusions and artifices of the devil, who is envious at the glory that is bestowed on the saints; and that their church being infallible, having proposed these relics to believers to be worshipped, she can neither err in matter of right, or in matter of fact.

"Many English Roman Catholics cannot endure to hear that they bestow adorations upon things that are so very vile, and contemptible; but it is only by reason of their ignorance of what passeth in those countries where Popery is rampant; for there may be seen things yet far more ridiculous, such as the lanthern of Judas; a shoe of St Joseph; hair, parings of nails, and all manner of excrements of their saints and saintesses. The treasures of their churches are top filled with these kinds of precious relics, and Protestant travellers may make themselves very merry in Italy, if they will give themselves the leisure to go and see the treasures which are kept in their churches,

and more especially in the country, where the capuchins, and other mendicants, take care to have great store of them. At least, they may be sure to find there those implements the Papists call *Agnus Deis*, and almost in every parish one of St Margaret's girdles. The *Agnus Deis* are pieces of white wax, upon which is imprinted the figure of a little lamb, carrying a cross upon his shoulder. The Popes bless them in holy week, at Rome, with great ceremony, in memory of the words which St John the Baptist said of our Saviour, 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.' They believe, therefore, conformably to this, that these *Agnus Deis* do forgive sins; at least those that are not very heinous ones indeed; and they almost pay as great respect to them as they do to the host itself. They carry them in procession, they kneel before them, they pray to them. Secular persons may not touch them with their fingers, they must be priests, or monks, or nuns to whom the bishop gives this permission and privilege. The nuns make it a great part of their employment to make inclosures of silk for them, very neatly wrought with a needle into all manner of figures, and then they bestow them upon such seculars as present them highest for the sanctification of their souls. And besides the remission of their sins, they are over and above very good to preserve a Roman Catholic from all the evil and accidents of this life." *Observations on a Journey to Naples; second day's Journey.*

It is an important observation of the above writer, that "many English Roman Catholics cannot endure to hear that they bestow adorations upon things that are so very vile." The fact is, Papists in England owe much to their intercourse with Protestants. They are, in consequence of this, more refined, and in some respects, more enlightened than they are aware of. They would shrink from the idea of falling down and adoring some of the articles enumerated in this sheet: but then, instead of abandoning the church which sanctions such abominations, they impudently deny the fact of their existence. They maintain that the faith and worship of their church is the same all the world over: and yet they would be ashamed to worship what is authorized by their religion where it reigns in all its glory.

No. LIII.

SATURDAY, JULY 17TH, 1819.

THERE are some persons who are surprised by the explicitness with which I charge lying upon Papists as a body; and who think I would do better to abstain from the use of such language. Such persons are not acquainted with the people I have to deal with, or with their writings, else they would be convinced that I could not do them justice without speaking of them as they are, in broad plain English. Papists themselves know that I do them no injustice by accusing them of lying; and they would only laugh at my simplicity if I were to affect to think otherwise of them. I refer not merely to the instances of falsehood which have come under my own observation, and which attach to individuals only, without being justly chargeable upon the general body. I speak of the system of Popery, which is built upon falsehood, is supported by falsehood, and is, in fact, nothing but fraud and falsehood throughout. I do not say that there are not individuals attached to the Church of Rome, who have a regard to truth, who would abide by it in their dealings with their neighbours, and who are therefore better than their religion; but I do not hesitate to affirm that it is impossible for any man to be an active promoter or defender of Popery, without having recourse to lying and imposition.

Their tricks and miracles are lies, every one of them. The virtue ascribed to their relics is founded on sheer lying and imposition; and when his Holiness condescends, or rather presumes, to authenticate a parcel of dry bones, found in the catacombs, or common sewers, to be relics of certain saints, it is nothing less than the head of the Church telling lies; and what must that Church be whose head practises such an abominable vice?

In my last Number, I gave some account of Popish relics, of the honour or worship which is given to them, and of the manner in which some of them were procured. I proceed now to speak of the wonderful things which they are said to have done.

"Prince Christopher, of the family of the Dukes of Radzecil, having gone a pilgrimage to Rome, to kiss his Holiness' toe, received, as a reward of his piety, a box of very precious relics. These, on his return home, became the consolation of the afflicted, and the terror of the devil. Even the most stubborn of those evil spirits, over whom ordinary relics possessed no influence, acknowledged their virtue in bellowings of submission.

"Scarcely had a few months illustrated their power, when some monks, with humble entreaty, requested the use of them for the benefit of a man into whom the devil had entered. As the foul fiend stuck to his new habitation with the utmost stubbornness, and disregarded their most potent conjurations, the prince readily complied; and no sooner were they applied to the body of the demoniac, than the devil was forced to decamp. The spectators exclaimed, A miracle! a miracle! and the prince lifted up his hands and heart in pious

gratitude to God, for bestowing upon him such a holy and powerful treasure.

"Some time after, when the prince was relating to his friends this wonderful deliverance, and extolling the virtues of his relics, one gentleman, who had been in his retinue at Rome, discovered uncommon incredulity. Being posed to account for his rejecting such plain evidence as attended this transaction, he told him, that, in returning from Rome, he had unluckily lost the box of relics, which had been intrusted to his care. To screen himself, therefore, from his resentment, he had provided another exactly similar, and filled it with bones and little trinkets; and this was the identical box which had wrought such wonders.

"Next morning, the prince sent for the monks, and asked, if they knew any other demoniac who needed his relics. A person of this description was easily found; for the devil, in Popish countries, is particularly remarkable for his spirit of opposition, and is generally to be found nestling in the neighbourhood of relics. When the monks produced the demoniac, the prince caused him to be exorcised in his presence, but without effect. The devil kept his birth with all the obstinacy of a mule, and would neither be moved by threats nor coaxing. The prince then ordered the monks to withdraw, and delivered the demoniac to some Tartars, whom he kept about his stable, with orders to give the devil his due. At first the devil thought to terrify them by his horrible gestures and grimaces; but these Tartars used their whips with such faithfulness, as the devil never witnessed before. Having never dreamed of such a mode of exorcising, he found himself taken on the weak side; and, therefore, without the use of either relics, hard words, or holy water, he began to cry for quarter, and confessed that the monks had hired him to personate a character which he was ill qualified to sustain.

"The prince again requested the presence of the monks, and produced to them the man, who threw himself at his feet, and acknowledged the imposture. They at first declared this to be only an artifice of the devil, who employed the organs of this man to propagate such a falsehood, to the discredit of religion. But when the prince told them, how necessary it was to exorcise the father of lies out of them also, they began to repent, and acknowledged that they had been guilty of this imposition, with a view to stop the progress of Lutheranism, and save the souls of all good Papists in that country. He then dismissed them, at the same time telling them, that such pious frauds were mere diabolical inventions, and that he would no longer trust his salvation to men who used such means to support their religion. He accordingly began to turn his attention to the Scriptures; and, notwithstanding their obscurity, he understood as much of their meaning as showed him the absurdity of Popish principles, and induced him to make an open profession of the Reformed religion.

"The reader may perhaps be curious to know what the Pope had put into this wonderful box. But the loss of it has for ever deprived us of this important piece of information. For his satisfaction, however, I can give him an abstract of the catalogue of images and relics which formerly belonged to the cathedral of Glasgow. At the Reformation, there were treasured up there, an image of our Saviour in gold, the twelve apostles in silver, and two silver crosses, enriched with precious stones, and small portions of the wood of the true cross. There were, likewise, five silver caskets, containing the following articles of adoration: 1. Some hair of the blessed Virgin; 2. A piece of the hairy garment worn by St Kentigern, a part of the scourge with which he flogged himself, and a part of the scourge used by St Thomas à Becket; 3. A piece of St Bartholomew's skin; 4. A bone of St Ninian; 5. A piece of the girdle worn by the Virgin Mary. In a crystal case was found a bone of St Magdalene. There were also four crystal phials, containing a part of the Virgin Mary's milk; a piece of the manger in which Christ was laid: a red liquor which formerly flowed from the tomb of St Kentigern; some bones of St Eugene and St Blaise; and a part of the tomb of St Catherine. There were six hides containing very precious relics: such as, a piece of St Martin's cloak, part of the bodies of St Kentigern and St Thomas à Becket, &c. Two linen bags were filled with saints' bones; and a vast assemblage of small relics were lodged in a wooden chest." (*Beauties of Scotland*, vol. 3. p. 217, 218.)

"When the Reformation rendered images and relics useless in Scotland, the Archbishop of Glasgow retired to France, and carried along with him this precious treasure. With such a host of friendly intercessors, he could not fail to enjoy a cordial reception from the church. The most mortified ecclesiastic in France could scarcely behold a golden Saviour, and silver apostles, without welcome greetings, and feeling his demure visage relaxing into smiles of complacency.

"Though I cannot at present give the reader a view of all the uses of relics in religion, there is one, which it would be doing injustice to the subject to omit. Like oral tradition, they have been found of vast use for explaining obscure passages of Scripture. Of this many edifying illustrations might be produced; but one will serve as a specimen of the whole. Five devout Pilgrims, happening to meet on their return from Rome, loaded with these excellent helps to religion, each began to extol his acquisitions. After much conversation, highly characteristic of their faithful simplicity, they produced their riches;

and, lo, to their great amazement, each was honoured with a foot of the very ass upon which Christ rode to Jerusalem. Now, the reader may recollect, that the Scriptures do not even tell us that this ass had a foot, but here is a decisive proof of the existence of five; and if five were collected by five pilgrims only, let him conceive how many must be travelling through other parts of the church, to assist the simple faithful in their exercises of devotion. The Romish church is extremely lucky, in picking up this relic before the existence of the Antiquarian Society. The discovery of an ass with five feet would have rendered them frantic with joy, and completely marred the devotions of the whole congregation of the simple. Rather than see such a precious ass deprived of one hoof, they would permit every member of the church to remain in ignorance for ever.

"Such idle fooleries has the Church of Rome palmed upon the world, under pretence of religion. A view of their influence upon our ancestors is sufficient to show their opposition to the spirit of the gospel. In proportion as our progenitors were actuated by this gloomy superstition, we find them destitute of practical piety and every social virtue. They spent that time and property in idle pilgrimage, in hunting after relics, and other nonsensical acts of devotion, which ought to have been employed for the benefit of mankind; and multitudes at last beggared their families, to perpetuate these delusions. So prevalent was this evil in England that the statute of mortmain was found necessary to prevent the whole landed property of the nation from becoming the plunder of the church.

"When the Church of Rome maintains the usefulness of images and relics as means of devotion, it is merely a cloak to conceal the most selfish views.—Wherever these appendages of superstition have abounded, they have always been connected with swarms of monks, remarkable only for their vices, and for impoverishing the bigotted and the ignorant. Mistaken views of religion introduced them at first into the church; and afterwards they have been used to render mankind subservient to the gratification of the clergy. The advice given to Pope Julius III. by the bishops assembled at Bononia, discovers the light in which the crafty ecclesiastics of the Romish church view the relics of the saints. "When any bishop," said they, "sets himself to officiate in any divine service with pomp and solemnity, he ought to have many ornaments to distinguish him from ordinary priests; such as, the bones and relics of some dead man. Do you command him to hang a whole leg, arm, or head of some saint about his neck, by a good thick cord; for that will contribute very much to increase the religious astonishment of all who behold it. The truth is, these ceremonies were all invented and continued by Popes; you, therefore, who are a Pope, may, if you please, augment them." *M'Culloch, Pop. Cond.* pp. 368, 376.

I make no apology for quoting so largely from so lively a writer as Mr M'Culloch, whose interesting work is not known in this country, except by a few individuals. This gentleman, who is a minister in Nova Scotia, in connection with the Associate Antiburgher Synod, has most ably exposed the errors of Popery, and the quibbling, shuffling practices of its advocates in that part of the world, who are truly worthy of being the brethren, and of the same body, with those in this country.

Relics have commonly been used for the vilest purposes of avarice and imposition. It was not enough to excite the devotion of the people, to have the most splendid and richly adorned buildings for the celebration of their idolatrous rites, unless they had them enriched by the bones of some saint; and these bones themselves could not be expected to excite much reverence, unless some extraordinary virtue were ascribed to them, such as the healing of diseases; that is, unless divine power were supposed to reside in them. It was easy for the priests to say that such power resided in the bones of any deceased man or woman, which they taught the people to worship. It was a lie to be sure; but that was a matter of no consideration, if it brought multitudes of pilgrims to pay their money, and feast their eyes with the sacred relics. In order to maintain the credit of such relics, it was necessary to maintain a succession of miracles. All the art and cunning of a numerous host of monks and priests was called into activity. It became their sole business to tell lies, and to deceive the people, by means of false miracles, which they pretended to perform by the touch of their relics, or by getting the diseased person to pray before the altar on which they were laid. They hired persons for the purpose of counterfeiting blindness, lameness, madness, and in short all the diseases incident to men; and then they pretended to cure them by touching them with some dry bone, or by some old rotten rag. They had such power over the minds of the people, that few doubted the reality of what they told them; and as for those whom they had hired to personate the blind and the lame, they had them bound by a solemn oath not to divulge the truth; they would promise them heaven, if they kept the secret; and threaten them with hell, if they told it; and during a period of general ignorance and superstition, there were few indeed who had the courage to despise such threats and such promises. I could give some curious instances of absurd and false miracles said to have been performed by the relics of St Wenefride, when her rotten carcass was removed to Shrewsbury; but some of my readers were so nauseated by former

extracts from that "*excellent* little volume," as Mr Andrews calls it, that I dare not venture to quote any more from it.

It is well known that the authority of Scripture goes a very little way with Papists, if it be opposed to any of their traditions and superstitions: yet if they can find a passage in which the words, detached from their connection, or taken in a perverted sense, seem to countenance any doctrine or practice of theirs, they gladly avail themselves of it. Thus they do profess to find, in Scripture, a warrant for worshipping dead men's bones, &c. "The pious Josiah," says the American opponent of Mr M'Culloch, "respected the bones of the prophet, who foretold the destruction of Bethel, 4 b. of Kings xxiii. 18. And Moses himself returning from Egypt, took with him the bones of the great patriarch Joseph."

It would be well, if those who make use of these passages to prove the propriety of worshipping dry bones, or any thing besides the one living and true God, would read them in connection with the context, and those parts of the sacred history to which they refer. Let them, for instance, read what is said of Josiah and the bones of the prophet, which in our Bibles is 2 Kings xxiii. 1—20. Let them compare this with what is related in the xiii. chapter of the same book, and they will find that the prophet denounced the destruction of Bethel, because they presumed to give divine honour to a creature, or to worship God by images. It is true, Josiah did respect the bones of the true prophet, and also of the lying prophet, who was buried beside him, so as not to burn them, when he was burning those of the idolatrous priests. Though acting under a divine commission, Josiah did not profess, like the Pope of Rome, to be able to distinguish the bones of the saint from those of the sinner, seeing they were blended together in one grave, and therefore he respected both. But how was this respect shown? Not by giving an arm to one priest, and a leg to another, to hang round their necks, when they performed divine service; not by sending fragments of their ribs and skulls to the temple at Jerusalem, to be adored by the many thousands of Israel, when they came to their great festivals. This is exactly what Papists would have done; but Josiah knew that this would have brought as heavy a punishment on Jerusalem as that which he was the instrument of inflicting upon Bethel. He respected their bones, as those of every saint ought to be respected; that is, he allowed them to rest quietly in their graves. "Let them alone," said Josiah, "let no man move his bones; so they let his bones alone."

When Joseph was a dying, he spoke of the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt, and gave commandment concerning his bones, Heb. xi. 22. This it is said he did by faith. This was a testimony to the children of Israel, that though he had lived almost a century in the court of Egypt, he died in the faith of the promise of the God of Israel. During the dreary period of the bondage of the people, the fact, known by them all, that the body of Joseph was kept in a state capable of being removed, was calculated to confirm the faith of believing Israelites, and to encourage them to hope for deliverance. Moses also testified his faith in the promise of the God of Israel, when he took the body of Joseph out of Egypt, and carried it along with the congregation, during all their wanderings in the wilderness. But let it be remembered, the body was put in a coffin in Egypt; and we have no hint that ever it was seen again by human eyes; and it was carried out of Egypt, through the desert, not that it might be worshipped, but that it might be buried. It was his dying command, that his body should rest with those of his fathers in the land of promise; believing, no doubt, that as he slept with them, so he would be raised up together with them, to the enjoyment of the everlasting inheritance.

The American Papist is not more successful in his appeal to the instance of the brazen serpent, as a scriptural authority for worshipping relics. "We know," says he, "the veneration which was conceived for the brazen serpent, on which whoever looked, when bit by the fiery serpents, were instantly healed." "And we know, likewise," says Mr M'Culloch, "that when Israel treated it with Popish honours, Hezekiah, a pre-eminent Reformer, sprung up in the church, and afforded an example which has been duly imitated by his Protestant successors. 'He removed the high places and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense unto it.'" Papists will no doubt execrate such conduct; —it is so like that of John Knox, who brake down the altars and images in many a church, at least if his enemies say the truth. No matter: we are assured, upon divine authority, that what Hezekiah did was right in the sight of the Lord, 2 Kings xviii. 3, 4.

It is argued farther, that "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs, or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them;" Acts xix. 11, 12. But Paul was alive, and these articles were not his relics; nor is it said that the handkerchiefs and aprons had any hand in working the cures which are mentioned. It was God who wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul; and it is admitted that, for the confirmation of the truth which was preached by his inspired apostles, he wrought many miracles. In this instance, he made the articles of

dress which are mentioned, a sign to connect the miracle, in the minds of the people, with the person of his inspired ambassador; but the articles themselves are thrown aside, and never mentioned again, as being of any use in relation to religious worship, though they would be as good as ever as aprons and handkerchiefs; but none but an idolater would have thought of preserving them as objects of worship.

In the 5th chapter of the Acts, ver. 15, we are told that the people brought out their sick into the streets, that the shadow of Peter might overshadow them, in order to their being healed. Now, it is a fact, that I have not been able to find, in any catalogue of relics, the identical shadow of the apostle, though it might have been catched almost as easily as Joseph's breath, which Papists profess to have preserved in a phial. The fact is, God wrought such miracles as pleased him by the instrumentality of his apostles. These were for the purpose of silencing adversaries, and for the confirmation of the truth; they were open to the inspection of enemies; and they were always well authenticated. But the miracles of Popish relics are all done in the dark, or in the presence of such only as are willing to believe them, and not one of them is supported by credible testimony. To the man who boasted that he had made a leap of ten yards, in Rhodes, it was answered, "Make such a leap here, and we will believe you." So, to our Papists I would say, "Show the power of your relics here, and we will believe you."

No. LIV.

SATURDAY, JULY 24TH, 1819.

IT will be gratifying to my Protestant readers to know that my work is known, and spoken of, in the remote dominions of the King of Spain. I know nothing that can form a better conclusion to my dissertation on the worship of images and relics, than the following letter, from a gentleman in the Havannah, island of Cuba, to his friend in Baltimore, which has kindly been handed to me by a gentleman of this city, who received it from a correspondent in the western world. I did not previously know, or even suspect, that THE PROTESTANT was known in the island of Cuba:—

"*Havannah, 9th April*, 1819.—I address you, my dear B——, from a place where the Church of Rome may be seen in all her glory. On every hand are indications of her supremacy. Altars, shrines, and consecrated relics meet your view in every direction; while the long-robed priest, bearing the insignia of his office, crosses your path at every step. The immense piles of buildings attached to each of the churches, show very distinctly that they who minister therein, know where to lay *their* heads.

"The churches are generally very large, and being built of a grey stone, have a very venerable appearance. The interior is finished in rather a coarse manner; and the style of architecture not very commendable. Between the columns, in the recesses, are placed sundry virgins of wax, and saints of stone; the former usually enclosed in a glass case, and arrayed in the style of dress which prevailed in the time of Queen Elizabeth. Here and there may be seen fonts of holy water, and little figures of Christ upon the cross. The appearance of the whole is very paltry; and naturally brings to mind a child's play house upon a large scale. At all hours of the day, you may observe the miserable dupes of this mummery kneeling, crossing themselves, or muttering their prayers before the image of their favourite patron saint, or confessing in some corner to one of their jugglers.

"Yesterday commenced the ceremonies attending the celebration of the death, burial, and resurrection. In this kind of farce, the machinery and scenery employed are very similar to those we have upon the theatre, except that they are formed upon a cheaper plan, and are far inferior in point of execution. About 3 o'clock, P. M. a figure intended to represent our Saviour, was produced at the cathedral, and nailed to a cross previously erected. After the side had been pierced, &c. it was taken down and carried to a private dwelling; and there laid out as for burial. In the course of my evening ramble with an acquaintance, we came to this house, and went in. Had "THE PROTESTANT" been here, he would certainly have given us a Number upon the scene which presented itself. At one end of a large room was erected a stage, on which was placed this sorry representation of a corpse, arrayed in a great deal of finery. In the rear was a large cross, and on each side a trio of hideous angels, each bearing a candlestick, behind which was placed a candle, so as to appear, from a particular position, to be in it. As this position had reference to but one candle at a time, the arrangement was so clumsy, that it cannot with propriety be called a deception. On the extremes, and facing each other, were figures to represent the Virgin and Joseph. The former was equipt with a richly wrought petticoat, hoop, stays, high-heeled shoes, and lace head dress; and the latter with a purple military coat covered with lace, brown breeches, buckles, silk stockings, ruffles, and a well dressed powdered peruke, surmounted by a cocked hat. Rays of glory, executed in gilt wood, formed a finishing decoration to both figures.

"The room was crowded with persons of all ages, sexes, colours, and conditions. They

kneeled for a few moments, and then made way for others. I took my position on one side of the room, and eyed this scene with emotions which I will not attempt to describe. I could have laughed at the ridiculous display which was before me; but when I reflected to what an event it was referred; when I cast my eyes upon those who kneeled around me, and compared their conduct with that reverence which a rational creature should pay to his God, my heart sickened within me. But I must leave reflection for a more fit occasion, and content myself with description.

"This afternoon, the burial was performed. The aforesaid representation of a corpse was carried from one church, through three or four of the principal streets, to another church, where it is to remain till *that resurrection*, which takes place *to-morrow*. I had a view of the whole from the gallery of a friend's house. A file of soldiers, music, several priests and attendants bearing badges, the standard of the cross, soldiers, priests, the body upon a kind of stage, soldiers, officers civil and military, priests, soldiers, the Virgin and Joseph, priests and soldiers, horse, foot, and artillery, the whole flanked by citizens in single file, each bearing a wax taper of five feet in length, formed the cavalcade. The introduction of artillery has taken place since the present governor came into office. The reason he alleges for this innovation is certainly more rational than the ceremony: 'A Spanish general is entitled to one piece at his funeral, and certainly Jesus Christ should have two.'"

"*Saturday, 10th April*, 1819.—As the ceremonies of this morning took place very early, I did not attend them, but I will give you a brief account of what I was told of it.

"The figure, which had been deposited in a grave yesterday, is brought forth repainted, &c. in order to represent animation; and sallying forth upon the shoulders of several negroes, and accompanied by an immense crowd, meets the Virgin and Joseph, (borne with like ceremony) at the intersection of two streets. The former proceedings you will, no doubt, suppose ridiculous enough. Those which take place here, 'out Herod Herod.' The Virgin, who, by the by is understood to be seeking her dead Son, thus unexpectedly meeting the living one, is, as might be looked for, surprised,—pauses, trembles, partially turns, and finally flies away in terror. These various emotions are performed by mere motions of the wooden stages upon which the characters are borne. The shouts and congratulations of the *pious* crowd now undeceive the Virgin, whose fears being removed, she countermarches. A happy meeting takes place; and the several figures, having thus faithfully performed their allotted duties, are, with all due reverence, carried to their respective quarters, and safely deposited, until their services shall be again required.

"About one-fourth of the people's time is spent in this manner. Scarce a week passes, but some saint or other is borne through the streets. There is yet some hope for this benighted land. I find that among the upper classes of society, these things are not looked upon with much regard, farther than as they are calculated to keep the vulgar in order. The dissolute lives which the priests lead must eventually open the eyes of all classes to the corruptions of the Church of Rome. Oh ye that possess the gospel unadulterated, ye know not the extent of the blessing! When I see the little children crossing themselves before some figure or image, I think of the Sunday schools, and thank God that my country is possessed of them."

What must that religion be which encourages, nay, which, in a great measure, consists in the exhibitions of such disgusting and profane farces, as that above described! My readers, I suppose, would expect to hear of no better in a Spanish island; but what will they think, when I show them that practices equally ridiculous and wicked are exhibited by Papists every year in Ireland, notwithstanding the light of knowledge which shines all around them. With a description of what takes place in that country, I shall occupy the remainder of this sheet.—On the 28th of June, every year, at Waterford, the stone coffin of St Dagland is emptied of such human bones as have been placed in it, (which bones are replenished every year, it is said, by a miracle), and borne away as precious relics, and preservatives against various afflictions.

In the county of Tipperary, the earth which covers the grave of father Sheely, boiled in milk, cures a variety of diseases. In the year 1763, this priest was convicted of treason, on the clearest evidence, and hanged. He is now, it is said, about to be canonized at Rome; and this no doubt will be a stimulus to other priests, to practise his treason, when they shall have an opportunity.—*Phil. Gaz.*, June 30th, 1818.

But there are some practices in Ireland, which not only equal those which I have related as taking place in Cuba, in absurdity and impiety, but which far excel them in wickedness and cruelty; as will appear by the following interesting letter, which I copy from the Hull Rockingham Newspaper, of May 18th, 1816, omitting a few sentences for want of room. It is, indeed, anonymous, but it is not to be supposed the Editor would make himself responsible, without knowing the author, and knowing that he was worthy of credit. I am, indeed, in possession of a written account of similar superstitions, by a minister in this country, who was an eye-witness of them, at a holy well near Sligo, but who does not go so much into detail as the writer of the following. I connect this with the worship of relics because it is the

same principle that leads to venerate holy wells and to adore holy bones:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROCKINGHAM.

SIR,—At a time when the attention of this country is almost entirely devoted to the frivolities, and vices, and imbecilities, and sufferings of the French nation;——it may not be impertinent to remind the people of our own country that there are subjects, yet more nearly connected with us, who are sunk in deeper shades of ignorance and barbarism than the French, the Italians, or even the miserable Spaniards.

I shall, for the present, confine myself to giving you an account of an annual festival, which is held in some particular places in different parts of Ireland, on every midsummer's eve, and the extravagancies which I witnessed, together with a few English friends, at some celebrated wells of St Patrick, in the county of Down, in order that you may judge how far the statement of honourable members of the House of Commons are to be relied on, which would encourage a belief that, as to the *general diffusion of knowledge and education, the lower Irish have greatly the advantage of the same class of people in our favoured island.*

When or how the custom which I shall describe originated, I know not, nor is it necessary to inquire; but, every midsummer's eve, thousands of Roman Catholics, many from distant parts of the country, resort to these celebrated holy wells, to cleanse their souls from sin, and clear their mortal bodies of diseases. The influx of people of different ranks, for some nights before the one in which alone, during the whole year, these wells possess this power, (for on all other days and nights in the year they rank not above common draw-wells,) is prodigious; and their attendants, hordes of beggars, whose ragged garments, if once taken off, could not be put on again by the ingenuity of man, infest the streets and lanes, and choose their lodgings in the highways and hedges. Having been previously informed of the approach of this miraculous night, and having made ourselves acquainted with the locality of the wells, early in the evening we repaired to the spot: we had been told that we should see something quite new to us, and we met with what scarcely was credible on ocular evidence. The spot, on which this scene of superstitious folly was exhibited, was admirably adapted to heighten every attendant circumstance of it; the wonderful wells, of which there are four, being situated in a square or patch of ground, surrounded by steep rocks, which reverberated every sound, and redoubled all the confusion. The *coup d'œil* of the square, on our approach, presented a floating mass of various coloured heads, and our ears were astonished with confused and mingled sounds of mirth and sorrow, of frantic, enthusiastic joy, and deep despondings ravings. On descending into the square, we found ourselves immediately in the midst of innumerable groups of these fanatics, running in all directions, confusedly, in appearance, but methodically, as we afterwards found, in reality —the men and the women were barefooted, and the heads of all were bound round with handkerchiefs. Some were running in circles, some were kneeling in groups, some were singing in wild concert, some were jumping about like maniacs, at the end of an old building, which, we were told, was the ruins of a chapel erected, with several adjacent buildings, in one miraculous midsummer's night, by the tutelar saint of the wells, of whose talent as a mason they give, it must be confessed, no very exalted opinion. When we had somewhat recovered from the first surprise which the (to us) unaccountably fantastic actions of the crowd had given us, we endeavoured to trace the progress of some of these deluded votaries through all the mazes of their mystic penance. The first object of them all appeared to be the ascent of the steepest and most rugged part of the rock, up which both men and women crawled their painful way, on their hands and bare knees. The men's clothes were all made so as to accommodate their knees with all the sharpness of the pointed rock; and the poor women, many of them young and beautiful, took incredible pains to prevent their petticoats from affording any defence against its torturing asperities. Covered with dust and perspiration, and blood, they at last reached the summit of the rock, where, in a rude sort of chair, hewn out of the stone, sat an old man, probably one of their priesthood, who seemed to be the representative of St Patrick, and the high-priest of this religious frenzy. In his hat each of the penitents deposited a halfpenny, after which he turned them round a certain number of times, listened to the long catalogue of their offences, and dictated to them the penance they were to undergo or perform. They then descended the rock by another path, but in the same manner and posture, equally careful to be cut by the flints, and to suffer as much as possible: this was, perhaps, more painful travelling than the ascent had been—the suffering knees were rubbed another way—every step threatened a tumble; and if any thing could have been lively there, the ridiculous attitudes of these descenders would have made us so. When they gained the foot of the hill, they (most of them) bestowed a small donation of charity on some miserable groups of supplicants, who were stationed there. One beggar, a cripple, sat on the ground, at one moment addressing the crowd behind him, and swearing that all the Protestants ought to be burnt out of the country, and, in the same breath, begging the penitents to give him one halfpenny for the love of "*swate blessed Jasus.*" The

penitents now returned to the use of their feet, and commenced a running sort of Irish jiggish walk round several cairns, or heaps of stones, erected at different spaces: this lasted for some time. Suddenly they would prostrate themselves before the cairn, and ejaculate some hasty prayers; as suddenly they would rise, and resume their mill-horse circumrotation. Their eyes were fixed; their looks spoke anxiety, almost despair; and the operations of their faculties seemed totally suspended. They then proceeded to one end of the old chapel, and seemed to believe that there was a virtue, unknown to us heretics, in *one particular stone* of the building, which every one was careful to touch with the right hand; those who were tall did it easily; those who were less left no mode of jumping unpractised to accomplish it. But the most remarkable, and doubtless the most efficient of the ceremonies, was reserved for the last; and surely nothing was ever devised by man, which more forcibly evinced how low our nature can descend. Around the largest of the wells, which was in a building very much, to common eyes, like a stable, all those who had performed their penances were assembled, some dressing, some undressing, many *stark naked*. A certain number of them were admitted at a time into this holy well, and there men and women, of every age, bathed promiscuously, without any covering. They undressed before bathing, and performed the whole business of the toilet afterwards in the open air, in the midst of the crowd, without appearing sensible of the observations of lookers-on, perfectly regardless of decency, perfectly dead to all natural sensations. This was a strange sight, but so nearly resembling the feast of lunatics, that even the voluptuary would have beheld it without any emotions but those of dejection. The penance having terminated in this marvellous ablution, the penitents then adjourned, either to booths and tents to drink, or join their friends. The air then rang with musical monotonous singing, which became louder with every glass of whisky, finishing in frolicsome debauch, and laying, in all probability, the foundation for future penances and more thorough ablutions. No pen can describe all the confusion; no description can give a just idea of the noise and disorder which filled this *hallowed* square, this theatre of fanaticism, this temple of superstition, of which the rites rival all that we are told of in the East. The minor parts of the spectacle were filled up with credulous mothers half drowning their poor children to cure their sore eyes; with cripples, who exhibited every thing that has yet been discovered in deformity, expecting to be washed straight, and to walk away nimble and comely. The experience of years had not shaken their faith; and, though nobody was cured, nobody went away doubting. Shouting and howling, and swearing and carousings, filled up every pause, and 'threw o'er this spot of earth the air of hell.'

"I was never more shocked and struck with horror; and perceiving many of them intoxicated with religious fervour and all-potent whisky, and warming into violence, before midnight, at which time the distraction was at its climax, I left this scene of human degradation, in a state of mind not easily to be described. The whole road from the wells to the neighbouring town was crowded with such supplicants as preferred mortal halfpence to holy penance. The country around was illuminated with watchfires; the demons of discord and fear were abroad in the air; the pursuits of the world, and occupations of the peaceful, appeared put a stop to, by the performance of ceremonies, disgraceful when applied to propitiate an all-compassionate Divinity, whom these religionists were determined, and taught, to consider jealous rather than merciful.

"I wish it were in my power, without insincerity, to pay a compliment to the Irish Catholic clergy, whom Mr Plunkett lately designated, to the astonishment of every body, as "that most respectable fraternity." I wish I could bear witness to their mildness and purity of character; their admonitory attentions to their illiterate flocks; their liberality, and their disposition to conciliate. So greatly the contrary is the truth, that I have only the alternative of passing them over in silence, or of stigmatizing them, with a few exceptions, as a low-lived, intriguing, violent set of men, whose power is almost unlimited; whose unrestrained abuse of that power, and shameless want of dignity in the performance of their functions, do more towards inflaming the minds of the lower orders than any other causes: they are altogether a lower order of beings than the clergymen of the same persuasion in England. On this occasion, they were the mad priests of these Bacchanalian orgies; the fomenters of fury; the setters on to strife; the mischievous ministers of the debasement of their people, lending their aid to plunge their credulous congregations in ceremonious horrors: perhaps the better to secure to themselves the undisputed enjoyment of the exercise of that tyranny, which is so generally practised in other Catholic countries, and which has embryo admiring Inquisitors enough in Ireland to pray for its establishment.

"I have trespassed much longer on your attention than I designed when I began this letter. This is but a single page of a book of enormities; it will, I doubt not, supply you with various reflections and interesting speculations on a people so energetic, yet so lost; so determined, yet so mistaken; so capable of the grandest impressions, such sad victims of the tyranny of superstition. Perhaps, hereafter, if your publication of this may be con-

sidered as an intimation that you think an exposition of such things useful, I may transmit some further particulars concerning that unfortunate country. VOLERO."

No. LV.

SATURDAY, JULY 31ST, 1819.

IT is a common trick of Popish writers to represent the reading of the Bible as the fruitful source of sedition and treason. Yet it so happens, that in Scotland, the most Bible-reading country in the world, there have been only two instances of rebellion since the happy revolution of 1688; and both of these were headed and promoted by Papists, who are hostile to the general reading of the Bible. It is well known that the rising in 1715, and also that in 1745, had nothing less for their object than the restoration of the Popish house of Stuart, and with them the Popish religion itself. One of the great instigators of the former insurrection was the Earl of Derwentwater, who, as a reward of his treason, was beheaded in London, in the year 1716. This nobleman was so zealous a Papist, that when the absurdities of some things which are held sacred by the Church of Rome were mentioned to him, he replied, "That for every tenet of that church, repugnant to reason, in which she requires an implicit belief, he wished their were twenty, that he might thereby have a nobler opportunity of exercising and displaying his faith."

Without stopping to expose the impiety of wishing any thing to be a matter of faith, or more things to be matters of faith, than God has been pleased to reveal, I refer to this anecdote merely to introduce the subject of this Paper, and to show how tenacious Papists are of things repugnant to reason; and how much they even prefer such things before those which are plain and indisputable. It is reasonable to believe what God has said, though we cannot comprehend it, or understand how it should be, but it is certain that he has not called us to believe any thing that is unreasonable or impossible, for no such things are contained in the revelation which he has given us; and yet the very impossibility and unreasonableness of a thing is, with such Papists as the nobleman above mentioned, a reason for his believing it. "Do you believe in transubstantiation?" said a Protestant to a Papist. "Yes, I do," was the reply. "Why," said the other, "the thing is impossible." "And I," said the Papist, "believe it, *because* it is impossible!"

I am now about to enter upon that branch of the idolatry of the Church of Rome, which consists in their sacrifice of the mass, adoration of the host. &c.; but as this is connected with the monstrous absurdity of transubstantiation, I must be allowed to bestow some attention upon this doctrine, which is one of the main pillars of their idolatrous temple. I merely touched upon it in my fourth Number; but I shall now present the subject more fully to the view of the reader.

That very night in which Christ was betrayed, he instituted an ordinance, which he appointed to be observed by his disciples to the end of the world. It is of the nature of a feast; and, from the hour of the day in which it was first observed, it is called "The Lord's Supper." It is called, by some, a sacrament, which signifies an oath, or sacred pledge; by others the eucharist, or thanksgiving. Without entering upon a discussion with regard to the propriety of these terms, I think I shall proceed upon the most sure ground, when I use the language of the apostle Paul, who gave it no other name than the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi. 20. The materials of the feast are simply bread and wine; but these are used to represent spiritual blessings: hence the same apostle says, 1 Cor. x. 16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" From this it is evident, that the symbols which were used by the apostles, in order to represent the spiritual blessings which are derived from the breaking of the body, and the shedding of the blood, of Christ, were plain bread and wine, and nothing else. By eating the bread, and drinking the wine, his people, in their social capacity, according to his appointment, show forth his death; and in the exercise of faith over the symbols of his broken body and shed blood, they really enjoy the benefit of his death, in the assurance of pardon, and the enjoyment of peace of mind and heart, imparted by the Holy Spirit, as the fruit of Christ's atoning sacrifice.

But this doctrine was too simple and too spiritual for the Church of Rome, when she began to give heed to seducing spirits, and when she became herself the great seductress of the world called Christian. Having lost sight of the design of *commemorating* the death of Christ by the elements of bread and wine, nothing less would satisfy her than the turning of the elements into the very body and blood of Christ himself; nor did she stop here: by degrees she rose to the climax of absurdity, and maintained that the whole substance of the bread, after the priest had pronounced the words of consecration, was converted, not only into the body and blood, but also into the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and the same with regard to the wine. This is the doctrine of the council of Trent, of the Douay Catechism, and of all the Popish Catechisms in Latin, French, and English, which have come in

my way; and these are not few. As the authors of these Catechisms rest the doctrine upon the supreme authority of the Council of Trent, I shall state here what the said holy council have authentically decreed upon the subject:—

"Since Christ, our Redeemer, has said that that was truly his own body which he offered under the appearance of bread, it has therefore been always believed in the Church of God, and it is now again declared by this holy council—that, by the consecration of the bread and wine, there is effected a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood: which conversion is fitly and properly termed, by the holy Catholic Church, transubstantiation." *Concil. Trid. Ses.* xiii. cap. iv.

"If any one shall deny that, in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are contained, truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ; or say that he is in it only as a sign, or figure, or by his influence,—he is accursed.

"If any one shall say that, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, (this is the *consubstantiation* of the Lutheran church) and shall deny the wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the appearances only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most properly terms transubstantiation,—he is accursed.

"If any one shall deny that, in the adorable sacrament of the Eucharist, a separation being made, the whole Christ is contained in each element or species, in the separate parts of each element or species,—he is accursed!" Ibid. cap. viii. *Fletcher's Lectures*, pp. 142—144. I think it unnecessary to give the Latin original, which the author gives in a note, and it may easily be seen and consulted by any person who understands the language.

Every genuine Papist firmly believes, at least professes to believe, the doctrine of transubstantiation, as laid down by the Council of Trent; and every Popish priest not only professes, but swears to the belief of it. Yet I believe our Glasgow Papists are heartily ashamed of it, and blush to avow it. In the Glasgow Chronicle, more than a year ago, Mr PAX, *alias* St Ange Simeon, declared as follows:—"Had your correspondent taxed the Catholics with one principle which they profess, I would gladly have acknowledged it." I have taxed them again and again, with professing and maintaining this monstrous absurdity; but there is no acknowledgment forthcoming from Mr PAX. There is no more truth in his promises than in his assertions; and I hope to show, by and by, that it would be absurd to expect to find truth in any man who really believes in transubstantiation.

The doctrine of the holy Council of Trent, which every Popish priest is sworn to believe, and which every man must believe, or be held as *accursed* (anathema), is simply this:—that what are seen to be bread and wine upon the altar, after the priest has pronounced these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, &c. (This is my body, &c.) are no longer bread and wine, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. The priest is understood to possess the miraculous power, by the use of the above words, to convert a piece of bread, in the form of a wafer, into the real body of Jesus Christ, which was born of Mary, which was crucified, was buried, rose again on the third day, and ascended into heaven; and to convert this piece of bread, not only into the body and blood, but also into the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. This wonderful conversion is produced by the use of these words, *Hoc est corpus meum;* and this, as Archbishop Tillotson has shown, led certain jugglers to call their sleight-of-hand tricks *hocus-pocus*, which is nothing but a corruption of the priest's *hoc est corpus*, by means of which he commands the whole substance of bread to be gone, and the real body of Christ to assume its place.

Among Protestants, and I may say among persons of common sense, it is not generally reckoned necessary to oppose the absurdity of transubstantiation by serious argument. The bare statement of it is enough to refute it, to the satisfaction of every person whose senses have any authority with his understanding; but Papists are multiplying among us: they are as tenacious as ever of their favourite dogma, that what they see to be bread is not bread, but the God whom they worship; it therefore becomes necessary to treat the subject with some degree of seriousness, lest they should boast that we have no serious objection to the wheaten idol which they make and adore as the Saviour of the world.

The divines of the holy Council of Trent, who were understood to represent the whole Catholic Church, as the Church of Rome is falsely styled, build their transubstantiation upon these words of Christ, which are literally rendered in English, "This is my body." Every person, acquainted with the style of the inspired penmen, knows that the substantive verb is used in numerous instances, in which it cannot mean the identity of one thing with another, but only resemblance or representation. "Hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say the seven kine *are* (*i. e.* represent) seven years." The attentive reader of the Bible will recollect numerous instances of the same nature, the

meaning of which it is impossible to mistake, without violating every rule of criticism, and giving up all pretensions to common sense.

It is admitted that, in the Greek language, in which the New Testament was written, there are words which express what we mean in English by *signify, denote, represent,* &c. But it is well known to have been a common thing with the apostles to write Greek according to the Hebrew idiom, or the Chaldaic, which was their vernacular, or conversation language. Thus the apostle John, Rev. i. 20, uses the substantive verb as the Hebrews did, —"The seven stars *are* the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks *are* the seven churches." Who would imagine from this that the very substance of seven stars, and seven candlesticks, was converted into the very substance of the seven churches in Asia, and of their seven ministers, as I suppose the word *angel* to mean? Yet it must be so, upon the principle laid down by the Council of Trent, and maintained by all good Papists, upon the perversion of the words, "This *is* my body."

"That our Lord neither spoke in Greek nor Latin, on this occasion, needs no proof. It was, most probably, in what was formerly called the *Chaldaic*, now the *Syriac*, that our Lord conversed with his disciples. Through the providence of God, we have complete versions of the Gospels in this language; and in them, it is likely, we have the precise words spoken by our Lord on this occasion. In Matth. xxvi. 26, 27, the words in the Syriac version are, HONAU PAGREE, *this is my body;* HENAU DEMEE, *this is my blood;* of which forms of speech the Greek is a verbal translation; nor would any man, even in the present day, speaking in the same language, use, among the people to whom it was vernacular, other terms than the above to express, This *represents* my body, and this *represents* my blood,"—*Dr Clarke on the Eucharist,* p. 53.

"But this form of speech is common, even in our own language, though we have terms enow to fill up the ellipsis. Suppose a man entering into a museum, enriched with the remains of ancient Greek sculpture; his eyes are attracted by a number of curious busts; and, on inquiring what they are, he learns, this *is* Socrates, that Plato, &c. Is he deceived by this information? Not at all: he knows well that the busts he sees are not the *identical* persons of these ancient philosophers, poets, orators, historians, and emperors, but only *representations* of their persons in sculpture, between which and the originals there is as essential a difference as between a human body, instinct with all the principles of rational vitality, and a block of marble. When, therefore, Christ took up a piece of bread, brake it, and said, *This is my body,* who but the most stupid of mortals could imagine that he was, at the same time, handling and breaking his own body? Would not any person, of plain common sense, see as great a difference between the *man* Christ Jesus and *a piece of bread,* as between the block of marble and the philosopher it *represented,* in the case referred to above? The truth is, there is scarcely a more common form of speech, in any language, than, this *is,* for, this *represents* or *signifies.* And as our Lord refers, in the whole of this transaction, to the ordinance of the Passover, we may consider him as saying, 'This bread is now my body, in that sense in which the Pascal lamb was my body hitherto; and this cup is my blood of the New Testament, in the same sense as the blood of bulls and goats has been my blood under the Old; Exod. xxiv; Heb. ix. *i. e.* the pascal lamb, and the sprinkling of blood, represented my sacrifice to the present time; this bread and this wine shall represent my body and blood through all future ages: therefore, do this in remembrance of me.'"—Ibid. p. 53, 54.

There are certain persons of extreme liberality, who are disposed to think the best of every system that is opposed to divine revelation, and to stigmatize as narrow-minded persons, those who will concede nothing which they conceive to rest upon divine authority. Such *liberales* will affect to consider transubstantiation as a mere obsolete dogma of the dark ages; very absurd, to be sure, but a thing that no liberal-minded man would lay to the charge of "enlightened Catholics" of the present day. It is, indeed, nearly three hundred years since the Council of Trent ordained the canon which I have given in this Number: I do not know how long it is since the Douay Doctors composed their catechism, of which I give the section on transubstantiation in my fourth Number; and I admit the possibility of persons, in an enlightened age, renouncing, in effect, the nonsense of a dark age, while they swear to the very words by which such nonsense is expressed. But our modern Papists have no right to avail themselves of this admission; for every priest among them not only swears to maintain every doctrine of the Council of Trent, but, in the most recent summaries of religion published by authority in the Church of Rome, the doctrine of transubstantiation is maintained in all the grossness of the darkest ages. To prove this, I shall transcribe the eighth lesson of the "Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French empire," published in 1806, by the authority of Napoleon Buonaparte, with the *bull* of the Pope, and the *mandamus* of the archbishop of Paris.

"Q. What is the sacrament of the Eucharist? A. The Eucharist is a sacrament which contains *really* and *substantially* the body, blood, soul, and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the forms or appearance of bread and wine. Q. What is at first put on the altar,

and in the chalice? Is it not bread and wine? A. Yes: and it continues to be bread and wine *till the priest pronounces the words of consecration.* Q. What influence have these words? A. The bread is changed into the body, and the wine into the blood, of our Lord. Q. Does nothing of the bread and wine remain? A. Nothing of them remains except the forms. Q. What do you call the forms of the bread and wine? A. That which appears to our senses; as, colour, figure, and taste. Q. Is there nothing under the form of bread, except the body of our Lord? A. Besides his body, there is his blood, his soul, and divinity; because all these are inseparable. Q. And under the form of wine? A. Jesus Christ is there as entire as under the form of bread. Q. When the forms of the bread and wine are divided, is Jesus Christ divided? A. No: Jesus Christ remains entire *under each part* of the form divided. Q. Say, in a word, what Jesus Christ gives us under each form? A. All that he is: that is, *perfect God,* and *perfect man.* Q. Does Jesus Christ leave heaven to come into the Eucharist? A. No: he always continues at the right hand of God, his Father, till he shall come at the end of the world, with great glory, to judge the living and the dead. Q. How then can he be present at the altar? A. By the almighty power of God. Q. Then it is not man that works this miracle? A. No: it is Jesus Christ, whose word is employed in the sacrament. Q. Then it is Jesus Christ who consecrates? A. It is Jesus Christ who consecrates; the priest is only his minister. Q. Must we worship the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist? A. Yes, undoubtedly; for this body, and this blood, are inseparably united to his divinity."

Such is the doctrine of the Church of Rome in the nineteenth century, concerning the conversion of the bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper, into the real body, and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and the reader will see that it is not a whit modified, or divested of any of the absurdities which attached to it in the dark ages. To this very day, whenever the "Eucharist" is celebrated in the Church of Rome, the priest having, by the words of consecration, turned the piece of bread into his God, adores it; and holds it up to be adored by the people. He does the same with the cup, which, in the language of the mass book, is called "this excellent chalice;" and, in the said mass book, we have the following "Divine office for the use of the laity:"—"The person who is to communicate, is ordered to go up to the rails, kneel down, and say the confiteor (confession), with true sorrow and compunction for his sins. After the priest has prayed that God may have mercy upon him, and pardon all his sins, he takes the sacred host (*i. e.* the consecrated wafer) into his hand, and again turns about, and says, Behold the Lamb of God! Behold him who taketh away the sin of the world! Then he and the communicant repeat thrice, 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof; speak, therefore, but the word, and my soul shall be healed;' the communicant striking his breast, in token of his unworthiness. Then, says the directory, "having the towel raised above your breast, your eyes modestly closed, your head likewise raised up, and your mouth conveniently opened, receive the holy sacrament on your tongue, resting on your under lip; then close your mouth, and say in your heart, Amen: I believe it to be the body of Christ, and I pray it may preserve my soul to eternal life."—*Ordinary of the Mass,* p. xxxiii. from *Clarke on the Eucharist,* pp. 57, 58.

As there are some things so plain and self-evident, that it is difficult to prove them by argument; so there are some things so extremely absurd and ridiculous that it is difficult to expose them, or make serious argument to bear upon them. Transubstantiation is an absurdity of this sort. It is more absurd than to assert that the full moon is an Ayrshire cheese; and I suppose it would be difficult to undeceive a man who should make this assertion, by means of serious argument. There are some plausible reasons which he could give for his belief; for instance, he might assert, and appeal to the senses of every man for the truth of it, that the full moon is precisely the size, and shape, and colour, of a good rich Ayrshire cheese; and that, when she is in the meridian, she is right in the direction of Ayrshire from Glasgow. Now, I defy all the Papists in the world to give so many good reasons for believing that a piece of bread, in the form of a wafer, or small biscuit, is not bread, but a real human body. I intend, however, to argue the matter, seriously, in my next Number, unless I find it impossible.

No. LVI.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7TH, 1819.

THE doctrine of the Church of Rome, on the subject of the Lord's Supper, is, that after the priest has pronounced the words of consecration, "This is my body," the bread which stood before him upon the altar, or which he held in his hand, is no longer bread, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and that a similar change takes place with regard to the wine in the cup, after the priest has pronounced the words, "This is my blood," &c. This, says the Council of Trent, has always been believed in the Church of God; and "this conversion is fitly and properly termed, by the holy Catholic Church, transubstantiation."

I showed in my last Number, that there is no foundation for this doctrine in the words of Christ; and that the use of the substantive verb in the words, "This *is* my body," according to the idiom of the language in which they were spoken, could express no more than this *signifies*, or *represents* my body; yet it is upon the use of the substantive verb, that the Church of Rome has built the monstrous fabric of transubstantiation, adoration of the host, and the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass.

Let us now attend to the words of Christ, and consider in what sense they were understood by his disciples. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," Mat. xxvi. 26—28. If the reader will take the trouble to compare this extract with the passage as it stands in his Bible, he will find, that I have omitted the pronoun *it*, which is introduced several times by the translators, distinguished, however, as their supplements usually are, by being printed in italics. They no doubt understood that the word blessed referred to the bread which our Lord took in his hand; and if this were the meaning, their supplement would be correct; but I apprehend this is a mistake; and a mistake which has led many Protestants to suppose that some mysterious change takes place; or that some holiness is imparted to the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, which they had not before the blessing was pronounced. The ordinance undoubtedly is holy. Christ sanctifies it by his presence wherever it is observed according to his appointment; and the believing communicant really partakes, in a spiritual manner, of the benefits of his death. But in order to this it is not necessary that the elements of bread and wine should be in any respect different from what they were before.

In the original Greek there is no word corresponding to the pronoun *it*, which our translators have supplied. The original in the 26th verse is ευλογησας, which more properly signifies "blessed God." "He took bread, and blessed God;" that is, he gave thanks, which is the literal meaning of the word ευχαριστησας in the 27th verse which is used in reference to the cup. I think there can be no doubt that the meaning of our Lord in reference to both elements was the same. It was the practice of pious Jews to have a short prayer both before the meat and the drink which they used at their tables, a practice which is observed by religious families where wine is used after dinner, at this day. In conformity with a laudable and religious custom; and also as an example to his people, not only in the observance of this ordinance, but in the use of their ordinary meals, which are to be sanctified by the word of God and prayer, Christ blessed God, or gave thanks to God, on taking the bread, and also on taking the cup.

That Christ blessed God, and not the bread, is farther evident from the word which both Luke and Paul make use of to express what he did on that occasion. It is ευχαριστησας, the very same word which Matthew uses in relation to the cup, and which signifies *gave thanks;* and so our translators have rendered it, Luke xxii. 19, "And he took bread, and *gave thanks;*" and 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, he "took bread, and when he had *given thanks*, he brake *it*, and said," &c. Here the pronoun *it* is properly supplied, because the action of breaking refers to the bread alone. I conclude, therefore, that the words blessing and giving thanks are expressions of precisely the same import, and that God is the object of both.

Christ took bread, into his hands, no doubt, and brake it, and said, This is my body. The disciples were witnesses of the action, and they heard his words. Now let us suppose how we would have understood him, had we been in the place of the disciples. They were men of the same feelings and perceptions with ourselves; and as we would have felt and thought, they must have thought and felt. Unless we admit this, we set aside the credibility of the apostles' testimony altogether. If we say they were men of other feelings and perceptions than we are, then we cannot judge of their testimony according to those rules of evidence which are applied to the "witness of *men*." They saw their Lord reclining at table, and taking bread in his hands; they saw him break the bread, they received the broken pieces into their own hands, and they ate them. They heard him say, This is my body; but they expressed no surprise, which they would have done, had they seen him break his body in pieces, with his own hands, and give the fragments to them to be eaten. We know that such an unexpected operation would overwhelm us with astonishment and dismay; and it would have done the same to the disciples had it actually taken place. They would have been, if possible, still more surprised, if after having eaten his body, they still saw him reclining where he was, taking a cup into his hands, and telling them that this was his blood which they were now to drink. Viewing the matter as it really was, that the bread and the wine represented his body and his blood, which were about to be broken and shed, every thing is plain and intelligible; but viewing it in any other light, the thing is absurd and impossible. Had the disciples ate the body of Christ, that which appeared and spoke to them afterwards, must have been a mere phantom. It must have been a phantom that was crucified, and not a real crucifixion. Then there was no real sacrifice offered to God upon the cross; no real

atonement for sin; then a propitiatory sacrifice is still necessary; and the Church of Rome professes to have one to offer every day, that is the mass, which they call a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Thus we see that transubstantiation is not a mere harmless absurdity to be laughed at. It strikes at the root of the Christian religion. It subverts the doctrine of the cross of Christ; and removes the only foundation on which a sinner can hope for the pardon of his sins, and the salvation of his soul. Some senators are reported lately to have said, that it hurt the feelings of certain Protestants to be obliged, in order to admission into certain offices, to make the declaration which the law requires against transubstantiation. I am persuaded that these tender-hearted Protestants, and the senators who pleaded for them, do not know what transubstantiation is, else they would use much stronger language in condemning it than the law requires; and certainly persons ought to know what it is which they declare against, as well as what they declare for.

If it were true that the elements in the Lord's Supper were changed into something which they were not before, we would expect to find the inspired writers speaking of them after the change by the name of the thing into which they were changed or transubstantiated. For instance, in 1 Cor. xi. 26—28, we should read, "For as often as ye eat this *body*, and drink this *blood*, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this *body*, and drink this *blood*, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *body* and drink of that *blood*." Such would be a true Popish reading; but to show that the apostle had no idea of transubstantiation, he calls the elements plain bread and wine to the end of the sentence.—By a figure of speech, indeed, he uses the word cup for the wine which was in it; but upon the Popish principle of interpretation, there was no wine at all, and no need of any; the cup itself literally must be taken for the blood of Christ.

The bread is understood to have become the real body of Christ before it is broken, else it would not be the breaking of his body. The change takes place on pronouncing the words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, which is done before breaking. But the apostle speaks of it as still bread after the blessing, that is, after what are called the words of consecration; nay, he calls it bread after it has been broken. "The cup of blessing which we bless, (that is, for which we bless God, or give thanks) is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the *bread* (not the *body*) which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one *bread*," 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. The last expression might indeed be rendered one *loaf*, which shows the unity of the church or body of Christ; and upon the Popish mode of interpretation, the many members of the church in Corinth were transubstantiated into one loaf, and at the same time, really and literally, into one human body, or into one individual person, for if it be a living body, we must suppose it to have a soul. And the Church of Rome is not satisfied with representing the bread as changed into the body of Christ, but also into his soul and divinity, for these are inseparable; then, I say, upon this principle, when Paul used these words, "We being many *are* one body," not only the church in Corinth, but he himself, and all the Christians in the world, were instantly converted into a single individual. This is very absurd; but it is not so absurd as the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation. It is easier to suppose a number of creatures converted into one, than to suppose a piece of bread converted into the living God.

The advocates of transubstantiation affect to have scriptural authority for the doctrine in the words of Christ, John vi. 50, 51, "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." To the same purpose, verses 53—55, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." This is very plain and easy to be understood by those whose faith rests upon the word of God. Christ was addressing a crowd of people who were anxious about a meal of meat. They had seen him, in a miraculous manner, feed many thousands by a few loaves and fishes. Some of them had eaten of the food thus provided; and they followed him to the other side of the lake, as appears, with no higher motive than to get another meal, without working or paying for it. Jesus knew, and reproved their sordid and selfish disposition. "Ye seek me," says he, "not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." He tells them that they ought to be more concerned to obtain heavenly blessings, than even their necessary food. "Labour not for the meat which perisheth; but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man will give unto you," verses 26, 27. This heavenly food was the doctrine concerning himself, as devoted, and about to offer himself to God, a sacrifice for the sins of the world; and it was to be enjoyed by believing in him, or coming to him, for these are expressions of precisely the same

import. "Jesus said unto them, (ver. 35.) I am the bread of life: he that cometh unto me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." Here the words coming and believing, are what are called convertible terms; the one may be used for the other, in the two clauses of the sentence, and the meaning will be precisely the same. Now, coming and believing, or, say believing itself, in relation to hunger and thirst, must be something else than literally eating and drinking, especially as it relates to the flesh and blood of a living person. In short, the doctrine of Christ crucified is proposed for the acceptance and belief of sinners of the human race; and he that believes it shall be saved. "This," says Jesus, (ver. 40.) "is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Believing in Christ is as necessary to the life of the soul, as eating and drinking are to that of the body. As the eagerness of the people to obtain food, led him to direct their minds to that which is spiritual and eternal; and as they reminded him of what Moses had done in giving manna to their fathers in the wilderness, he takes occasion to tell them that it was not Moses, but his Father who gave the manna to their fathers; that his Father now gave the *true bread* from heaven, of which the manna was only a type or shadow, and that by believing in him their souls should live, as by eating the manna the people lived in the wilderness.

But the Church of Rome will have it, that Christ here speaks of literally eating his flesh and drinking his blood, which is the very mistake of the carnal Jews. They "strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" This was a very natural question, supposing him to speak of literally eating his body. It was a kind of food to which the Jews had not been accustomed, and for the eating of which there was no warrant in their law. They "said, This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" and from that day many who were called disciples, as having professed to be for a time his followers, went back, and walked no more with him. Now the Church of Rome really holds and teaches at this day, the very doctrine for which the carnal Jews were condemned. Papists maintain that, literally, Christ gives his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk. The Jews, mistaking his meaning, understood him to teach this doctrine, and therefore they rejected both it and him, because the thing was absurd and impious; and the Papists, mistaking his meaning, have adopted the construction of the carnal Jews, and they maintain it most pertinaciously, though it be absurd and impious.

Those who partake of the Lord's Supper unworthily, are said, 1 Cor. xi. 29, to "eat and drink judgment to themselves, not discerning the Lord's body," from which some Popish writers triumphantly exclaim, "How can they discern the Lord's body if it be not there?" To this it may be enough to reply, that it is there under the symbolical representation of the elements of bread and wine, which he appointed to represent his body in that holy ordinance. The believing Israelite discerned the Lord's body in the pascal lamb, which prefigured the sacrifice of Christ; but I suppose no Jew ever imagined that the lamb was the real Messiah; so every one who eats the Lord's Supper in faith, discerns the Lord's body in the symbols which represent and commemorate his death; but it was reserved for the Church of Rome to excel in impiety and absurdity all that had been foolishly maintained by the Jews in times of the greatest apostacy and idolatry, by teaching that the symbols which represent the Saviour are really the Saviour himself.

It is reported of a plain common sense man, that when somebody denied that there was such a thing as motion, he thought it a sufficient reply to rise up and walk: So to any person who maintains that a piece of bread is the real body of Christ, it might be a sufficient answer to hold it up before his eyes. Our sight is the most perfect of all our senses. We cannot properly be said to believe, but rather to know a thing to be what we see it to be. But the thing in question is not subject to the evidence of one sense only. The touch, the taste, and the smell, as well as the sight, unite in bearing testimony to the identity of the thing consecrated with what it was before consecration. What were bread and wine, we see, and feel, and taste, and smell, to be bread and wine still; and though an angel were to come from heaven and tell us that these are not bread and wine, but the real natural body of Jesus Christ which was born of Mary, we would not be bound to believe him. The Almighty deals with us as with rational creatures. He never called us to believe any thing that is unreasonable, or impossible, or contrary to the evidence of our senses; and when he condescended to work a miracle by the instrumentality of any of his servants, the senses of men were appealed to, and were actually the judges of the reality of the miracle. No prophet or apostle ever had the effrontery to tell the people that he had wrought a miracle, when the people saw nothing done; but this downright insulting impudence is practised by Romish priests every day.

If the doctrine of transubstantiation were true, we could not be sure of the truth of any thing else. It is, says Dean Swift, a "doctrine, the belief of which makes every thing else unbelievable." "Supposing," says Archbishop Tillotson, "Supposing this doctrine had been delivered in Scripture, in the very same words that it is decreed in the Council of Trent, by what clearer evidence could any man prove to me that such words were in the Bible, than I

can prove to him that bread and wine after consecration, are bread and wine still? He could but appeal to my eyes to prove such words to be in the Bible; and with the same reason and justice might I appeal to several of his senses, to prove to him that the bread and wine after consecration are bread and wine still." —*Discourse on Transubstantiation, Sermons,* folio, p. 278.

If a man were to tell me that he really believes this doctrine, I should hesitate before I would believe any thing that he should say; in short I would not take the bare word of such a man, or even his oath, in order to verify any fact whatever. His mind must have become familiar with deceit and falsehood. Every time he attends mass, or receives the sacrament, he hears the priest tell a lie, when he declares the bread and wine to be the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, and when as such he holds them up to be adored. Now the communicant either knows this to be a lie, or he discredits the testimony of his own senses. Take it either way, it will make his testimony unworthy of credit, and his word ought not to be believed without some corroborating evidence.

Take it thus:—When the priest has pronounced the words *Hoc est corpus meum,* and when he affirms that what was bread the moment before, is not bread now, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ—the receiver of the sacrament knows it to be a lie. I say, if this be the case, such a person is not worthy to be believed in any matter whatever; because he who gives his countenance to a lie in one case, will do it in another: and by the daily habit of witnessing, and professing his belief in a lie, he becomes callous to all right feeling with regard to truth and falsehood. This I take to be one reason why it is impossible to find Papists adhering to truth when engaged in controversy about their religion.

Or take it thus:—He believes what the priest tells him,—that the bread upon the altar is, on pronouncing the words of consecration, instantly converted into the real natural body of Christ, &c., and of course he disbelieves his own senses. Then I say this man ought not to be believed in any thing else. His eye-sight deceives him in one case, and why not in another? He sees a thing to be plain bread, but he believes it to be the person of the living Saviour. I would not take this man's word for the identity of any person or thing in the world. He himself cannot be sure of any thing. Suppose him brought to give evidence in a court of justice, he can give no credible evidence. Suppose he appears as a witness against, or in favour of a criminal, he cannot be sure that the person at the bar is the same man whom he had seen commit a certain action, or that he is the same man who had lived many years, and behaved well in his neighbourhood. It is much more likely that by a mistake in his vision, he should take one man for another, than that he should take a piece of bread for a man. But he does the latter every day, therefore, he may do the former at any time. If he is so much deceived by all the senses of seeing, feeling, smelling, and tasting, how can he depend upon the single sense of hearing? I would not believe such a man's report of any words which he had heard. Words are mere sounds, which being conveyed by the medium of the air fall upon the ear, and produce the effect which we call hearing. We cannot be so sure of what reaches the mind through this sense, as of that which we see with our eyes. A man, therefore, who is every day deceived in the sense of seeing, is more likely to be deceived in that of hearing; and I would not take that man's word, or even his oath, for any thing that he professed to have heard or seen.

No. LVII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 14TH, 1819.

HOLY Councils can tell lies with as little scruple as any Pope of Rome, or any vender of old clothes in the Saltmarket. The worthy associate of Messrs. Simeon and M'Hardy * will understand the allusion, and he will be pleased to see that I have not overlooked him altogether. But the falsehood to which I at present refer, is a broad and barefaced one asserted by the holy Council of Trent. Speaking of transubstantiation, they say, it has always been believed in the Church of God.

* These gentlemen have, I see, been aiding Mr Andrews again. In the 33d Number of The Catholic Vindicator, they give what they call, "Farther Remarks by the Deputation on the 50th Number of THE PROTESTANT," in which there is so much shuffling and misrepresentation, that I am strongly tempted to address a second Letter to Mr M'Hardy; and indeed I would do so forthwith, were I not afraid it would not be reckoned Christian-like to imitate the heathen king of whom it is sung, that "*thrice* he slew the slain." As for Mr Simeon, he is by his own confession, *hors de combat.* He has done every thing in his power to uphold the credit of his infallible church, and of her spotless children; and seeing *he* can do no more, he tells the world by an advertisement in the Glasgow Chronicle of July 27, that he leaves "all to the retributive dispensations of Providence." While The Vindicator is pleading his cause, he disavows The Vindicator; and speaks of the foul attempts made to injure his character and his interest, which I suppose he means to apply to me; but as if his pen had known better, it has so arranged the words as to speak the truth against his will, and make his accusations apply to The Vindicator alone; for it would not appear from the advertisement that there is such a work as THE PROTESTANT. Aware that his character and interest would be affected by being supposed to have a hand in such a work as The Vindicator, he declares that he is not the author of any thing that ever appeared in its columns, or of any advertisement relating to it. Mr M'Hardy, therefore, must bear the whole burden of the work of "the Deputation;" unless indeed he make it appear that Mr M'Corry can write, and then he may divide the honour with him.

Now the fact is, it was *never* believed in the Church of God; and I shall proceed to prove that it was not *always* believed in the Church of Rome.

The Bible contains the whole belief of the Church of God, and as we find nothing of transubstantiation there, we might satisfy ourselves with giving the assertion of the holy fathers of the Council a broad denial. Some of the greatest writers and divines, even of the Romish church, admit that the doctrine cannot be proved from the Bible. Scotus himself, the great oracle and schoolman, is represented by Bellarmine and others, as having said, that the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot evidently be proved from Scripture; and Bellarmine himself grants that this is not improbable. Suarez and Valasquez acknowledge Durandus to have said as much; and Ocham, another famous schoolman, says expressly, that "the doctrine which holds the substance of the bread and wine to remain after consecration, is neither repugnant to reason nor Scripture." Petrus ab Alliaco, cardinal of Cambray, says plainly, "that the doctrine of the substance of bread and wine remaining after consecration, is more easy and free from absurdity, more rational, and noways repugnant to the authority of Scripture." Nay, he says expressly, that for the other doctrine, that is, transubstantiation, "there is no evidence in Scripture." Gabriel Biel, another great school-man and divine of their church, freely declares, "that as to any thing expressed in the canon of Scripture, a man may believe that the substance of bread and wine doth remain after consecration." And therefore he resolves the belief of transubstantiation into some other revelation, besides Scripture, which he supposes the church had about it. Cardinal Cajetan confesses "that the gospel doth no where express that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; that we have this from the authority of the church:" Nay, he goes farther, "that there is nothing in the gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, 'This is my body,' in a proper and not in a metaphorical sense; but the church having understood them in a proper sense, they are to be so explained." Fisher, bishop of Rochester, who is ranked by the Church of Rome among her martyrs, candidly admits, that there is not one word in Scripture "from whence the true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in our mass can be proved." Most of these divines were firm believers in the doctrine; but they had honesty enough to confess that they did not derive it from the Bible, but only from some other revelation which they supposed the church to have had about it. Some of them, indeed, seem to rest it upon the mere authority of the church; but whether she had it by a revelation in her private ear or invented it, they do not inquire. The above extracts are quoted from a Discourse on Transubstantiation, by Archbishop Tillotson, who refers in the margin to the books and chapters from which they are taken.

Here then we have the admission of many great divines of the Romish church, that transubstantiation is not a doctrine of the Bible. It is not therefore a doctrine believed by the Church of God at any time; and I shall now proceed to prove that it was not always believed even by the Church of Rome. I shall take the same Discourse of Tillotson for my guide. I shall sometimes use his words, and sometimes my own; but to prevent confusion, I shall give only the words which he quotes from ancient writers with marks of quotation. I request the reader to observe, that the present discussion is merely about an historical fact, of which these writers were competent witnesses. I do not appeal to their authority, or to that of Tillotson, in support of any Christian doctrine. I admit no authority in religion but that of the word of God; but I admit the authority of certain ancient writers as to the matter of fact, whether such a doctrine was held by them, or generally believed in their time. The Fathers have a way of speaking about the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, which is far enough from Scripture simplicity, and which of course I cannot approve; but all that I have to do with them at present is, to prove by their own words that they had no idea of the bread and wine being converted into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; or that they were converted into any thing which they were not before, unless it were into the substance of the bodies of the persons who ate and drank them.

I begin with Justin Martyr, who expressly says that "our blood and flesh are nourished by the conversion of that food which we receive in the Eucharist." *Apol.* 2. p. 98. edit. Paris, 1636. I believe it formed no part of our Lord's design, in instituting this ordinance, to make provision for the support of our bodies. The bread and wine were not intended to be used in such quantities as to make a meal; yet so far as they were used, they are represented by the above author as having the same effect as our ordinary food. It was, therefore, far from his thoughts to represent them as the real body and blood of his Saviour; and no man, I suppose, will say that these are converted into the nourishment of our bodies.

The second is Irenæus, who, speaking of this sacrament, says, (*Lib.* 4. *c.* 34.) "The bread which is from the earth, receiving the divine invocation, is now no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly." He says it is no longer *common bread*, be-

cause it is set apart for a heavenly use; but the expression implies that it is still bread, and nothing else. He says farther, (*Lib.* 5. *c.* 21.) "When, therefore, the cup that is mixed, (that is, of wine and water) and the bread that is broken, receives the word of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists." It is therefore plain bread and wine; and so far as it goes, has the same effect upon our bodies as the same substances have when eaten or drank on other occasions.

Tertullian, *Advers. Marchionem*, (*Lib.* 4. p. 571. edit. Paris, 1634.) writes as follows: —"The bread which our Saviour took, and distributed to his disciples, he made his own body, saying, This is my body, that is, *the figure or image of my body*." This is the very thing for which we contend, which clearly proves that the Christian writers of the early ages of the church had no idea of transubstantiation. Arguing against the sceptics, who denied the certainty of sense, he used this argument: That if we question our senses we may doubt whether our blessed Saviour was not deceived in what he heard, and saw, and touched. "He might," says he, "be deceived in the voice from heaven, in the smell of the ointment with which he was anointed against his burial, and in the taste of the wine which he consecrated in remembrance of his blood." Here Tertullian plainly intimates that our senses are to be regarded, even in the matter of a sacrament; and therefore he knew nothing of transubstantiation.

Origen, in his commentary on Matthew xvth, speaking of the sacrament, says :—"That food which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught;" and he adds, by way of explication,—"It is not the matter of the bread, but the words which are spoken over it, which profiteth him that worthily eateth the Lord; and this (he says) he had spoken concerning the typical and symbolical body." I grant that such expressions as *eating the Lord* are fanciful and incorrect. It is evident that Origen meant no more than eating figuratively; but his successors perverted such figurative language, and spake of literally eating the Lord, which prepared the way for transubstantiation. Notwithstanding the figurative language of this Father, his words are so plainly against any thing but a figure of our Lord being in the Eucharist, that Cardinal Perron rejects his testimony, because he was accused of heresy by some of the Fathers, and he says he talks like a heretic in this place.

That the wine in the cup merely represented the blood of Christ, was evidently the doctrine of St Cyprian, and of Christians in his time. He wrote an epistle against those who gave the communion in water only, without wine mingled with it; and his main argument against them is this, that "the blood of Christ with which we are redeemed and quickened, cannot seem to be in the cup when there is no wine in the cup by which the blood of Christ *is represented*." *Epist.* 65.

I suppose there are few of the Fathers in more esteem in the Church of Rome, than St Austin, who lived in the fourth century of the Christian era; and he was undoubtedly a man of singular endowments; but on many important subjects, he spoke more like a Protestant than a Papist. Popery, indeed, scarcely appeared in the world in a visible form till some ages after his time; and though many errors and corruptions had then crept into the churches, it would be easy to show that St Austin's doctrine was more like that of Luther, than like that of the Council of Trent. With regard to the point in hand, his sentiments were evidently those of the Reformation. "Our Lord," says he, "did not doubt to say, This is my body, when he gave *the sign of his body*." *Tom.* 6. p. 187, Edit. Basil, 1596. "He commended and delivered to the disciples the *figure* of his body." *Tom.* 8. p. 16.; language which would now be condemned by the Church of Rome for heresy. Austin was never accused of heresy, as Cardinal Perron says Origen was; but he talks as like one as Origen himself. Speaking of the offence which some disciples took at the saying of our Saviour, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood," &c. he brings in our Saviour (*Tom.* 9. p. 1105.) as speaking thus to them: "Ye must understand spiritually what I have said unto you; ye are not to eat this body which ye see, and to drink that blood which shall be shed by those who shall crucify me. I have commanded a certain sacrament to you, which, being spiritually understood, will give you life." I do not pledge myself for the accuracy of the saint's exposition of our Lord's words as relating to a sacrament; but his language certainly is not that of a man who believed in transubstantiation. Tillotson has a folio page of extracts from the same Father, all to the same purpose; from which it appears that he had more Protestant-like views of the Lord's Supper than even Luther had, and approached nearer to the sentiments afterwards maintained by Calvin and Knox, and which are held by most Protestant churches at this day.

It is true that in the fifth century there were some heretics who taught something like transubstantiation; but then the high authorities of the church, and even the Pope of that day, was against them. Thus Pope Gelasius writes against the Eutychians, (*Biblioth. Pat. Tom.* 4.) "Surely the sacraments which we receive of the body and blood of our Lord are a divine thing, so that by them we are made partakers of a divine nature, and yet it *ceaseth*

not to be the substance or nature of bread and wine; and certainly the image or resemblance of Christ's body and blood are celebrated in the action of the mysteries." Here is the infallible authority of a Pope against transubstantiation.

Facundus, an African bishop of the sixth century writes, (p. 144. edit. Par. 1676.) "And the sacrament of adoption may be called adoption, as the sacrament of his body and blood which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is by us called his body and blood: not that the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain in them the mysteries of his body and blood; hence our Lord himself called the blessed bread and cup which he gave to the disciples his body and blood." Can any man believe after this, that it was then, and had ever been, the universal and received doctrine of the Christian church, that the bread and wine in the sacrament are substantially changed into the proper and natural body and blood of Christ?

These extracts, I hope, will be considered enough to show that transubstantiation was not always the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Scotus himself acknowledges that it was not always thought necessary to be believed; but that the necessity of believing it was consequent to that declaration of the church made in the Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III. (*In sent.* l. 4. *Dist.* 11. Q. 3.) that is, in plain English, the grave divine, Duns Scotus, did not believe the doctrine to rest on any higher authority than that of the said Lateran council, which was held, I believe, in the thirteenth century. And Durandus, another great authority in the Romish church, freely discovers his inclination "to have believed the contrary (of transubstantiation) if the church had not by that determination *obliged men to believe it.*" (*In sent.* l. 4. *Dist.* 11. Q. 1. n. 15.) Tonstal, bishop of Durham, also confesses, that "before the Lateran Council men were at liberty as to the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament." (*De Euchar.* l. 1. p. 146.) Erasmus, who lived and died in the communion of the Church of Rome, than whom no man was better read in the ancient Fathers, confesses that it was "late before the church defined transubstantiation," which was "unknown to the ancients both name and thing." In 1 Cor. c. 7.

Attend now to the particular time and occasion of the coming in of this doctrine; and by what steps and degrees it grew up, and was advanced into an article of faith in the Church of Rome. The doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ was first started upon occasion of the dispute about the worship of images, in opposition to which the Synod of Constantinople about the year 750, argued thus: "That our Lord having left us no other image of himself but the sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord." In answer to this argument, the second council of Nice, in the year 787, did declare, that the sacrament, after consecration, is not the image and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly his body and blood. So that the corporeal presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament, was first brought in to support the stupid worship of images: and indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper occasion, or have been applied to a fitter purpose. *Tillotson,* p. 276.

The above refers to the introduction of the doctrine of the real presence into the Greek church; and in the Latin or Roman church, it was first broached by the monk, Paschasius, afterwards abbot of Corbey, in the year 818. In reference to whom, Bellarmine writes, (*De Scriptor. Eccles.*) "This author was the first who hath seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist." Thus, by the confession of the great and learned Cardinal, it was about 800 years after Christ before any author wrote seriously and copiously about the real presence. This must have been because, before that period, no author seriously believed it, or ever thought of it; for long before that period there were many voluminous authors upon every subject connected with religion.

But the doctrine was not generally received for a long period after it was broached. Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, about the year 847, reciting the very words of Paschasius, wherein he delivered the doctrine of the real presence, says concerning the novelty of it;—"Some, of late, not having a right opinion concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said, that this is the body and blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the cross, and rose from the dead; which error we have opposed with all our might."—(*Epist. ad Heribaldum,* c. 33.)

In the year 1059, great opposition was made to the doctrine in France and Germany, by Berengarius; who was compelled to recant his opposition, and profess his faith, in these words:—"That the bread and wine which are set upon the altar, after the consecration, are not only the sacrament, but the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and are sensibly, not only in the sacrament, but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the priest, and ground or bruised by the teeth of the faithful." But it seems the Pope and his council were not then skilful enough to express themselves rightly in this matter; for the gloss upon the canon law says expressly, "That unless we understand these words of Berengarius, (that is, the words which the Pope and his council compelled him to speak,) in a sound sense, we shall fall into a greater heresy than

that of Berengarius; for we do not make parts of the body of Christ." The meaning of which gloss, says my author, I cannot imagine, unless it be this, that the body of Christ, though it be in truth broken, yet it is not broken into *parts*, but into *wholes*. Now, this new way of breaking a body, not into parts, but into wholes (which in good earnest is the doctrine of the Church of Rome), though to them that are able to believe transubstantiation, it may, for any thing I know, appear to be sound sense, yet to us who cannot believe so, it appears to be solid nonsense.

About twenty years after, in the year 1079, Pope Gregory VII. began to be sensible of this absurdity; and therefore in another council at Rome, made Berengarius to recant in another form, viz., That the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar, are substantially changed into the true, and proper, and quickening, flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, after consecration, are the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and which being offered for the salvation of the world, did hang upon the cross, and sits at the right hand of the Father.

So that, from the first starting of this doctrine in the second council of Nice, in the year 787, till the council under Pope Gregory VII. in 1079, it was almost three hundred years that this doctrine was contested, and before the mis-shapen monster of transubstantiation could be licked into that form in which it is now settled and established in the Church of Rome. Here, then, is a plain account of the first rise of this doctrine, and of the several steps whereby it was advanced by the Church of Rome into an article of faith.

I recommend the whole discourse of the worthy Primate to all who have access to it. It contains the best exposure of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the most condensed history of it, that has come in my way. He and his colleagues, Chillingworth and Stillingfleet, were such great literary and controversial giants, as to make all the mighty men of Rome appear as mere children when they came into contact with them. If the Church of England in the present day, possessed many such worthies, I should have fewer fears of her falling away towards Rome: But where shall we find champions equal to this *first three*?

I hope it will appear from the preceding, that I have proved the point with which I set out in the present Number, that the holy Council of Trent were guilty of a barefaced falsehood, in asserting that transubstantiation was always believed in the church. It is, in fact, a mere mushroom novelty of the dark ages, which would never have taken root, or grown to maturity, but in a rank and filthy soil, on which the light of truth was not permitted to shine.

No. LVIII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 21ST, 1819.

WHEN Christ spoke of his flesh being "meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed," he evidently meant the doctrine concerning his death as an atoning sacrifice for sin. Some of his followers, affecting to understand him to speak of literally eating his flesh, were offended by it; and he, knowing that they had taken offence, and the cause of their doing so, condescended to explain his meaning. "It is the Spirit," said he, "that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," John vi. 63. Thus he told the people plainly, that he was not speaking of his flesh literally; it was not this which they were to eat; it could not profit them as food; but it was his words, that is, his doctrine, which by the divine Spirit was made instrumental in giving life to the soul of every one that believed it. But the Church of Rome will have it, that Christ meant what he declared he did not mean. They deny the spiritual meaning of his words; and they profess really and literally to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, into which, they say, the bread and wine upon the altar are converted, when the priest pronounces the words of consecration.

This conversion, they say, is so entire, that nothing whatever of the substance of bread and wine remains after pronouncing the mysterious words. The form and appearance, they admit, remain as before, but the whole substance is converted into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. Therefore, whatever may have been mixed up with the bread and the wine before consecration, however deleterious in itself, can do no harm to him that receives it. The following anecdote, which many of my readers may have seen in the public journals, will illustrate what I mean.

"A Protestant lady entered the matrimonial state with a Roman Catholic gentleman, on condition he would never use any attempts, in his intercourse with her, to induce her to embrace his religion. Accordingly, after their marriage, he abstained from conversing with her on those religious topics which he knew would be disagreeable to her. He employed the Romish priest, however, who often visited the family, to use his influence to instil his popish notions into her mind. But she remained unmoved, particularly on the doctrine of transubstantiation. At length the husband fell ill, and, during his affliction, was recommended by the priest to receive the holy sacrament. The wife was requested to prepare bread and wine for the solemnity, by the next day. She did so; and on presenting them to the priest, said, 'These, Sir, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the real body and blood of Christ, after you have consecrated them.'

'Most certainly,' he replied. 'Then, Sir,' she rejoined, 'it will not be possible, after the consecration, for them to do any harm to the worthy partakers; for, says our Lord, 'my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;' and 'he that eateth me shall live by me.' 'Assuredly,' answered the priest, 'they cannot do harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate great good.' The ceremony was proceeded in, and the bread and wine were consecrated; the priest was about to take and eat the bread; but the lady begged pardon for interrupting him, adding, 'I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, Sir, but as it is now changed into the real body of Christ, it cannot of course do *you* any harm.' The principles of the priest, however, were not sufficiently firm to enable him to eat it. Confused, ashamed, and irritated, he left the house, and never more ventured to enforce on the lady the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation."

Whether this anecdote be literally true, in all its circumstances, or not, is of little importance to the argument. It may be realized by any person, at any time; and it may be used very fairly to put any Papist to the test as to his belief in transubstantiation. I have no wish to get rid of any of my opponents, else I would advise them to make the experiment. If the priest's words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, should have the power of expelling the arsenic, as well as the flour and water, from the consecrated wafer, I will acknowledge a miracle; and perhaps some worthy Papist may have the courage to run the risk of being poisoned, for the sake of converting such a heretic. But I would not trust a Papist with the making of the wafer; I would have it made by such a Protestant as the lady above mentioned.

The entire substance of the wine being converted into the substance of the blood of Christ, it follows, of course, that nothing of an intoxicating quality remains; but as the priest takes the whole to himself, and drinks it off, every time he gives the sacrament, though it were fifty times in a day, there is some risk of the wine letting out the secret of its own substance, by its effects upon the brain of the priest; and this would no doubt often be the case, were it not well diluted with water.

When the priest, by the mysterious words, has produced what the Council of Trent calls the wonderful conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, the first thing to be done is, to fall down and worship. To worship what? Any man who trusts his senses, I had almost said, any man in his senses, would answer, The wafer, or bit of bread, which the priest holds up for the purpose of being adored; and this leads unavoidably to the conclusion, that such worshippers are guilty of direct and gross idolatry. But Papists consider themselves greatly injured, misrepresented, and insulted, when they are accused of this; and they are incessantly accusing Protestants of bigotry and illiberality, because we will not renounce the evidence of our senses as they do theirs, and because we will not grant them, that what we see to be a wafer is the God that made us.

They maintain that God alone is the object that they worship; but they do not deny that he appears to their eyes in the form of a wafer. This is the image by which they represent their God; but they spurn at the idea of his being what he appears to be. I shall give here, in their own words, the doctrine which they disavow, together with that which they do avow. I quote from the work entitled, "The Papist Misrepresented and Represented," by Gother, which is a work of high authority, and in great esteem among English Papists, having been republished by the late Dr. Challoner, bishop of Debra, and vicar apostolic in the London district.

"*Of the Eucharist.*—The Papist misrepresented, believes it lawful to commit idolatry, and makes it his daily practice to worship and adore a breaden God, giving divine honour to those poor, empty elements of bread and wine. Of these he asks pardon for his sins; of these he desires grace and salvation; these he acknowledges to have been his Redeemer and Saviour, and hopes for no good but what is to come to him by means of these household gods. And then for his apology, he alleges such gross contradictions, so contrary to all sense and reason, that whosoever will be a Papist, must be no man: fondly believing, that what he adores is no bread or wine, but Christ really present under these appearances; and thus makes as many Christs, as many Redeemers, as there are churches, altars, or priests. When, according to God's infallible word, there is but one Christ, and he not on earth, but at the right hand of his Father in heaven.

"The Papist truly represented, believes it abominable to commit any kind of idolatry; and most damnable to worship or adore a breaden god, or to give divine honour to the elements of bread and wine. He worships only one God, who made heaven and earth, and his only Son Jesus Christ our Redeemer; who being in all things equal to his Father in truth and omnipotency, he believes made his words good, pronounced at his last supper; really giving his body and blood to his apostles; the substance of bread and wine being by his powerful words changed into his own body and blood, the species or appearances of bread and wine remaining as before. The same he believes of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, consecrated now by priests; that it really contains the body of Christ, which was delivered for us; and his blood, which was shed for the remission of our sins: which being there united with the divinity, he confesses whole Christ to be pre-

sent. And him he adores and acknowledges his Redeemer, and not any bread and wine. And for the believing of this mystery, he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's words to his own senses or reason, for the examining the truth of what he has said, but rather to submit his senses and reason to Christ's words, in the obsequiousness of faith: and that, being the son of Abraham, it is more becoming him to believe as Abraham did, promptly, with a faith superior to all sense or reason, and whither these could never lead him," &c.—The author then goes on to argue the matter at great length; endeavouring to show that it is with this faith that we believe every mystery of religion, as the Trinity, incarnation, &c.; but the above is the substance of his faith "truly represented" in opposition to "the Papist misrepresented."

Now, let any one carefully examine both the misrepresentation and the representation, and he will find them substantially the same. The misrepresenter gives the truth according to the evidence of his own senses. He sees a Papist paying divine honour to what he sees and knows to be nothing but a piece of bread. He calls this idolatry; and he does so truly, according to the evidence of his own senses, and the authority of the Bible, which declares idolatry to be the giving of divine worship to any thing that is not God. He knows that the bread is a mere creature, the workmanship of human hands; and therefore he does, and cannot but consider the adoration paid to it as the grossest idolatry. The representer, after disclaiming idolatry as abominable and damnable, proceeds to tell us, that Papists do the very thing of which we accuse them; but then it is not idolatry, because the bread and wine are not bread and wine, but the real body and blood of Christ, united to his divinity; and him they worship under the appearances of bread and wine. Now, every one who does not believe that the bread and wine are really converted into the body and blood of Christ, does, and cannot, without renouncing his own senses and reason, do otherwise than consider the Papists as worshipping the "empty elements," as Gother calls them. In short, let them say what they will, we must take them for downright idolaters, unless we make them a surrender of our senses and reason, which I would be loath to do, at least till they have learned to make a better use of their own.

The argument from the faith of Abraham is nothing to the purpose. It is not said that he believed any thing contrary to his reason or his senses. He did indeed believe the word of God in relation to a thing which was out of the ordinary course of nature, as all miracles were. But the effect of divine power was made palpable to his senses at the time it was promised to be; whereas, "the Papist truly represented," believes a thing that never was, and never can be palpable, but is directly contrary to his senses.

Besides, it is not true that transubstantiation rests upon the same evidence as the real mysteries of our religion; such as the doctrine of the Trinity, the incarnation, &c. These are plainly revealed in the word of God, which transubstantiation is not; and there can be nothing more reasonable than to believe what God has said, though we cannot understand how it should be. In point of fact, however, God has said nothing that is contrary to our reason, or to the evidence of our senses. The Bible contains all that he has to say to human creatures till the day of judgment; and I defy the world to prove that it contains any thing contrary to sense and reason. It does, indeed, make known things which human reason cannot reach, and things which cannot be subjected to the scrutiny of human senses: but on this very account it is impossible to show that such things are *contrary* to reason and sense. We must have the perfect understanding of a thing before we can pronounce it contrary to sense and reason; but we have not such understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity; we cannot say it is unreasonable; and we have nothing to do but to believe what God has revealed on the subject. But transubstantiation does come within the sphere of our senses. They are as capable of judging of it as of any thing which we see, or hear, or touch, or taste, or smell; and since by the evidence of four of these five senses, we know bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, it is impossible for us to believe that they are any thing else.

Papists, having made a god of a little flour and water, and having adored the work of their hands, the next step in the process of absurdity and impiety is to eat the idol. This, it must be allowed, has no parallel among the most savage heathen tribes. "How many gods are there?" said a Popish missionary to a young heathen convert. "None," replied the youth. "None! you fool, what do you mean?" "I mean," said the raw Papist, "that there is no God, for you told me that there was only one, and I ate him yesterday." It is painful to be obliged to speak with an air of levity on such a subject: but the believers and advocates of the monstrous absurdity of transubstantiation must answer for it. I believe it is as lawful to ridicule the breaden god of the Papists, as it was for the prophet Elijah to mock the god of Jezebel and the idolatrous Israelites.

Dr. Middleton, who has traced many of the Popish rites up to their heathen original, frankly confesses that he can find nothing in heathenism equal to the Popish adoration of the host and their subsequent eating of it. "As to that celebrated act of Popish idolatry," says he, "the adoration of the host, I must confess that I cannot find the least resemblance of it in any part of the pagan worship: and as oft as I

have been standing at Mass, and seen the whole congregation prostrate on the ground, in the humblest posture of adoring, at the elevation of this consecrated piece of bread; I could not help reflecting on a passage of Tully, where, speaking of the absurdity of the heathens in the choice of their gods, he says "Was any man ever so mad, as to take that which he feeds upon for a god?"—(*Cic. de nat. Deor.* 3. cap. 16.) This was an extravagance left for Popery alone; and what an old Roman could not but think too gross, even for Egyptian idolatry to swallow, is now become the principal part of worship, and the distinguished article of faith, in the creed of modern Rome." —P. 179.

The above sentence from Cicero, (*Ecquem tam amentem esse putas, qui illud, quo vescatur, Deum credat esse?*) is taken as a motto by a spirited writer of some letters in the Morning Post, under the signature of Philopatris. With the following extracts from which I shall conclude the present Number.

"Sir,—The great and enlightened moralist, who made the observation which I have prefixed to this, and two former letters, could never have become a Christian on the terms of Popery. If he had lived in *Papal Rome*, instead of Pagan Rome, he must have suffered at the stake (as Lord Cobham, Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, and other pious and good men did in *Papal Britain*) for denying the doctrine of transubstantiation. What a revolution in the history of human intellect is such a declension from pagan light to Christian darkness *in the same capital!* But indeed I ought not to call it *Christian* darkness; because the doctrine of transubstantiation is no part of Christianity.

"It is, nevertheless, one of the most distinguishing tenets of the Romish church. In Queen Mary's days, it was a test of *heresy*. In a Protestant church, it is a test of *Popery*. It is the spear of Ithuriel that unmasks all disguises. A declaration against the *doctrine* of transubstantiation, is a much surer declaration against Popery, than a simple renunciation of the *term* Papist; or than any verbal acknowledgment of the king's supremacy.

"The declaration against transubstantiation pronounces the doctrine to be idolatrous; and so our statute and ecclesiastical law declare it. It is the language of a Protestant country. But some liberal and charitable minds object to this language, because, they say, it hurts the moral feelings of the Roman Catholics. But must we sacrifice our principles to feeling, our faith to charity, our Protestant character to liberality? Do we find in the writings of Gandolphy, or Dr Milner, or Dr Drumgold, or of the Irish Bishops, or of the present Pope, any such tenderness for Protestants—especially the Protestants of the church of England?"—*Morning Post of June 7th*, 1819.

"Sir, I cannot yet part with my motto, it says so much and so well, in so small a compass. Besides, the judgment of an *ancient Roman* upon the idolatry of *modern Rome*, in taking that for God, which is not God, is such a coincidence—such an instance of almost prophetic anticipation—as may have a providential influence on the minds of Roman Catholics, which are at all open to the dictates of right reason.

"In a political point of view, the most decisive objections to Lord Grey's bill, for the repeal of the declaration against transubstantiation and Popery, appear to be these. In the *first* place, the subject has been, in effect, already decided in both houses of Parliament, in the present session. For, when Parliament decided against the eligibility of Roman Catholics to a seat in the legislature, it, in effect, decided against the repeal of securities which alone keep them out of Parliament.

"In the *next* place, the act of Union with Scotland has guaranteed the perpetuity of the Protestant religion, as by law established, that is, as established by those securities which Lord Grey's bill proposes to abrogate. Those securities cannot, I conceive, be repealed without the consent of the church of Scotland. And the church of Scotland having no representatives in either house of Parliament, and therefore taking no share in the discussion of the subject, is a distinct party, and deeply interested, whose consent ought to be obtained, before the securities for the maintenance of the Protestant religion ought to be abrogated. The church of Scotland has already petitioned (in 1813) against innovating upon the laws which uphold our Protestant constitution."

The reader will see that Philopatris is going more into the political question of "Catholic emancipation" than I choose to go; but these extracts contain some information on the subject which may be useful. "As to the religious view of the subject," says this writer, "it is alleged that the oaths and declaration related to mere speculative doctrines, and dogmatical opinions. The merely speculative character of the doctrines protested against in the declaration, does not lessen their importance, as a test of Popery. They are essential articles of the Papal creed, and are its most distinguishing tenets; and, as such, the fittest that could have been chosen to distinguish Papists from Protestants.

"But it is objected, that some Protestants do not believe the doctrines to be idolatrous, which are the subject of the declaration (*i. e.* transubstantiation and the invocation of saints.) To this it may be answered, that, so far as they do not consider the said doctrines to be idolatrous, they dissent from the principles of the Reformation, and are, so far, not Protestants. If they do not see the idolatry of the doctrines, it must be for want of inquiry. What says the light of nature? *Do you think that any one is so insane as to believe that which he eats is*

a God? What says the honest conviction of our own reason? That an Infinite Being cannot be circumscribed, whole and entire, within the compass of a wafer. What says the word of God? It says nothing that, in the smallest degree, warrants the doctrine, that a priest has the miraculous power of converting bread into an immaterial being; or that any thing which he can make with the breath of his mouth, can be a proper object of divine worship. Transubstantiation, therefore, is, as the declaration pronounces it to be, an idolatrous doctrine. And so it is declared to be by all the great lights of the Reformation, from Wickliffe to Jewell, especially by those holy men who died for their protest against it."—*Morning Post*, June 9th, 1819.

The same writer gives, in the Morning Post of June 10th, the following curious document: it is part of an address by the parliament to king James I. "From these causes, as bitter roots, we humbly offer to your Majesty, that we foresee and fear there will necessarily follow very dangerous effects both to church and state. For (1) The Popish religion is incompatible with ours in respect to their positions. (2) It draweth with it an unavoidable dependency on foreign princes. (3) It openeth too wide a gap for popularity to any who shall draw too great a party. (4) It has *a restless spirit*, and will strive by these gradations; if it once get but a *connivance*, it will press for a *toleration*; if that should be obtained, they must have an *equality*; from thence they will aspire to *superiority*; and will never rest till they get a subversion of true religion.'

From the above, the reader will perceive, that the parliament of king James knew the true character of Popery much better than some of our present senators do; and it is pretty evident, that Papists, having now for a long time enjoyed the most liberal toleration, are aiming at an equality, and a place in the legislature, only as a stepping-stone to that superiority which they all have in their eye, and which, when they have obtained, they will employ for the extirpation of all heretics.

No. LIX.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 28TH, 1819.

IT often happens that I receive interesting letters from correspondents, on subjects which I have just handled, and which would have furnished useful hints, had I received them before entering upon the discussion, or even in the course of it; but when I have finished what I intended to write on a particular topic, it is not always convenient to return to it, even when new and useful matter has been suggested.

The concluding paragraph of my 56th Number, in which I observed that I would not take the word of a believer in transubstantiation for the identity of any person or thing in the world, has led a gentleman, who subscribes himself "Armiger Olim," but who has also given me his real name, to address me a letter, of which I shall extract only that part which relates to transubstantiation, as I have not yet done with that subject. "Before I finish this short note," says he, "I shall detail the preached sentiments of a very respectable dignitary of the Romish church in this kingdom, whom I heard preach upon the subject, within these six months. From the service of the day read at the altar, he was led to address the congregation on the subject of transubstantiation. After treating the immortal Luther, at least, with no great respect, he strongly put the question to the separatists as to the blessing of the priest not turning the bread and wine into the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thus:—'Are they sure their senses do not deceive them in this respect?'" meaning, I suppose, that it may be a defect in the senses of Protestants, which disables them from seeing the real body, &c. in the elements; at least the question is put as if it were possible that our senses may be so deceived. "Upon stating this to a friend," says my correspondent, "he observed, 'Then I may shoot a man, and maintain that my senses impressed me with an idea that a grouse was before me. It would be a curious circumstance, if such a case were to come before the Lord Justice-Clerk of Scotland, or any other judge; and if the panel were to plead such an excuse for his conduct. We may easily imagine how any virtuous and upright judge would be affected by such a plea: what abhorrence it would excite in the whole court; and in what a light transubstantiation would appear, when it was found to open a door for the commission of the greatest crimes. If men suffer their senses so to deceive them, what confidence could they have in a signature to a bill, the deposition of a witness in any case, civil or criminal, the purchase of an estate, or the solemn act of infeftment, or its record, well known in the Scotch law, as matters of the highest importance to the security of our lives and property?'"

A writer, whom I quoted in my last Number, has justly remarked, that transubstantiation is one of the most distinguishing tenets of the Church of Rome. Among Papists, it is a test of heresy, for none but a heretic would refuse to swallow it; and among Protestants, it is a test of Popery, for no true Papist will renounce or disavow it. They will quibble about many other points, and even deny some things that really belong to their church; but they hold most tenaciously the most absurd and wicked of them all; for I can imagine nothing more absurd and wicked than the doctrine in question, and its necessary consequences. If, there-

fore, it be necessary to have a test, in order to know who are Papists and who are not, there seems to be nothing so fit for the purpose as transubstantiation. To try them on this point is to bring them to *the test.*

Absurd and wicked as the doctrine is, there is nobody in this country allowed to molest them on account of it. They are allowed to hold and teach it as freely as any man is allowed to hold and teach the plainest truths of the gospel. But how stands the matter in Popish countries, with regard to those who do not believe in transubstantiation? This is a proof of heresy, and nothing more is necessary to send a man to the flames. It was so in England in queen Mary's time, and there can be no doubt it will be so again, if ever Papists shall obtain the power and ascendancy which they are aiming at.

Speaking of transubstantiation, Dr Tillotson remarks:—"It is scandalous also, on account of the cruel and bloody consequences of this doctrine; so contrary to the plain laws of Christianity, and to one great end and design of this sacrament, which is to unite Christians in the most perfect love and charity towards one another: Whereas this doctrine has been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody tragedies that ever were acted in the world. For this has been, in the Church of Rome, the great *burning article;* and as absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murdered for the denial of it, than perhaps for all the other articles of their religion. And I think it may generally pass for a true observation, that all sects are commonly most hot and furious for those things for which there is least reason; for what men want of reason for their opinions, they usually supply and make up with rage."—"O blessed Saviour! thou best friend and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagine that thou didst ever intend that men should kill one another for not being able to believe contrary to their senses, for being unwilling to think that thou shouldst make one of the most horrid and barbarous things that can be imagined, a main duty and principal mystery of thy religion; for not flattering the pride and presumption of the priest who says he can make God, and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the people who are made to believe that they can eat him?"—*Sermons, folio,* p. 277.

It is true, we do not hear of any persons having been put to death of late, under form of law, in Popish countries, for denying transubstantiation: but the reason is, that in countries thoroughly Popish, there are no persons to be found so courageous as to deny it. Let any one be so bold as to make the trial in Spain, within reach of the Inquisition, and we shall see what will be the consequence.

One thing is certain, that, of late years, the Protestants in France have suffered not a little, because they will not acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the consecrated wafer, and worship it as their Saviour. In all Popish countries it is the practice to carry the consecrated host in procession through the streets, in order to be administered to sick or dying persons in their own houses; and whoever happens to meet it must fall down on his knees and worship. If, in some instances, Englishmen are exempted, it is because they are Englishmen, not because they are Protestants; and even they are expected to show some mark of reverence, such as touching the hat, in honour of the idol.

On Corpus Christi day, it is the custom to carry the host about in solemn procession in great pomp; and though France be not so thoroughly Popish as Spain, Portugal, and Italy, yet all those who reside in the streets, through which the procession is to pass, are compelled to decorate their houses, in honour of the idol that is passing by. Now this is nothing less than to compel persons to be guilty of idolatry; for whatever Papists themselves may think and believe upon the subject, those who are not Papists believe that what they are commanded to honour is not God, but a piece of bread; and to compel them to violate their consciences, by honouring in the smallest degree such an idol, is such direct persecution, that were Papists in this country subjected to the tenth part of the hardship, our own Protestant population would cry out against it, and they would justly do so, as a proceeding unknown and unwarranted by any principle of genuine Christianity.

I am aware, that by the constitutional charter, Protestants in France are relieved from the obligation of this idolatrous compliance; but many have been compelled to it notwithstanding; and others, on their refusal, have been exposed to vexations and sufferings innumerable.

It was lately stated, in some of the public papers, that the British minister in Paris, had his house finely decorated on the octave of Corpus Christi day, in honour of the great Popish idol.*

* The following is the paragraph extracted from the Glasgow Chronicle of June 29th, copied, I presume, from some of the London papers:—"On Sunday, being the octave of Corpus Christi day, the processions of the host were repeated in various districts of Paris; and Monsieur, Madame, and the Dukes of Angouleme and Berry, again appeared in the train of the faithful. The English Ambassador's Hotel was decorated with rich and magnificent tapestry on this occasion, a circumstance, which, according to the Parisian Journalists, excited general interest and delight. There was a period in our history when such a mark of respect by any of our representatives at foreign courts, to one of the most absurd and ridiculous descriptions of idolatry ever invented, would have called for serious animadversion on the part of the British Government. It cannot be supposed that he acted under compulsion; and his voluntary compliance cannot but prove truly disheartening to the French Protestants, many of whom have so re-

This, if true, must have been a voluntary thing on his part, and no doubt some of our very *liberal* Protestants will consider it no more than a decent mark of respect for the established religion of the country in which he happened to reside; but for my part, I consider it no less than an act of gross idolatry; and as the person said to have been guilty of it, was a public character, and the representative of the sovereign of Britain, I consider it no less than an act of national idolatry; and I shall continue to do so, until it be disclaimed by authority, and the guilty individual severely censured for his conduct.

I know there is a popular feeling in favour of small compliances with the religious practice of others, though not precisely what we would habitually practise ourselves. But, in matters of divine worship, there cannot be a *small* compliance, if it relate to any thing that diverts the mind from the only true God as the sole object of worship. Idolatry, in every form, is pointed out in the Bible as the object of divine displeasure and abhorrence; and it is not enough that a Christian should forbear the external practice of it: he must also regard it with abhorrence; he must not be seen in an idol's temple; he must not taste or touch what has been offered to an idol; much less must he show positive respect to an idol, which has been the sin of Britain, in the person of their representative: I mean if the fact be true, and I have never seen it contradicted.

What must the Protestants in France have thought of such a compliance on the part of the ambassador of a Protestant nation? Some of them were suffering the loss of all things rather than show the smallest respect to what they knew to be an idol. They considered Englishmen as their friends and their brethren, who, being of the same faith, would sympathise with them in their sufferings, and encourage them to be steadfast in their adherence to the truths of the Reformation, and in opposition to all idolatry. But here is the representative of a great, nay of the greatest Protestant power in the world, symbolizing with Popery in that very article, for non-compliance with which they suffered such persecution! Certainly this was calculated to depress them, and to encourage their persecutors to exercise greater severity. It furnished the persecutors with this strong argument, which they will not fail to make use of:—"It is nothing but unreasonable obstinacy on the part of you Protestants, that you will not do honour to the consecrated host; for seeing the British ambassador does it, it cannot be contrary to the tenets of the Protestant religion." Thus, one Protestant may have given a deeper wound to the cause of true religion in France, than a thousand Papists could have done. There are doubtless many in that country, as there are in our own, who, though called Protestants, are not well grounded in the Protestant faith. Such will be encouraged to embrace Popery, when they see that a Protestant ambassador can voluntarily give his countenance to what they had been taught to consider idolatrous, and inconsistent with the Protestant religion. Those who are really Christians, and confirmed in the Protestant faith, will reason more correctly; but we ought to remember, that though every Papist is really what he professes to be, there are thousands of Protestants who are such only in name, and who are therefore ready to adopt any system that may suit their interest, or their convenience.

The following extract will show that there are Protestants who make very light of the difference between themselves and Papists, even on the point of transubstantiation, and who, if they were to become Papists, would not have made a great transition. It is part of the speech of Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, on the 10th of June last, on the subject of repealing the act which requires of those admitted into office, a declaration against transubstantiation, and the invocation of saints. I quote from the Orthodox Journal for June, and the Editor professes to have taken it from the British Press newspaper:—

"But my Lords, on a due examination of these declarations, are you ready to say, that the doctrines thus reviled are idolatrous and superstitious? Do you know what is meant, in the Church of Rome, by the invocation of saints, or the adoration of the Virgin Mary? Are noble lords ready to point out those decisive reasons which led them to look on the sacrifice of the mass, and the doctrine of transubstantiation, as worthy of the vile epithets of idolatrous and superstitious? I believe most firmly, that some of those who have signed this test would not be competent to assign any reasons for holding the opinion which the test supposes to exist in the mind of the person agreeing to it. If there were no other cause, this calls on your Lordships to examine the nature of these tests. Can the doctrine of transubstantiation be, in any sense, idolatrous? What does the Roman Catholic believe, what does he adore? He believes the Deity to be transferred to the sacrament —and he adores, not an image, but what he believes to be the *real presence* of that Deity, to whom all adoration is due.—Can this worship be described as idolatrous? Or is it so widely different from the principles of our own church, that it must be contemned? Or is the text of Scripture, on which it is founded, so clear, that we must censure it as wrong? We may believe it wrong, but we ought to recollect, that the faith of the Roman Catholic

cently remonstrated against their being subjected to this superstitious homage, as a violation of the rights of conscience, and an infringement of the constitutional charter."

is derived from the same source from which we have drawn our own, and its truth or error only one Being, all-wise, and all-perfect, can decide. This is of the more importance to be considered, because it is a point *most difficult* to decide. Let us look to the nature of the sacraments in which the Roman Catholic believes. He believes, as I have already stated, in transubstantiation,—he is convinced that he receives the *body of God* in the sacrament. The Lutheran believes the same thing, but in another form—what he terms consubstantiation. The Calvinist believes this doctrine also: but he, too, has his own modification—he believes that he receives the body and blood of Christ in some mysterious sense, which it is impossible to explain." (I wish his Lordship had said where he got his views of Calvinism.) "Your Lordships, we of the Protestant church, undoubtedly condemn the doctrine of transubstantiation; but we believe that the body and blood of Christ is indeed perfectly taken by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. In all the churches I have mentioned, this doctrine is admitted: Queen Elizabeth undoubtedly believed in it—that the same doctrine was held by Archbishop Laud is indisputable — and many members of what is called the High Church, avowed a similar belief. What I wish to call your Lordships' attention to, is this—whether, on a point of such a nature, too high for the weakness of human nature to decide on, it is not too much for us to arrogate to ourselves the intentions of the Deity, and state what is the true or the false principle? In other words, declare that which can be known to Him, and to Him alone, from whom the gospel is derived? We may act on our own belief—we may act piously and even ardently on it, but we ought still to conduct ourselves with charity to all those who hold different opinions. It is surely most improper in us to use terms of reproach to the Roman Catholics, with respect to a point on which a great diversity of opinions prevails amongst Christians."

I believe there are several sentiments in the above extract which will surprise my readers as coming from a Protestant nobleman. He puts the question, "Are you ready to say that the doctrines thus reviled are idolatrous and superstitious?" Most certainly, every Protestant would reply, if he had examined and understood the subject; and agreeably to an opinion expressed by a writer whom I quoted in my last, I believe that he who hesitates about the matter, be he what he may, is no Protestant. If there be any who have signed the test, or declaration against transubstantiation, and cannot assign a reason for it, it is the more shame; and it only shows that there are Protestants who do not know why they are so; and who are ready to go over to Rome, whenever it may serve a purpose.

It is not my intention to go over, and expose, all the absurdity which is contained in the above extract. It exposes itself to every one who understands the subject; and it is indeed so very absurd, that I am inclined to think it is not precisely the same as was spoken by the nobleman whose name it bears; but that it must have received a tinge of Popery from the medium through which it has passed; for, if I am not mistaken, "The British Press" is one of the London Journals which are in the interest of Rome, of which there are said to be at least half a dozen. If the extract do express the genuine sentiments of Earl Grey, I must consider him as teaching, that there is not, and that there never was, such a thing as idolatry in the world. "Can the doctrine of transubstantiation be, in any sense, idolatrous? What does the Roman Catholic believe, what does he adore? He believes the Deity to be transferred to the sacrament, and he adores, not an image, but what he believes to be the real presence of the Deity, to whom all adoration is due." I shall not stay to expose the absurdity and impiety of the idea of Deity being "*transferred;*" but I wish to mark and reprobate the principle laid down by the speaker or his reporter, that if a person does not believe his worship to be idolatry, it is therefore not idolatry though it be the adoration of a piece of bread. Upon this principle, I say, there never was such a thing as idolatry in the world; for where was the man that ever worshipped an idol, believing it to be an idol? It was because the Divinity was supposed to reside in an image, that the ancient heathen worshipped images; and it is because Papists believe that the Deity is transferred to a piece of bread, or to speak more correctly, that a piece of bread is converted into the Deity, that they worship it. And he that will say this is not idolatry, will acquit the children of Israel of idolatry, when they made and worshipped the golden calf; for they did not worship it as an idol, but because they supposed the Deity to reside in it. "These," said they, "be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt;" and the feast which they made on the occasion, they declared to be a feast, not to the calf, but to the Lord. But after all, it is neither the bread nor the Deity whom the noble speaker represents as the object of Popish worship. The Papist, he says, "adores not an image, but what he believes to be the real presence of the Deity." He worships the *real presence;* but what that is he does not say. If he worships the bread, because the Deity is present, he may as well worship every creature in the heavens, and in the earth, and in the waters under the earth.

I shall only add, that if it be the opinion of his Lordship, that it is a thing too high for human reason to decide, whether that which we see to be bread and wine, be really bread

and wine, or whether they be not the God that made us, then he has a much lower opinion of human reason than any Calvinist I ever met with. And if his Lordship had the advantange of being acquainted with persons of this sect, he would find that they had no difficulty in explaining in what sense Christ is present, and received, in the sacrament.

No. LX.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4TH, 1819.

IN the days of bloody queen Mary of England, there was no greater crime than to disbelieve the doctrine of transubstantiation. People were not secure although they were silent upon the subject, and lived at peace with their neighbours, without meddling with religion. They were often interrogated by authority with regard to their belief, and if this was found defective, they were instantly sent to the stake. The queen hated her sister Elizabeth, and wished if possible to get her cut off; but her conduct was so uniformly correct that nothing of a criminal nature could be found against her. At last she was put to the test upon the "burning article," as Tillotson calls it; but she escaped the snare that was laid for her life in a very ingenious manner. "The common net at that time," says Sir Richard Baker, "for catching of Protestants, was the real presence; and this net was used to catch the lady Elizabeth: for being asked one time, what she thought of the words of Christ, *this is my body*, whether she thought it the true body of Christ that was in the sacrament? It is said, that after some pausing, she thus answered—

> Christ was the word that spake it,
> He took the bread and brake it;
> And what that word did make it,
> That I believe and take it.

Which, though it may seem but a slight expression, yet hath it more solidness than at first sight appears; at least it served her turn at that time to escape the net, which by a direct answer she could not have done." *Hume's Hist. Eng.* vol. 6. chap. 7.

But there were many who had neither their wits nor their rhymes so ready as the princess, afterwards queen Elizabeth; and who being caught in Mary's net, were doomed to the flames. More than a hundred years before this period, Wickliffe had taught the scriptural doctrine relating to the Lord's supper, and he offered publicly to defend it against every opponent. Great multitudes in different parts of England embraced his doctrine; and down to the period of the Reformation there continued not a few who disbelieved transubstantiation. The number was no doubt greatly increased by the time of Mary, so that when she cast her net in order to catch subjects for the fire, she seldom drew it back empty.

Before leaving this part of the subject, I shall show the means which were used in England to uphold the credit of the doctrine after it began to be shaken. "No intelligent reader of ecclesiastical history," says a writer in the Dublin Christian Instructor for July 1819, "needs to be informed of the frauds and lying expedients, to which the enemies of the truth and of its defenders resorted, to support the dominant corruptions and confirm the people in delusion. It may not be wholly useless, however, to relate one instance from many. After the condemnation of the doctrines of Wickliffe by the council mentioned above, (that is, a council which had been called by Courtney, Archbishop of Canterbury,) a sermon was preached at the church of Grey Friars, by a John Cunningham, a distinguished adversary of Wickliffe. At this sermon was present a knight, named Cornelius Cloune, a great favourer of the doctrines of Wickliffe then condemned. To Wickliffe's doctrine concerning the sacrament, (says the legend, especially,) he was a devoted convert. The next day he went to the same church to hear mass, when, lo! at the breaking of the host, upon casting his eye towards the friar who happened to celebrate the mass, he saw his hands full of flesh, raw and bloody!! Amazed he called his squire to see the prodigy; but, lo! the squire who had been a good catholic, and whose faith, therefore, needed no such miraculous confirmation, saw nothing more than usual. But wonderful still more, he saw in the middle of the third piece which was to be put into the chalice, the name Jesus Christ, written in letters of flesh, raw and bloody! The friar preached at Paul's Cross next day, told the story to the assembly, and the knight offered to attest the truth of it, by fighting any one who should question it."

The absurdity of transubstantiation might be enough of itself to expose it to the derision of the whole world; but its wickedness consists chiefly in the idolatry of which it is the foundation. The Church of Rome teaches her children to worship the consecrated bread, because they say it is converted into the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. In other words, they believe the bread to be converted into God; and as such they worship it with divine honour; but if the bread be not God, but a mere lifeless creature, as every man who trusts to the evidence of his senses takes it to be, the Papist's believing it to be God, can neither make it God, nor save him from the charge of gross idolatry.

When speaking of the idolatry of worshipping the Virgin Mary, I gave some examples of

the style of devotion in which she is addressed; and I shall now give some examples or specimens of prayers addressed to the holy sacrament. The following is from the Manual of Godly Prayers.—*Missal. Rom. in solemn. corporis Christi.* "O God, which under the admirable sacrament, hast left unto us the memory of thy passion, grant, we beseech thee, that we may so worship the sacred mysteries of thy body and blood, that continually we may feel in us the fruit of thy redemption." This, it will be allowed, is not a prayer to the sacrament, but a prayer to God that he would enable them to worship the sacrament.

In the office of the "venerable sacrament," printed at Colen, 1591, are the following words, "O God, who wouldst have the glorious mystery of thy body and blood to remain with us; grant, we pray thee, that we may so worship thy corporal presence on earth, that we may be worthy to enjoy the vision of it in heaven." I suppose the reporter of Lord Grey's speech, of which I gave an extract in my last Number, must have been thinking of such a prayer as the above, when he made his lordship represent Papists as worshipping the *presence* of the deity. This prayer lets us into the secret of what Papists expect from the object of their worship in answer to their prayers: it is not pardon and salvation for the sake of Christ, who alone is *worthy*; but that they themselves may be made *worthy* to enjoy the vision of God in heaven: and this worthiness is to be acquired by worshipping his corporal presence on earth. Though there were nothing else than cherishing this notion of self-worthiness, or self-righteousness to be objected against Popery, this alone would prove the system to be opposed to the whole doctrine of Christ.

The same work contains the following:—"O God, who in memory of thy passion didst wonderfully change bread and wine into thy body and blood; mercifully grant, that we who believe thy corporal presence in the venerable sacrament, may be brought to the beholding the appearance of thy highness."

The Roman Missal contains the following, by St Thomas Aquinas, in Latin rhyme: I shall give only a few lines of the original, to show the structure of the verse:—

Adoro te devote latens deitas,
Quæ sub his figuris vere latitas,
Tibi se cor meum totum subjicit,
Quia te contemplans totum deficit, &c.

"I devoutly adore thee, O latent Deity,
Who under these figures truly liest hid.
My heart submits itself wholly to thee,
For when it contemplates thee, it wholly fails me.
Sight, taste, and touch, is deceived in thee,
Hearing alone a man may safely trust.
Whatsoever the Son of God said, I believe.
Nothing is truer than this word of truth.
The Deity only on the cross was hid,
Here the humanity also is concealed:
But both believing, and confessing both,
I ask what the repenting thief desired.
I do not see, as Thomas did, thy wounds,
Yet I acknowledge thee to be my God.
O make me still more to believe in thee,
On thee to place my hope, and thee to love.
O thou memorial of my dying Lord,
Thou living bread, and giving life to men,
Grant that my soul on thee may ever live,
And thou to it mayest always sweetly taste."

The same angelic doctor writes of the sacrament as follows. It is a hymn for the feast of Corpus Christi.

Docti Sacris institutis,
Panem vinum in salutis
Consecramus hostiam.
Dogma datur Christianis,
Quod in carnem transit panis,
Et vinum in sanguinem, &c.

"Being taught by holy lessons, we consecrate bread and wine for a saving host. It is a maxim to Christians, that bread is changed into flesh, and wine into blood. What thou dost not comprehend, or see, a strong faith confirms, besides the order of nature. Precious things lie hid under different species, which are signs only, not things. The flesh is meat, and the blood drink, yet Christ remains whole under each kind. Uncut, unbroken, undivided, he is received whole by him that takes him. When a thousand take him, one takes as much as they; nor is he consumed in taking. The good and the bad both take him, but their lot is unequal in life and death. He is death to the bad, and life to the good; behold an unlike end of a like thing. When the sacrament is broken, be not staggered, but remember, there is as much in a particle as the whole covers. Here is no division of the thing, only a breaking of the sign; whereby neither the state nor stature of the thing signified is diminished."

To those who would inquire how this can be? the following answer is furnished, in another hymn for Corpus Christi day.

"What never yet was understood,
Nor ever seen by any creature,
A confident belief makes good,
Though cross to all the laws of nature.
Though sense will not be brought to allow it,
A heart sincere may be secure,
And, waving all its scruples, sure,
Since faith alone's enough to do it;
For faith supplies the sense's want,
And makes good measure where that's scant."

In the Manual of Godly Prayers, there is another hymn by the same saint, which is in English as follows:—

"At his last supper made by night
He with his brethren takes his seat,
And having kept the ancient rite,
Using the law's prescribed meat,
His twelve disciples doth invite,
From his own hands himself to eat.
The word made flesh, to words imparts
Such strength, that bread himself is made,

He wine into his blood converts:
And if our sense here fail and fade,
To satisfy religious hearts
Faith only can the truth persuade.

Then to this sacrament so high,
Low reverence let us now direct;
Old rites must yield in dignity
To this, with such great graces deckt;
And faith will all those wants supply,
Wherein the senses feel defect."

Again:—

"O saving host, that open'st heaven's door
Th' arms of our foes do us inclose,
Thy strength we need; O help with speed,
We humbly thee implore."

Such are the prayers of Papists to a piece of bread, the work of the baker.*

There was published at Paris, with the approbation of three doctors of the faculty there, in 1669, a little book in French, called, "Practique pour adorer le tres saint Sacrament de l'Autel:" Or, A Form for the adoration of the most holy sacrament of the Altar; which begins thus: Praised and adored be the most holy sacrament of the altar; and then adds:—

"Whosoever shall say these holy words, (Praised be the most holy sacrament of the altar), shall gain a hundred days of indulgences; and he that does reverence, hearing them repeated, as much. He that, being confessed, and having communicated, shall say the above-said words, shall gain a plenary indulgence; and the first five times that he shall say them, after his having confessed and communicated, he shall deliver five of his friends' souls, whom he pleases, out of Purgatory."

Then follows the form for honouring the holy sacrament, consisting of two prayers, as follow: (I give the English only.) The first of them has this rubric before it, in the hours of Salisbury: "Our holy Father, Pope John XXII., hath granted to all them that devoutly say this prayer, after the elevation of our Lord Jesus Christ, three thousand days of pardon for deadly sins."

Soul of Christ, sanctify me.
Body of Christ, save me.
Blood of Christ, inebriate me.*
Water of Christ's side, wash me.
Passion of Christ, comfort me.
O good Jesus, hear me.
Within thy wounds hide me.
Suffer me not to be separated from thee.
From the malicious enemy defend me.
In the hour of death call me;
And command me to come to thee,
That with thy saints I may praise thee
For evermore. Amen.

At the elevation of the Mass.

All hail, true body, born of the blessed Virgin Mary;
Truly suffered, and offered upon the cross for mankind:
Whose side, pierced with a spear, yielded water and blood.
Vouchsafe to be received of us in the hour of death.
O good, O Jesu, Son of the blessed Virgin, have mercy on me.

Let it be observed, all this is addressed to the bread upon the altar, which the Papist is taught to believe is really his Saviour. After the above, the French form adds what follows:

"These two good prayers were found in the sepulchre of our Lord Jesus Christ in Jerusalem; and whosoever carries them about with him with devotion, and in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, shall be delivered from the devil and from sudden death, and shall not die an ill death. He shall be preserved from pestilence, and all infectious diseases. No sorcery, or sorcerer, shall be able to hurt him or her that has these two good prayers about them. The fire from heaven shall not fall upon the house where these prayers are rehearsed with devotion. A woman with child saying them devoutly, shall be brought to bed, without any danger of her own, or her child's death. Lightnings and thunders shall not fall upon the houses where these prayers are rehearsed with devotion. Such a one shall not die without confession, and God will give him grace to repent of his sins."

It is easy to see the pernicious tendency of such doctrine, not only as cherishing idolatry and superstition, but encouraging men to live in all the wickedness to which their hearts may be inclined; seeing they are assured, that by the use of a few words, now and then, they shall not die without grace to repent of their sins.

I shall conclude these specimens of Popish devotion with the Litany of the holy sacrament, from the Manual of Godly Prayers:—

Living bread that didst descend from heaven
God hidden and my Saviour
Bread corn of the elect
Wine budding from virgins
Fat bread, and the delight of kings
Continual sacrifice
Pure oblation
Lamb without spot
Most pure table
} Have mercy upon us.

---

* *The following is translated from a satirical Poem of George Buchanan:—*

A Baker and a Painter once contended which of them could produce the best specimen of his art;—whether the former would excel with his oven, or the latter with his colours. The Painter boasted, that he had made a god; the Baker replied, It is I who make the true body of God, thou only canst produce an image or representation of it. The Painter said, Thy god is always consumed by men's teeth. Thine, rejoined the Baker, is corroded by worms. The Painter affirmed, that one of his making would endure entire for many years, while an innumerable quantity of the Baker's would be often devoured in an hour. But you, said the Baker, can scarcely paint one god in a year, while I can produce ten thousand in an hour.

Stop, said a Priest, and contend no more with words to no purpose, neither of your gods can do any thing without me; and seeing it is I that make each of them a god, both shall be subservient to me: for the picture shall beg for me, and the bread be eaten by me.

* It seems they wish the substance of the wine to remain after all.

Food of angels
Hidden manna
Memorial of God's wonderful works
Supersubstantial bread
Word made flesh and dwelling in us
Holy host
Chalice of benediction
Mystery of faith
Most high and venerable sacrament
Sacrifice of all other most holy
Truly propitiatory for the quick and dead
Heavenly antidote whereby we are preserved from sin
Miracle above all others astonishing
Most sacred commemoration of our Lord's death
Gift surpassing all fulness
Chief memorial of divine love
Abundance of divine bounty
Holy and most majestical mystery
Medicine of immortality
Dreadful and life-giving sacrament
Bread by the words omnipotence made flesh
Unbloody sacrifice
Meat and guest
Most sweet banquet, whereat the ministering angels attend
Sacrament of piety
Bond of charity
Offerer and oblation
Spiritual sweetness tasted in its proper fountain
Reflection of holy souls
Viaticum of those who die in the Lord
Pledge of future glory

} Have mercy upon us.

It must be allowed that there is a great deal of apparent fervour here. Papists seem really in earnest in devotion to their idol, which they call the holy sacrament; but it is the earnestness and fervour of a nurse, who labours to silence a petulant and peevish child, by giving it many fine names without much meaning.

I am indebted for most of these extracts, and some of the remarks, to a work entitled, "The Popish Doctrine concerning the Sacraments refuted," in volume second of the "Preservative from Popery," title vii, by Dr Stillingfleet, and other eminent divines of the seventeenth century. I shall conclude the present Number, with an extract from title vii. chap. v. of this work, which shows the practice of the Church of Rome as it corresponds with their doctrine.

"Having considered the adoration of the host as it is taught in the Church of Rome, I shall now consider the practice of it, which is more plain and evident, and notorious to all the world; however they would palliate and disguise their doctrine. According to their Missal, which is wholly different in this, as well as other things, from the old liturgy, and eucharistic forms, as I shall show by and by,—the priest in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the bread and wine, with bended knees, he adores the sacrament; that which he has consecrated, that very thing which is before him, upon the patine, and in the chalice; and gives the same worship and subjection, both of body and mind to it, as he could to God or Christ himself: for, with his head and his soul, bowing towards it, and his eyes and thoughts fixed upon it, and directed to it, he prays to it, as to Christ himself; 'Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us, grant us peace,' and the like; then the priest rising up after he has thus adored it himself, he lifts it up as high as conveniently he can, above his head, and with eyes fixed upon it, he shows it to be devoutly adored by the people, who having notice also by ringing the mass bell, as soon as they see it, fall down in the humblest adorations to it, as if it were the very appearance of God himself."

The remainder of the passage will be given in my next.

No. LXI.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 11TH, 1819.

THE reader is requested to connect what is contained in this and the following page, with the conclusion of the last Number:—

"If Christ were visibly present before them, they could not show more acts of reverence, and devotion, and worship, to him, than they do to the host. They pray to it, and use the very forms of petition and invocation to that, as to Christ himself; such as these,—'O saving host, or blessed sacrament, which openest the door of heaven, give me strength and power against dangers, and against all my enemies. Make me always more to believe, to hope in thee, to love thee; grant that my soul may always live upon thee, and that thou mayest always taste sweet unto it.'

"Thus both the priest and the people are several times to adore and worship both the host and the cup in the celebration of the eucharist; and they will not disown, nor cannot, their directing and terminating their devotions and prayers upon the sacrament, which is before them. Prayers they call them to the eucharist, and it is become a common form of doxology amongst them, instead of saying, 'Praise be given to God,' to say, 'Praise be given to the most holy sacrament.' Sanders, in his book of the Supper of the Lord, instead of 'Glory be to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' turns it thus, 'To the body and blood of our Saviour, under the species of bread and wine, be all honour and praise, and thanksgiving for evermore:' as if it were another person of the blessed Godhead.

"This adoration is not only in the time of communion, when it is properly the Lord's Supper and sacrament; but at other times, out of it, whenever it is set upon the altar with the candles burning, and the incense smoking before it; or hung up in its rich shrine and tabernacle, with a canopy of state over it. And not only in the church, which is sanctified, they say, by this sacrament, as by the presence of God himself, but when it is carried through the streets in a solemn and pompous procession;

as it is before the Pope, when he goes abroad, just as the Persian fire was before the emperor, merely by way of state, or for a superstitious end, that he may the better be guarded and defended by the company of his God. In all these times it is to be worshipped and adored by all persons as it passeth by, as if it were the glory of God which passeth by. They are, like Moses, to make haste, and bow their heads to the earth and worship; but above all on that high day, which they have dedicated to this sacrament, as if it were some new deity, the *festum Dei*, as they call it, the feast of God, or the *festum corporis Christi*, the feast of the body of Christ; for to call the sacrament God, is a general expression among them, as when they have received the sacrament, to say, 'I have received my Maker to-day;' and the person, who, in great churches, is to carry the sacrament to the numerous communicants, is called, *Bajulus Dei*, 'the porter or carrier of God;' and they always account it, and so always reverence it, as Boileau falsely says the ancients did, as a present Numen and Deity. This feast was appointed by Pope Urban IV. about the middle of the 12th century; and again by Clement V. in the beginning of the 13th, as is owned by themselves, upon the occasion of a vision to one Juliana, who saw a crack in the moon, that signified, it seems, a great defect in the church, for want of this solemnity. Such was the rise of this great festival, and so late was its institution in the Roman church; in which, and in no other Christian church in the world, is it observed to this day. And that the whole practice of the adoration of the host is novel, and unknown to the primitive church and to ancient writers, I shall endeavour to make evident against the bold and impudent canon of the Council of Trent, which is the first council that commanded it, in these words:—'If any one shall say that the sacrament is not to be worshipped by a peculiar festival, nor to be solemnly carried about in processions according to the laudable and universal manner and custom of the holy church; nor to be publicly proposed to the people, that it may be adored by them, and that the worshippers are idolaters: let him be accursed.'"—The author gives in the margin the most ample authorities for his statements, from saints and fathers of the Romish church; and he generally gives their very words in the original Latin.

Thus I have shown that Papists address prayers and hymns to the sacrament, as if it were the living God. They profess to believe not only that God is in it, but that it is God. As such they pray to it, and trust in it. To honour it, they believe, is to honour God; and to contemn it, is to contemn Him. In their esteem there is no impiety equal to that of slighting the consecrated wafer; and no punishment too great for those who are guilty of it.

I shall illustrate this by a number of examples, all of a miraculous nature, and as well attested as things of the kind can be. We shall see, indeed, if we can believe the *facts* which I am going to relate, that the consecrated wafer has received the honour which was predicted of Christ in the viiith Psalm, and which is applied to him by the Apostle, in the 2d chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews: that under him should be put all beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fishes of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the path of the sea. I have before me a vast collection of instances of the consecrated wafer being worshipped and adored by all sorts of creatures, from insects up to horses, asses, and oxen. This collection was originally made by Father Toussain Bridoul, a Jesuit; and from his work it is transferred by Mr Gavin, into the third volume of his Master Key to Popery, from which the following are extracted. The Jesuit, in his preface, represents heretics, conducted, no doubt, by the devil, as conspiring to extirpate the holy sacrament, and so to destroy souls more easily; who cannot, he says, "subsist long in grace without the participation of this divine and celestial food. "Wherefore," he adds, "without troubling myself to confute these hair-brained people, who turn a deaf ear to all that the holy Fathers have said about it; and having renounced their reason, I have resolved to send them to the school of the beasts, who have shown a particular inclination (not without a superior conduct) for the honour and defence of this truth."

The chapter of the work from which I quote, is entitled, "A Collection of Miracles of the consecrated Wafer, grounded upon the respects and acknowledgements which beasts, birds, and insects, on several occasions, have rendered to the holy Wafer." I am afraid my intelligent readers will reckon this a very trifling Number; but I request they will bear with it, as I feel it sometimes necessary to descend very low, in order to expose the idolatry and superstition of the Church of Rome:—

"Petrus Cluniac, lib. 1. cap. 1. reports, That a certain peasant of Auvergne, a province in France, perceiving that his bees were likely to die, to prevent this misfortune, was advised, after he had received the communion, to keep the host, and to blow it into one of his hives; and, on a sudden, all the bees came forth out of their hives, and ranking themselves in good order, lifted the host up from the ground, and carrying it in upon their wings, placed it among the combs. After this the man went out about his business, and at his return, found that this advice had succeeded contrary to his expectation, for all his bees were dead. Nay, when he lifted up the hive, he saw that the host was turned into a fair child among the honey combs; and being much astonished at this change, and seeing that this infant seemed to be dead, he took it in his hands, intending to

bury it privately in the church, but when he came to do it, he found nothing in his hands; for the infant was vanished away. This thing happened in the county of Clermont, which, for this irreverence, was, a while after, chastised by divers calamities, which so dispeopled those parts, that they became like a wilderness. From which it appears, that bees honour the holy host divers ways, by lifting it from the earth, and carrying it into their hives, as it were in procession." Let the reader remember, it was the God whom Papists worship, that was indebted to the bees for shelter in their hive.

"Cantiprat, lib. 2. cap. 40. sect. 1. writeth, That a certain poor man going to visit his bees, perceived them to make a sweet harmony: he stood ravished a while with it, not knowing what it meant. The night following, as he went about some business, and casting his eyes towards his bees, he perceived them to rejoice, and sport themselves, making an admirable melody. First, he informed his curate of it, and afterwards broke up his hive, where he found a box made of wax, but of such admirable whiteness, that it looked like ivory; and within it the holy sacrament adored by the bees, who ranged themselves into two choirs, and sang the praises of their Creator. The Bishop ordered a procession to carry back the holy host of the church; and in that place was erected a sumptuous chapel, which became a place of refuge for the sick and the afflicted. When nobody knew from whence, and by whom, that host had been brought there, two thieves of their own accord discovered themselves, and confessed, that having stolen a box, they had thrown the host against the hives. By which miracle we see that the bees adore the holy host, and sing the divine praises, dividing themselves into two choirs."

"Cæsarius, lib. 9. cap. 8. reports, That a certain woman, having received the communion unworthily, carried the host to her hives, for to enrich the stock of bees: and afterwards coming again to see the success, she perceived that the bees, acknowledging their God in the sacrament, had, with admirable artifice, erected to him a chapel of wax, with its doors, windows, bells, and vestry; and within it a chalice where they laid the holy body of Jesus Christ. She could no longer conceal this wonder. The priest being advertised of it, came thither in procession, and he himself heard harmonious music, which the bees made, flying round about the sacrament; and having taken it out, he brought it back to the church full of comfort, certifying, that he had seen and heard our Lord acknowledged and praised by those little creatures."

The same author relates, lib. 4. cap. 99. "That an old and simple priest, of the parish of St Colen, carrying the holy sacrament out of town to a sick person, and going up a very rough hill, met some loaded asses descending towards the town; and the way being very narrow, and the priest not being able to get past them, and fearing to be overturned by those beasts, he spoke to them according to his simplicity in this manner: My asses! what do you mean? Do ye not see him whom I carry? Go aside, and stop to make room for your Creator, which I command you in his name. O admirable obedience! Those asses, which used not to stir but when they were beaten, presently went to one side, where the hill was more steep, without apprehending any danger or letting fall their load. The town of Colen remembers this wonder to this day, and mentioneth it with astonishment."

"P. Orlandi, in his History of the Society, tom. 1. lib. 2, No. 27, says, That, in the 16th century, within the Venetian territories, a priest carrying the holy host, without pomp or train, to a sick person he met, out of the town, asses going to their pasture; who, perceiving by a certain sentiment, what it was which the priest carried, they divided themselves into two companies on each side of the way, and fell on their knees. Whereupon the priest, with his clerk, all amazed, passed between those peaceable beasts, which then rose up, as if they would make a pompous show in honour of their Creator; followed the priest as far as the sick man's house, where they waited at the door till the priest came out from it, and did not leave him till he had given them his blessing. Father Simon Rodriguez, one of the first companions of St Ignatius, who then travelled in Italy, informed himself carefully of this matter, which happened a little while before our first Fathers came into Italy, and found that all had happened as has been told."

"Nicholas de Laghi, in his book of the miracles of the holy sacrament, says, that a Jew blaspheming the holy sacrament, dared to say, that if the Christians would give it to his dog, he would eat it up, without showing any regard to their God. The Christians being very angry at this outrageous speech, and trusting in the Divine Providence, had a mind to bring it to a trial: so, spreading a napkin on the table, they laid on it many hosts, among which one only was consecrated. The hungry dog being put upon the same table, began to eat them all, but coming to that which had been consecrated, without touching it, he kneeled down before it, and afterwards fell with rage upon his master, catching him so closely by the nose, that he took it quite away with his teeth."—"The same which St Matthew warns such like blasphemers, saying, 'Give not that which is holy unto dogs, lest they turn again and rend you.'"

"St Anthony of Padua, disputing one day with one of the most obstinate heretics that denied the truth of the holy sacrament, drove him to such a plunge, that he desired the saint to prove this truth by some miracle. St Anthony accepted the condition, and said he would

work it upon his mule. Upon this the heretic kept her three days without eating and drinking; and the third day, the saint, having said mass, took up the host, and made him bring forth the hungry mule, to whom he spoke thus: —In the name of the Lord, I command thee to come and do reverence to thy Creator, and confound the malice of heretics. While the saint made this discourse to the mule, the heretic sifted out oats to make the mule eat; but the beast having more understanding than his master, kneeled before the host, adoring it as its Creator and Lord. This miracle comforted all the faithful, and enraged the heretics; except him that disputed with the saint, who was converted to the Catholic faith."

In the catalogue before me, there are seventy-three such stories, all certified by some great saint or father; but I presume I have given enough of such matter to put it beyond a doubt that the prevailing belief of Papists is, that the wafer which they receive in the sacrament, is the God that made heaven and earth, and that the prevailing practice among them, is to adore it as such. The works of many Popish saints consist in little else than such stories as the above; and if they do not prove the Church of Rome to be guilty of suffering idolatry, and even encouraging the practice of it, it is not possible to prove any thing. Before entering upon the discussion of what is called the sacrifice of the mass, I shall advert shortly to another peculiarity of the Church of Rome, in relation to the Lord's supper; that is, communion in one kind, or withholding the cup from the laity. This rose out of transubstantiation, and is intimately connected with it: for the practice cannot be defended but upon the principle of transubstantiation.

In the words of institution, both as spoken by our Lord, and recited by the apostle Paul, it seems perfectly evident, that both bread and wine were to be given and received in the Lord's supper. These were appointed to represent his body broken and his blood shed for the sins of his people. "With respect to the bread, Christ had said, Luke xxii. 19, 20; 'Take, eat, this is my body:' but concerning the cup, he says, 'Drink ye all of this;' for as this pointed out the very essence of the institution; to wit, the *blood of atonement*, it was necessary that each should have a particular application of it; therefore, he says, 'Drink YE ALL OF THIS.' By this we are taught, that the cup is essential to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, so that they who deny the cup to the people, sin against God's institution; and they who receive not the cup, are not partakers of the body and blood of Christ. If either could without mortal prejudice be omitted, it might be the bread; but the cup, as pointing out the blood poured out, that is the life, by which alone the great sacrificial act is performed, and remission of sins procured, is absolutely indispensable. On this ground it is demonstrable, that there is not a Popish priest under heaven, who denies the cup to the people (and they all do this), that can be said to celebrate the Lord's supper at all; nor is there one of their votaries that ever received the holy sacrament. All pretension to this is an absolute farce, so long as the cup, the emblem of the atoning blood, is denied. How strange is it, that the very men, who plead so much for the bare literal meaning of *this is my body*, in the preceding verse, should deny all meaning to *drink ye all of this cup*, in this verse! And though Christ has in the most positive manner enjoined it, they will not permit one of the laity to taste it! O what a thing is man! a constant contradiction to reason and himself. The conclusion therefore is unavoidable. The sacrament of the Lord's supper is NOT celebrated in the church of Rome."—*Clarke on the Eucharist*, pp. 60, 61.

If the concluding remark of this learned writer be correct, and I think it cannot be denied by any Protestant, it would appear that the priests would do the people no harm, though they withheld the bread as well as the cup from them. Christ instituted the ordinance of the Supper for the purpose of keeping alive in the minds of his people the remembrance of his death, until he should come again; but the observance of the ordinance can be of no use to persons who do not understand its meaning, which it is evident Papists do not; for instead of remembering Christ as *absent*, with respect to his body, as his words, "until I come," undoubtedly signify, they consider his body *present* in every consecrated wafer. The idea, therefore, of remembering him has no place in their minds, for the word remember does not apply to a thing that is present. It follows as a necessary consequence, that no believer in transubstantiation, that is, no true Papist, can obey our Lord's dying command, 'Do this in remembrance of me;' and it were better to let the sacrament alone altogether, than to do something else under the pretext of observing it.

I know that the priests withhold the cup from the laity, because, they say, in giving them the consecrated wafer, they give the true body of Christ, which being a living body, contains the blood; but if this were the case, the priests, as well as the people, would receive the whole Christ in receiving the bread, and there would be no occasion for wine at all; yet it is well known that they use plenty of wine, which, being consecrated, they say is the real blood of Christ, and the priests take it all to themselves; which is making a distinction between the clergy and the laity, that is quite unwarranted by the word of God, and the practice of the primitive churches. In short, as transubstantiation itself was not, strictly speaking, an article of faith in the Roman church, till it was made so in 1215, by the Lateran Council; so communion in one kind

was not a general or authorised practice in that church, till it was ordained by the Council of Constance, about two hundred years after.

To deny the cup to the laity; to give them nothing but a piece of bread in the form of a wafer, and to call it the Lord's Supper; is most certainly a piece of barefaced imposition: But though they gave the wine along with the wafer, it would not mend the matter, or profit the souls of them who receive it, while they teach them to attach a false and idolatrous meaning to the service; and to consider it, not as a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, as an atonement for the sins of his people, but as in itself a real propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. This is their doctrine concerning the sacrifice of the mass, which I intend to take up in my next Number; and while they attach such an absurdity to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, they make it not the Lord's Supper: it is an impious invention of their own; and in a Christian point of view, it is a matter of no importance, whether idolaters use bread and wine, or bread and cheese, or bread alone, in the service of their idol.

I have travelled through many a dense folio page, full of learning and of argument, on the subject of withholding the cup from the laity; and have admired the patience of really eminent divines, who could enter so fully and minutely into the discussion of a question which appears to me so unimportant. For those who know what the ordinance of the Lord's Supper means, and believe the truth to which it relates, will never think of observing it without both bread and wine; and those who do not know what it means, and do not believe the truth, will not observe it, whether they use one or both of the elements.

No. LXII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18TH, 1819.

"THE sacrifice of the mass," says a late learned author, "is the most considerable part of worship in the Roman church. It is their *juge sacrificium*, their daily and continual offering, and the principal thing in which their religion does consist. It is, they tell us, of the greatest profit and advantage to all persons, and I am sure their priests make it so to themselves; for by this alone, a great number of them get their livings, by making merchandise of the holy sacrament, and by selling the blood of Christ at a dearer rate than Judas did. The saying of masses keeps the Church of Rome more priests in pay, than any prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers; and it has raised more money by them, than the richest bank or exchequer in the world was ever owner of. It is indeed the truest patrimony of their church, and has enriched it more than any thing else. It was that which founded their greatest monasteries, and their richest abbeys; and it had well nigh brought all the estates in this kingdom into the church, had not the statute of mortmain put a check to it. The donation of Constantine, were it ever so true, and the grants of Charles and Pepin, were they ever so large, and the gifts of all their benefactors put together, are infinitely out-done by it. The gain of it has been so manifestly great, that one cannot, but on that account, a little suspect its godliness."—*Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass, by Mr Payne, late Prebendary of Westminster*, p. 1.

Before entering upon a discussion of this subject, it will be right to tell what it is. I shall, therefore, give the doctrine as it is laid down by the Douay Catechism, which AMICUS VERITATIS says is approved by the whole church:—

"Q. Is the Eucharist a sacrament only? A. No, it is also a sacrifice. Q. What is a sacrifice? A. It is a supreme act of religion, due to Almighty God. Q. How is this performed? A. By offerings made to him, in testimony of his being the sovereign Lord of all things. Q. In what did the sacrifices of the old law consist? A. Chiefly in bloody sacrifices of beasts, which the priests offered in the temple, as figures of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, which was then to come. Q. In what consists the sacrifice of the new law? A. In the voluntary and bloody oblation which Christ made to his eternal Father, by dying on the cross for our redemption. Q. But this is past, how have we now any sacrifice in the new law? A. By the standing memorial and continuance of it in the blessed Eucharist. Q. Why do you say that the Eucharist is a standing memorial of Christ's sacrifice on the cross? A. Because Christ, at his last supper, commanded it should be offered as a remembrance of his passion to the end of the world; and this is what is performed in the sacrifice of the mass. Q. Why is it a continuance of Christ's sacrifice? A. Because Jesus Christ, who is a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec, having offered himself once in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, continues daily to offer himself, by the ministry of his priests, in an unbloody manner, under the form of bread and wine. So that the sacrifice offered on the cross, and the sacrifice of the mass, are one and the same, as to the chief priest who offers it, and the thing which is offered; and differ only in the manner of offering. Q. What therefore is the mass? A. It is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, under the form of bread and wine, in memory of his death and passion for the remission of our sins. Q. Who said the first mass? A. Jesus Christ. Q. When did he say

it? A. At his last supper, when he instituted the holy Eucharist. Q. To whom is the sacrifice of the mass offered? A. To God only. Q. Is it not sometimes offered to the saints? A. No, masses are sometimes said in honour and memory of the saints, in thanksgiving to God for the benefits he has been pleased to bestow upon them; and that they, joining their prayers to ours, may intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate here on earth. Q. What benefit receive we by this sacrifice? A. It is a daily application of the merits of Christ, for the relief of our necessities, by laying before the eternal Father the infinite value of his Son's bitter passion. Q. What are the benefits the living receive by it? A. They are many; 1. It applies the merits of our Saviour's passion for the remission of our sins. 2. It procures new graces and blessings for us, by virtue of the said passion. 3. It is the most acceptable offering we can make to Almighty God, in thanksgiving for all his benefits. Q. Does it avail the faithful departed? A. It is not to be doubted, but as St Augustine, *Serm.* 26, *de verbis Apostoli*, cap. 2, says, by this wholesome sacrifice, which is offered for them, they are so far helped, as to be treated with more mercy than their sins deserve. Q. Is it not a prejudice to the faithful, that the mass is said in an unknown language? A. No; for the mass contains only those prayers which the priest alone is commanded to say, as the mediator between God and his people. Neither are the people ignorant of what is said, since they have the mass expounded and Englished in their ordinary prayer books."

From this long extract, the reader will see what is the most modified and moderate view which Papists give of this great act of their worship. The Douay Catechism, being calculated for the meridian of Scotland, is much less gross, both in sentiment and expression, than most others that are issued by the Church of Rome. It does not, for instance, say in plain words, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, though as much is implied in the words which represent it as the very same sacrifice that Christ offered on the cross, and in the words which it ascribes to St Augustine, that the dead are so far helped by it, "as to be treated with *more* mercy than their sins deserve;" from which last expression, I remark, in passing, that it seems to be a doctrine held by Papists that their sins deserve *some* mercy. The mass only helps them to *more* than they would otherwise deserve. All the world is acquainted with the Popish doctrine of the merit of good works; but I suppose this will be the first time the world has been informed that they ascribe some merit to their sins; and that these deserve mercy, though but in a small degree, without the additional merit of the mass.

The Catechism, for the use of all the churches in the French empire, more explicitly declares the mass to be a sacrifice of propitiation. Speaking of the souls of the dead, it is asked and answered, "Are these souls any wise relieved by this sacrifice? A. Yes: they are very much relieved. Q. Why? A. Because in it Jesus Christ is offered as the common propitiation for all mankind." The thing is asserted still more plainly in "The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, contained in the Profession of Faith, published by Pope Pius IV." in which we read as follows:—"Q. What is the Catholic doctrine as to the mass? A. That in the mass, there is offered unto God, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Q. What do you mean by the mass? A. The consecration and oblation of the body and blood of Christ, under the sacramental veils or appearances of bread and wine: So that the mass was instituted by Christ himself at his last supper: Christ himself said the first mass; and ordained that his apostles and their successors should do the like. Do this in remembrance of me, Luke xxii. 19. Q. What do you mean by a *propitiatory* sacrifice? A. A sacrifice for obtaining mercy, or by which *God is moved to mercy*." There is an error in the last expression, which I have marked by Italics, distinct from the error of the mass sacrifice, though connected with it, and which I shall expose by and by; but, at present, I wish to give a full view of the subject as it is set down by Popish authors.

The following is from a work entitled, "Holy Altar and Sacrifice explained," by the Rev. Father Pacificus Baker, of the order of St Francis:—"Many are the spiritual graces and benefits which the devout Christian gains by seriously attending to, and assisting at, this holy sacrifice. *First*, By the sacrifice of the mass, the fruits of Christ's bloody sacrifice of himself on the altar of his cross, are applied to our souls. This sacrifice of the mass being the same with that on the cross, differing only in the manner. On the cross Christ offered himself in a bloody manner, shedding every drop of his sacred blood, as a sacrifice of redemption for mankind. In the mass he offers himself by the ministry of the priest, in an unbloody manner. Hence the mass is called by the holy Fathers, an *incruental*, or unbloody sacrifice; for, as the Council of Trent declares, Sess. xxii. 6, 2. It is one and the same host (or body), and the same offerer, now by the ministry of the priest, who offered himself on the cross, differing only in the manner of offering, the fruits of which unbloody oblation are here most plentifully received. *Secondly*, The mass is *latreutical*, that is, a holocaust, or oblation, offered to God in acknowledgment of his supreme majesty and dominion over us; worshipping him herein with divine worship, due to him alone and not to any creature, how

excellent and perfect soever. *Thirdly*, It is a *eucharistic* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for, as well as commemoration of, the inestimable benefit of Christ's passion, and of praise and thanksgiving for all the blessings we have received, spiritual and temporal. *Fourthly*, It is an *impetratory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain whatever we ask, if we ask as we ought, according to what our Saviour says; 'Ask and you shall receive,' John xvi. For the Father will not deny what we ask in his Son's name, much less when we ask by his Son, who is here offered to him. With him he has given us all things. With him he will refuse us nothing. *Fifthly*, It is a *propitiatory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain pardon of our sins, our daily failings and offences against God, by the merits of Christ's passion, here renewed and offered up for us."

I believe no real sacrifice ever made on earth contained so many things as are here ascribed to the mass, not even the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. This certainly was not unbloody, or *incruental*, as the reverend father says that of the mass is: and I would question very much the propriety of calling the sacrifice of Christ eucharistical. If the mass, then, have two ingredients which the sacrifice of Christ had not, it is absurd to call it the very same sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ was undoubtedly propitiatory; and the principal error of the Church of Rome, on this subject, consists in ascribing the same character to their mass.

When Papists are pushed upon such a subject as this, they will not admit the authority of individual authors, however great, or even of such Catechisms as are recommended by their priests, and in general and daily use. The Douay Catechism, as I have said, does not use the word propitiatory; and, therefore, a Scottish Papist, when assailed by a Protestant, may disavow the doctrine as not in his Catechism. On the other hand, should he be accused by one of his own brethren, of not holding that fundamental doctrine of his church, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice, he will get out by referring to his Catechism, in which the mass is declared to be the very same sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross, which is allowed on all hands to be propitiatory.

But that none of my Popish readers may have it in their power to evade the question, or deny that their church holds this doctrine, on account of any defect in my authorities, I shall now cite the highest authority known in their church, that is, the Council of Trent, which may justly be said to be higher with them than the Bible itself; for that Council not only decreed many things contrary to the Bible, but actually added to it a number of books, whose authors never dreamed that they wrote under divine inspiration, or that their works should be exalted to an equality with the word of God.

The holy Council has decreed thus:—"If any shall say, that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, let him be accursed. If any shall say in those words (Do this in remembrance of me), Christ did not institute his apostles to be priests, or that he did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed." "If any shall say, the sacrifice of the mass is only of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it profits him alone that takes it, and ought not to be offered for quick and dead, for sins, punishments, and satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed." *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 22. *de Sacrific. Missæ.* can. 1, 2, 3.

This is the doctrine of the Church of Rome distinctly laid down. Every Popish priest takes a solemn oath to abide by it, and all that the Council of Trent has decreed: and we see by the above, that a solemn curse is pronounced against all who say that the mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice; and that it ought not to be offered for the quick and dead, for sins, punishments, and satisfactions. I consider myself, therefore, as standing under the curse of the most *holy* and *infallible* church; but while advocating the truth of God, I can, without anxiety about the matter, use the words of the Psalmist:—"Let them curse, but bless thou."

One of the worst features of modern Popery, is the affected liberality of Papists. Their fawning and flattering of their Protestant brethren, as they now condescend to call us, are infinitely more disgusting than their cursing and wrath. The wolf is never so dangerous as when he appears in a sheep's coat. Modern Papists affect all the meekness of the lamb, because they want what they call emancipation, that is, nothing less than a place in the legislature and government of the kingdom. But they know that they look upon Protestants as heretics accursed. They will not tell us so just now, though all their priests have sworn to it, and all the faithful must believe as their priests bid them. They speak in very mild language, at present, because they want something which Protestants have in their power to deny them. They condescend even so far as to use the phrase, "our dissenting brethren," hoping that Dissenters will be flattered by their condescension, that they will be induced to forward their cause, and help them to places of power, and to that ascendency which is their ultimate object. But their soft words and fair speeches can deceive only the hearts of the simple. Their affected moderation is gross hypocrisy, while they carry, under the cloak, all the cursing and bitterness of their fathers against those who

will not fall down and worship their mass idol. If it be not so, let them renounce the Council of Trent, and withdraw their solemn curses against those who deny their mass sacrifice, and trust in the sacrifice of Christ alone. I have no doubt many of them will even do this to serve a purpose; but when the purpose is gained, they will find out that they were incompetent to make the renunciation. Though the Pope himself were to withdraw these curses, and though he were to grant leave to all the Papists in Britain and Ireland to disavow them, it would be found, when they had attained the object which they have in view, that the Pope was incompetent to set aside a solemn decree of a general council, confirmed by the Pope of the day. Those who shall live to witness Popish ascendency in this country, will have a better understanding of this than my present readers have. The curses which have been accumulating for ages upon the heads of all who deny that the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, will break forth with dreadful fury upon all who shall refuse to bow the knee to the idol which the Church of Rome has set up. In the days of the Council of Trent, curses were not empty sounds. The Church of Rome boasts of being unchanged and unchangeable; and this is almost the only true thing which she utters amidst her thousands of lies. She will therefore be what she was in the days of that Council, whenever she has the opportunity and the power.

But to return to the mass itself,—it is said to be a propitiatory sacrifice. Such the Council of Trent declares it to be; and the expression refers to that which reconciles sinners to their offended Creator. This is expressly asserted in the New Testament of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. "Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood," Rom. iii. 25. And "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," &c. 2 Cor. v. 19. I shall show, by and by, that this is true of the sacrifice of Christ, and that it cannot be true of any thing else; but, in the meantime, I shall expose the error to which I adverted in a preceding page of this Number. After having declared the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice, it is asserted in "The grounds of Catholic doctrine," that a propitiatory sacrifice is that "by which *God is moved to mercy;*" and in the mass, such a sacrifice is offered. Now this is ascribing more to the mass than can be justly ascribed to the sacrifice of Christ himself, and to all that he did and suffered, while on earth.

The minds of Papists are so estranged from the knowledge of the true God, that when they do speak of him, they speak of him as if he were an idol. They look upon God the Father as if he were a cruel and austere Being, not of himself inclined to be merciful; and they consider that the intercession of Christ, and of the Virgin Mary and other saints, and the sacrifice of the mass, are all necessary to *move him* to mercy. With such a false idea of God in their minds, they cannot worship him otherwise, or from any other motive, than that from which the American Indians worship the devil—that he may not hurt them.

It is not true, even of the sacrifice of Christ, that it moved God to mercy; or that it was necessary for that purpose. Christ did not come into the world, and lay down his life, to purchase or procure the mercy of God for sinners. Such an idea is quite inconsistent with his own explicit testimony, in which he declares his work of saving sinners, to be the work which his Father had given him to do. So far from requiring to be moved to mercy, by the intervention of any agent, divine or human, God is in himself infinitely merciful; and it was in the mercy of God the Father that the salvation of sinners originated. Christ does not tell his disciples, that he came into the world in order to move his Father to be merciful to them. He ascribes the sending of himself, and all the blessings which he brought with him, to the mercy of his Father. "God so loved the world, that he *gave* his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," John iii. 16. "When the fulness of the time was come, God *sent forth* his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law," Gal. iv. 4, 5. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and *sent* his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John iv. 10. And those who are saved by faith in Christ, are taught to trace up their salvation to the mercy of God the Father. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his *abundant mercy*, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead," 1 Pet. i. 3. From such passages as these, and there are many such in the Bible, it is evident that God is not moved to mercy by the consideration of any thing done, or to be done, in heaven or in earth. The Popish doctrine, therefore, is most erroneous. It presents a false view of the divine character: and from such a view of it, nothing but false or idolatrous worship can proceed.

Christ came into the world to do his Father's will. This was to make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness; —to accomplish the salvation of sinners, by giving his life a ransom for them. This was not to procure the mercy of God; but to satisfy his justice, without which, mercy could have no place; for mercy, at the expense of justice, would be inconsistent with all that the Bible makes known to us of the divine character. The justice of God is as essential, and as

amiable an attribute as his mercy; and the law of God is as holy, and as amiable as his gospel. Christ magnified the one which we had broken, and satisfied the other which we had offended. He "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." By giving himself up to the death, he made a full and sufficient atonement for sin; so that our salvation is ascribed to him alone, who hath redeemed us to God by his own blood. The pretended sacrifice of the mass is an impious attempt to rob him of the glory that is his due. It diverts the minds of men from the work of Christ, to the work of a fellow-creature of a priest, who pretends to offer up daily a propitiatory sacrifice, while he has no more power to do so, than he has to create a world.

No. LXIII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25TH, 1819.

MY last Number contains the doctrine of the Church of Rome, on the subject of the Mass, as laid down by the Douay and other Catechisms, and by the supreme authority of the Council of Trent. The Mass is declared to be a real propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead; and if any man shall say otherwise, "let him be accursed." It is the object of the present Number to show that this is a great and fundamental error; that it sets aside the sacrifice of Christ; and that it implies no less than a rejection of Christ himself, as the Saviour of the world; for as there is no other name, so there is no other sacrifice than that of Christ, in virtue of which, a sinner can be saved. If a man trust in the mass-sacrifice for propitiation, he is trusting in something else than the righteousness of Christ; and this is the same thing as to trust in another Saviour.

A propitiatory sacrifice is that on account of which God's anger is turned away from sinners,—that for the sake of which he pardons their sins, receives them into a state of friendly intercourse, and gives them everlasting life. As sinners, we can have no friendly intercourse with our Creator, any more than a band of rebels could have with their sovereign. If it were so that convicted traitors enjoyed the countenance and favour of the King, it would appear to every good subject, that he had compromised the honour of his crown and government; and that, in fact, he encouraged rebellion against his own authority.

Sin places mankind in the state here supposed, in relation to the Creator and Sovereign of heaven and earth. As transgressors of his law, we are rebels against his authority; and to suppose friendly intercourse to exist—to suppose rebels to enjoy his favour, and to have access to him as friends, would appear to all other intelligent creatures, as indeed it would appear to the rebels themselves, a departure from the strictness of his law, a relaxation of the rules of his government, and an encouragement to continue in disobedience. There is no way, therefore, by which it is possible that sinners, such as we all are, by nature and by practice, can be brought to the enjoyment of the divine favour, or into a state of friendship with God, but in the way of a propitiatory sacrifice, offered by one adequate to the undertaking, and accepted by Him whom we had offended by our transgressions.

Such a sacrifice Christ offered upon the cross. "He loved us," says an apostle, "and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet-smelling savour." This sacrifice was fully adequate. As such it was accepted. It derived infinite value from the dignity of Him who offered it; and the fact of such a sacrifice being necessary, in order to the restoration of sinners to favour and friendship with God, shows, in the most striking manner, the evil of sin, the divine abhorrence of it, and that disorder and disobedience cannot be suffered with impunity, under the divine administration.

The sacrifice of Christ consisted in giving himself up to death, and that by the shedding of his blood upon the cross. This was not the mere surrender of natural life. His death contained all that was implied in the sentence of death denounced against the first transgression:—"In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This death consisted in the loss of the image and favour of God, and the effects of his displeasure, which, to immortal creatures, must necessarily be eternal, unless reparation be made equal to the eternal punishment of creatures. This was done in the sufferings of Christ, when he made his soul an offering for sin;—when he bare the sins of his people in his own body on the tree;—when God laid upon him the iniquities of them all; when he poured out his soul unto death, bearing the sins of many, and making intercession for the transgressors. Then God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them: that is, when Christ offered himself in sacrifice to God upon the cross, God was in him, by that sacrifice, making reconciliation, or taking away the grounds of difference, which stood between him and sinners of the human race. In the work of obedience and suffering, of which his death was the consummation, Christ satisfied the justice of God, magnified his law; and showed both his law and justice in characters more glorious, than could have been exhibited by the obedience and the suffering of all creatures put together.

In the sacrifice of Christ, therefore, a ground is laid for the salvation of sinners, consistently with the character of justice, which is as essen-

tial in Deity as that of mercy. Nay, if we can use, with propriety, the language of comparison on such a subject, we may say it is more so; for we can conceive of Deity without mercy, at least without the exercise of mercy; for there was no occasion for this until sin and misery entered into the universe, but it is impossible to have rational conceptions of Deity, without the attribute of justice. A ground being thus laid for the salvation of sinners, by the sacrifice of Christ, it is effectual to the salvation of every one who believes the divine testimony concerning it; for he that believes this, acknowledges himself to be a sinner, and to deserve eternal punishment; he is brought to cordial repentance for his sins; he comes to Christ as a needy suppliant; he trusts in Him alone for pardon and deliverance from sin, as well as from its punishment; and Christ has said, "Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out."

The offering which Christ made of himself to God as a propitiatory or atoning sacrifice, was so excellent, as to supersede all other sacrifice. From the time that mercy was revealed to our first parents, and a Saviour promised to come of the seed of the woman, until this Saviour did come, God was worshipped by sacrifices. Animals were slain by divine appointment; and the believing worshipper, confessing his sins over the head of the bleeding victim, was taught to look for pardon, not for the sake of the blood that was shed by his hands, but through the blood of the Saviour, who was typified and represented by the lamb, or other animal, offered in sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ availed for the salvation of those who believed the promise of his coming, and professed this belief by the offering of beasts, as really as it avails for the salvation of those who believe that he has come according to the promise, and that he has put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. "Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus," Rom. iii. 25, 26. Thus we find that sins which were past, or committed before the coming of Christ, were remitted on account of the propitiation, or sacrifice which Christ made of himself; and that God is just in granting the pardon of sin to them who believe in Christ.

Now, this sacrifice of propitiation being made, there is no need of any other: and we are explicitly taught, in the New Testament, that all others are superseded by it. The sacrifices which were offered according to the law of Moses, as well as those of the patriarchal state, were mere shadows, or typical representations, of the sacrifice of Christ, and could be of no use after the substance, or thing signified, was come. They never were of any use in themselves, but merely as pointing or directing the mind of the worshipper to Christ and his sacrifice; and now they are of no use at all; nay, so far from being useful, the repeating of them would be nothing less than rebellion against God, and a rejecting of the sacrifice which he has provided.

I believe there is nothing laid down in the word of God more plainly than this. It was the principal design of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews to prove to Christians, who were Jews by birth, that the ceremonial part of the law of Moses was abrogated; and he is particularly explicit upon the subject of sacrifice. It is scarcely possible to use words to express more strongly the fact of every divinely appointed sacrifice having terminated in that of Christ, than the apostle uses in the tenth chapter of this epistle. He says "that the law could not, with those sacrifices which were offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect"—"that it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sin." "If such sacrifices could have effected this, they would not have ceased to be offered;" in which words it is implied that they have ceased to be offered. And we shall see, by and by, that this applies not only to the bloody sacrifices under the law, but to every thing that can be named, or thought of, that is of the nature of a propitiatory sacrifice. Such sacrifices have ceased to be offered; and therefore there is no such thing as that which Papists call the sacrifice of the mass.

The apostle declares that the sacrifices which the priests offered daily, could never take away sins; "but this man," speaking of Christ, "after he had offered *one sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool; for by *one offering* he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," verses 12—14. Here every thing that a propitiatory sacrifice could accomplish, is declared to be accomplished by the one offering or sacrifice of Christ. They who are sanctified by the will of God, through the offering of the body of Christ *once*, are declared to be perfected for ever; that is, they have a perfect standing before God, as justified persons, on the footing of what Christ has done for them; for the apostle cites the words of God by Jeremiah,—"Their sins and iniquities I will remember no more;" and then he draws this unavoidable inference, "Where remission of these is, *there is no more offering for sin*," verses 17, 18. Again the apostle declares, in the same chapter, "If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth *no more sacrifice for sins;* but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall

devour the adversaries." That is, if persons will continue to live in sin, after they are told of an atoning sacrifice, and of the mercy of God ready to pardon, and to give a new heart to serve him, they must abide the consequence. They must suffer not only the punishment of their former sins, but also the fearful punishment of that greatest of all sins—despising and rejecting the blood of Christ, which made atonement for sin: For those who reject this sacrifice shall never have another. But the Church of Rome professes to have a sacrifice to offer for sins every day;—a sacrifice, which, they say, profits both the living and the dead, which helps them to mercy, and moves God to mercy, and relieves them, less or more, from the punishment which their sins deserve. There are no words in human language that can express the diabolical wickedness of such a doctrine. It is directly opposed to the plain declaration of God himself, in the words which I have just cited; and it goes to set aside all the faithful threatenings and warnings which are contained in the Bible. Men may live in sin, and die in sin, and yet have the benefit of a propitiatory sacrifice to relieve them from the punishment which they deserve! The church that teaches this is guilty of the murder of all the souls that perish in the delusion.

The great and fundamental error of the Church of Rome, on the subject of the mass-sacrifice, appears in this, that it necessarily implies a rejection of the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. The sacrifice of Christ was a sufficient atonement for sin, or it was not. Those who say that it was not, plainly reject the gospel testimony, and are not to be reasoned with as Christians; but ought at once to be classed with avowed infidels. Those who say that the sacrifice of Christ was a sufficient atonement for sin, and yet plead the necessity of another sacrifice—of a sacrifice daily repeated, in order to move God to mercy, contradict themselves, and without the honesty of the avowed infidel, they put themselves upon the same footing, and equally with him reject the sacrifice of Christ.

To say that a propitiatory sacrifice is still necessary, and that the church offers one every day, is, in plain language, to say that Christ has not done what he professes to have done, and what all his inspired messengers declare that he has done; namely, that he bare the sins of his people in his own body on the tree —that he gave his life for them—and that he is the Lamb of God, who hath taken away the sins of the world. If any other sacrifice be necessary, this is not true; and as the Church of Rome puts forth her sacrifice of the mass as a necessary part of her daily worship, she is guilty of denying Christ and his sacrifice. She says, in effect, Christ has not taken away sin by the sacrifice of himself, for sin still requires to be taken away, and the priest must do it by the sacrifice of the mass. If this be not to set aside the sacrifice of Christ altogether, words have no meaning.

The apostle argues, Heb. x. that by the repetition of sacrifices there was a remembrance of sin made every year. The very circumstance of repetition proved the fact, that such sacrifices could not take away sin. The one sacrifice of Christ is of such efficacy, that, in virtue of it, sin is remembered no more. The transgressions of those who have interest in this sacrifice, are blotted out as a cloud, and their sins as a thick cloud. But the Church of Rome professes to have a sacrifice daily repeated. This, according to the apostle's reasoning, must be a sacrifice that cannot take away sin; but which serves only to bring sin daily to remembrance. Instead of being a sacrifice on account of which God will remember sin no more, and on the ground of which the sinner enjoys peace and pardon, it serves no purpose but to bring sin perpetually to view, and to keep the sinner in continual bondage and uncertainty. It will not mend the matter to say, that the mass is the very same sacrifice which Christ offered upon the cross; for, according to the reasoning of the apostle, if it be a sacrifice that requires to be repeated, it cannot take away sin.

The Church of Rome calls the mass an *unbloody*, as well as a propitiatory sacrifice. Now, these two characters cannot possibly belong to any one sacrifice. There are eucharistical sacrifices which are not bloody; such, for instance, as the apostle speaks of, Heb. xiii. 15, "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." In such passages the word sacrifice is used in a figurative, and not strictly proper sense; but where a sacrifice is said to be propitiatory, it necessarily implies the shedding of blood, that is, the death of the victim; for the apostle tells us plainly, Heb. ix. 22, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." Remission, or pardon of sin, is the fruit of a propitiatory sacrifice; but if there be no remission, there has been no propitiation, for the latter being made, the former is granted as the just reward of it; and there is neither the one nor the other without shedding of blood. Those, therefore, who call the mass an unbloody sacrifice, (and this is the language of most Popish catechisms and books of devotion) virtually give up the doctrine of its being propitiatory, and thus contradict both themselves and the Council of Trent.

By the use of the term *unbloody*, as applied to the sacrifice of the mass, Papists endeavour to evade the charge of cruelty and barbarity, which Protestants bring against them, upon the supposition, that the real body and blood of Christ are offered to God in this sacrifice. It is admitted that Christ, in offering himself to God in sacrifice, suffered inexpressible agony.

He suffered not only from the hands of men, but also from the powers of darkness; and, above all, from the wrath of his Father, on account of the sins of his people, which were laid to his account, and which he assumed as his own, in order that he might make atonement for them, by the shedding of his blood. In this sacrifice of himself he bare the sins of his people in his own body, and suffered the punishment that was due to them. Now, if the mass be the very same sacrifice—if in it Christ be offering himself every day, he must every day undergo the same suffering—he must be every day bearing the sins of his people, and every day enduring their punishment. I know the Church of Rome will not say this. They say, indeed, plainly enough, that the sacrifice of the mass is not a suffering or bloody one. Then I say that it cannot be a sacrifice or offering of Christ at all; for his offering of himself, and his suffering, are represented in Scripture as precisely the same thing.

See what the Apostle says, Heb. ix. 24—26, "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should *offer* himself *often*, as the high priest entereth into the holy place once every year, with blood of others; for then must he often have *suffered* since the foundation of the world; but now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." From this the apostle evidently means to assert, that had Christ been often *offered*, he must often have *suffered*. In his mind, the ideas of offering and suffering, in relation to Christ, were the same thing. Now, since the Church of Rome professes to make an offering and sacrifice of Christ every day, they must put him to death every day, else their notions of sacrifice and offering are quite different from what the word of God teaches.

Besides, the apostle evidently lays great stress on the fact of Christ offering himself *once*, and only once, as his words imply; for he puts a strong negative upon his offering himself often, as a thing that was not to be supposed possible, or at all consistent with the perfection of his sacrifice.

If Christ is to be often offered to God as a propitiatory sacrifice, then it follows, that no one offering of his has yet made propitiation, or atonement for sin. The Bible tells us that he hath made reconciliation by the blood of his cross—that in him we receive the atonement, or reconciliation; but, according to the Church of Rome, this is not true, for the propitiatory sacrifice requires still to be offered. In the Bible we learn that Christ made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness; and that the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake, because he hath magnified the law and made it honourable. This assures us, that in the sacrifice of Christ, the justice of God was satisfied, else he would not have been well pleased with it; and if divine justice was satisfied by the sufferings of Christ *once*, or, which is the same thing, by his *one* sacrifice, it would be unjust to require the repetition of it; but the Church of Rome is guilty of the impiety of charging the Almighty with injustice, by requiring the daily repetition of the sacrifice, by which, when it was offered on the cross, his justice was satisfied, and his law magnified.

The sacrifice of Christ has, farther, this glorious peculiarity, that all the benefits of it are bestowed for nothing; whereas, the Church of Rome makes her members pay immense sums for her mass-sacrifice. It is an old Popish proverb, "No pay no pater noster;" and it is equally true of the benefits of their propitiatory sacrifice—No pay no pardon. The priest professes to offer the body and blood of Christ in sacrifice every day; but no sinner shall receive the benefit of it without money. There is a sordidness and a carnality here, that is absolutely inconsistent with a spiritual and divine religion. Popery is not of God, but of Mammon; and though they have not the image of this idol among their other images, it is evident that he has a greater hold of their hearts than any one of them.

The blessings which flow from the sacrifice of Christ are figuratively compared to the riches of Canaan, as wine, and milk, and pure water; and the needy are invited freely to partake of them. Such is the language of divine liberality: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy and eat, yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price," Isa. lv. 1. Again, "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely," Rev. xxii. 17. This is in the true character of kindness and mercy, and is therefore worthy of God; but to set up spiritual blessings to sale, and to extort money for them, is worthy of the devil.

No. LXIV.

SATURDAY, October 2d, 1819.

Absurd and impious as the Popish doctrine of the mass-sacrifice is, the Douay, and some other catechisms, allege scripture authority for it. I endeavoured in my last Number to show that the Bible knows nothing of any real propitiatory sacrifice but that of Christ: that by the one offering of himself, he accomplished all the purposes of such a sacrifice; that no other is needed, or ever will be offered; and that to

trust in any other, or in the pretended repetition of this, implies no less than a rejection of Christ and his sacrifice of atonement. I proceed, in the present Number, to answer the arguments from scripture, which some Papists use in support of their doctrine; but it must be allowed, that the more wise and candid among them choose to rest it upon the foundation of tradition, and church authority, rather than upon the authority of the Bible.

Great stress is laid upon the fact of Christ being a priest according to the order of Melchisedec. In the Douay catechism, in answer to the question, "Why is it (the mass) a continuance of Christ's sacrifice?" it is answered, "Because Jesus Christ, who is a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec, having offered himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, continues daily to offer himself, by the ministry of his priests, in an unbloody manner, under the form of bread and wine." And in the "Sincere Christian Instructed in the Faith of Christ, from the written Word," a work ascribed to the late Bishop Hay of Edinburgh, we read as follows:—"The second proof from the New Testament is taken from the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where St Paul, citing this prophecy of David, 'The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec,' urges it to show the excellency of the priesthood of Christ above that of Aaron, and to prove that his priesthood shall never end: whereas, that of Aaron being only a figure of his, was of necessity abolished when he came. Now the same Apostle assures us, that every high priest 'is appointed to offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins,' Heb. v. 1. and he repeats it, Heb. viii. 3. and adds as a consequence of this essential office of a priest, 'Wherefore it is of necessity that he should have something to offer.' Seeing, therefore, that the order of Melchisedec consisted in offering bread and wine, and that the great victim offered by Christ, is his own precious body and blood, it is only by offering this under the appearances of bread and wine, by the external ministry of his priest, that he continues a priest for ever of this order."

Here there are some things of which I must take a cursory notice, before I enter upon the exposure of the weakness of the argument drawn from the case of Melchisedec. I object to the expression, Christ offering "himself by the ministry of his *priests*." I have no objection to the word priest, as used to denote the ministers of the gospel, if it be understood merely as a contraction of the word presbyter, which signifies elder; but when the term priest is used, and connected with the act of sacrifice, there is nothing in the New Testament that authorises the use of it, except that all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile, male or female, are declared to be made kings and *priests* unto God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, holy, and acceptable, by Jesus Christ. The New Testament knows nothing of an order of men set apart for the purpose of offering sacrifices, as the sons of Aaron were.—Christ alone is the High Priest of our profession; and his servants in the gospel are ordained, not to offer a sacrifice for sin, but to preach and declare to the world, that the great sacrifice of atonement has been made by Christ himself; and to lead the worship of his churches, by dispensing the ordinances which he has appointed to be observed till his second coming. If the Romish clergy can find in the New Testament any authority for calling themselves priests, in the sense of being sacrificers, otherwise than all Christians are, let them produce it; and it will be well for them if they can make it appear that they are entitled to the appellation, even in the sense in which it is justly applied to the poorest and most illiterate Christian in the world.

I observe, farther, that there is a great fallacy in the argument of the bishop, on the subject of priests and sacrifices. He says indeed truly, that the "apostle assures us, that every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." The apostle is evidently speaking of the priesthood of Aaron, which he declares to have been abolished, or superseded by that of Christ; but our Scottish Bishop would have it understood, that this is a priesthood in the Christian church, continued to the present day, and to be continued to the end of the world; and he will have it, that it is only by the offering of the body and blood of Christ, "under the appearances of bread and wine, by the ministry of *his priest*, that he continues to be a priest for ever of this order;" which is a mere gratuitous assumption; and it proves nothing but that according to the doctrine of this prelate, it must depend upon the good pleasure of such men as himself, whether or not Christ shall continue a priest for ever; for if all the priests should take it into their heads to become Protestants, and cease to offer up Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, Christ would be a priest no longer; for it is *only* by this, (that is, being offered by the external ministry of his priests), that Christ continues a priest for ever, of the order of Melchisedec. Thus, not the Pope of Rome only, but every pedant of a priest, will be found guilty of exalting himself above all that is called God, and that is worshipped.

Who Melchisedec was, I do not pretend with certainty to say, but from his being both a king and a priest, and his name signifying king of righteousness and king of peace, he was an eminent type of Christ, who is a priest upon his throne. Some learned men have been of opinion, that this king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God, was no other than Shem, the eldest son of Noah. From Genesis xi. 11.

we learn by the incidental mention of Shem's age, that he must have been alive at the time when Abraham was met by Melchisedec, on returning from the slaughter of the kings, Gen. xiv. and for more than half a century after. We can scarcely then suppose a man to have been in the world, more venerable, and of greater dignity than Shem, who had been an inhabitant of the old world, a contemporary with Methuselah, who was contemporary with Adam. He had been miraculously preserved with his father and brothers when God destroyed the world by a flood; he was by the time of Abraham the father of many great nations, and he was Abraham's own progenitor. In the patriarchal state, the privilege of the first born was to be both king and priest in the family or tribe. It was this which rendered so valuable that birth-right which was despised by Esau, and forfeited by Reuben. Shem, as the eldest son of Noah, would, of course, inherit the birth-right of the whole human race, but more particularly of his own family and descendants, after the other families and tribes were dispersed on the confusion of tongues at Babel; and we are sure that God honoured him in the same manner as he honoured Abraham, when, he allowed himself to be called the Lord God of Shem, Gen. ix. 26. which expression implies that he was, like Abraham, the friend of God. Though, therefore, it would be presumptuous to speak positively on a subject on which the Bible is silent; yet, as matter of conjecture, I think there is no other individual mentioned in the book of Genesis, to whom the description of Melchisedec can be so properly applied.

I see no serious objection to this opinion in the account which the apostle gives of Melchisedec, Heb. vii. 3. "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life;" for this is spoken of him, not personally, but officially; it is not said of him as a man, but as a priest; and in contrasting his priesthood with that of the order of Aaron, the meaning will more plainly appear. The priests of the order of Aaron were subject to certain laws which were peculiar to that order. It was necessary that they should be of the line of Aaron; therefore, he was their father. There was a law with regard to the marriage of the priests, which was, in effect, a law with regard to their mothers, and their descent. The priests had the beginning of their official days at thirty years of age, and the end of their official life at fifty. All this was peculiar to the order of Aaron; but Melchisedec was not subject to such laws. He did not receive his priesthood, or transmit it like the sons of Aaron; but appears a priest continually, without any record of the commencement or termination of his office, or any law with regard to the one or the other; and he is, therefore, a lively type of Him who continueth a priest for ever, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

I hope this will not appear an idle digression, when it is considered that the church of Rome rests almost the whole weight of her mass-sacrifice, so far as regards scripture authority, upon the recorded fact of Melchisedec having been a priest; of Christ being declared a priest of this order; and the assumption, that Melchisedec made a sacrifice of bread and wine when he met Abraham coming from the slaughter of the kings. It is argued that if Christ be not offering himself daily, under the forms of bread and wine, he cannot be a priest of the order of Melchisedec; and therefore the sacrifice of the mass is a necessary part of the work of Christ as a priest of this order.

The argument, if it can be called an argument, is founded on the words in Genesis xiv. 18, "And Melchisedec, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God." Plain common sense can see no more here than that this venerable priest, knowing that Abraham and his servants, who had been engaged in a very arduous work, were probably both hungry and thirsty, brought out refreshments to them, and blessed him who was their leader, knowing, no doubt, that he had been favoured by God by a revelation from Him, and a promise that the Messiah should come of his seed. From the context we learn that Abraham, on the other hand, was apprised of the office and dignity of him who honoured him with the interview; and he gave him the tithe, or tenth of the spoils which he had taken, which seems to have been understood as the proportion which God, by some intimation of his will, required to be devoted to his service; as we find afterwards, that Jacob, on making a vow to God, Gen. xxviii. 22, promised that of all that he should give him, he would give the tenth to Him in return, which was probably founded upon some known law, or approved practice among the worshippers of God in those days.

Overlooking the true meaning of the passage, the church of Rome fixes her eyes upon the words relating to Melchisedec, "He brought forth bread and wine, *and he* was the priest, (or as the Douay Bible has it, *for* he was the priest) of the Most High God," they argue as if, being a priest, he could have nothing to do with bread and wine, but to make a sacrifice of them; and they infer from this, that Christ, being a priest of his order, must continue for ever to offer sacrifice as he did.

Now I think any person who will be at the pains to read the whole passage, will see that there is not a word of sacrifice in it; and the fact of Melchisedec being called a priest does not necessarily infer that he made a sacrifice; for he exercised the priestly function in "blessing him that had the promises;" and this cir-

cumstance is enough to account for the inspired historian's being so particular, as to give him his designation of priest of the Most High God. But supposing that Melchisedec did make a sacrifice of his bread and wine, what is it to the purpose? It could not be a true figure of the sacrifice of the mass with which Papists compare it; for, according to their own doctrine, Christ never offered bread and wine in sacrifice to God; and the priests at this day do not offer bread and wine, but the real body and blood of Christ. This could have no resemblance in the bread and wine of Melchisedec, for it does not appear that either he or Abraham took them for any thing but bread and wine.

"Wherever," says Mr Payne, late Prebendary of Westminster, "they meet with bread and wine, which are things of great antiquity, they resolve to make a sacrifice of them; especially if there be but a priest by, who has the power of consecrating; for they suppose he must presently fall to his office, and put on his habit, if bread and wine be before him; and that he cannot, like other men, eat and drink them as his ordinary food, or entertain his friends and others with them, except he not only religiously bless them by prayer and thanksgiving, which every good man ought to do, and it was the custom even of the heathens to do this before they did eat, but they must sacrifice and offer them up to God. This they will needs have Melchisedec to do in the xiv. of Genesis, verse 18th. What is there here to shew that Melchisedec offered bread to God? the very word, in their own vulgar Latin, answering to the Hebrew, is *protulit*, he brought forth, not *obtulit*, he offered; and were it the latter, could not he offer bread and wine to Abraham and his company upon a table, but must it necessarily be to God upon an altar." "Bellarmine, indeed, as if he had been by at the entertainment, and had been one of Abraham's soldiers, tells us, they had eaten and drank very well before, and, therefore, desires Melchisedec to excuse them, for they had no need of his bread and wine at that time. *Bellarm. de Miss.* l. 1. c. 6." "Why Bellarmine should cite any father for his opinion, I cannot imagine, since the oldest of them are so much later, I suppose, and at so great a distance, from the time of Melchisedec, that they could know no more what Melchisedec did at that time than we can now, and they are very improper witnesses of a matter of fact that was so long ago, which nothing but the scripture history can give us any account of." *Discourse concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass*, p. 60. That such a great author as Bellarmine should be reduced to the necessity of using such a contemptible argument, in support of the mass-sacrifice, shows, pretty clearly, that no good argument was to be found in the Bible.

Bishop Hay, in his Sincere Christian Instructed, seems to think that he has a strong argument for the sacrifice of the mass, in these words of God to the Jewish priests by the prophet Malachi:—"I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will not receive a gift at your hand; for, from the rising of the sun even to his going down, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is a sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean offering; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts;" Mal. i. 10. "In this glorious prophecy," says the bishop, "three things are to be remarked, (1.) That the sacrifices of the Jews were rejected, —'I will not receive a gift at your hand.' (2.) That in their place a pure offering was to be instituted; and (3.) That this clean offering and sacrifice should be offered among the Gentiles in every place, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, throughout the whole world. All which points to us the holy and pure sacrifice of the mass in the strongest light."

This argument of the grave prelate proves nothing but that what was very weak in itself appeared in a strong light to him. There were many reasons why God should reject the sacrifices of the carnal Jews. They offered the blind and the lame, which would not have been accepted by their governors; but the grand defect in their offerings was, that they had lost sight of their spiritual meaning and design; and supposing the mass-sacrifice to be a divinely appointed one, which it is not, I am afraid there will be found many reasons why it should be rejected as well as the sacrifices of the Jews, especially as it diverts the mind from the only sacrifice for sin with which God is well pleased.

The language of Old Testament prophecy, and sometimes of the New also, was formed upon Old Testament manners, customs, and rites. Priests and sacrifices were associated with religious worship, in the mind of every Jew, insomuch that he had no idea of worship without them. Hence it became customary to speak of spiritual worship in the language of ritual worship; and the words incense, offering, and sacrifice, came to be used to express praises, prayers, and thanksgivings, although unaccompanied by the offering of any victim, or the observance of any external rite. In some cases, indeed, the literal and the figurative language are used in the same sentence; for instance, in the xiv. of Hosea, verse 2, "Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so shall we render the calves of our lips;" the sacrifices are called the calves, because calves were victims usually offered in sacrifices; and by the sacrifices of the lips, we are to understand as the apostle tells us, Heb. xiii. 15, praise to God continually, giving thanks to his name. The prophecy of Malachi, therefore, predicts, not the continuance among the Gentiles, of such sacrifices as those which were offered by the Jews, but the prevalence of spiritual wor-

ship, by a holy people, among the Gentiles, taken out from the world, or separated from it, formed by God, for himself, to show forth his praise. This is accomplished wherever the Holy Spirit makes the reading or the preaching of the word effectual for the conversion of sinners. Those who are converted are declared by the apostle Peter to be "an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ," and he tells us immediately what these sacrifices are, and what is the character of the priests who offer them. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light," 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. Such are the sacrifices, and such are the priests who offer them, in the New Testament church. The sacrifices are called incense and a pure offering, because they are acceptable, and pleasing to God, when presented in the name of Christ, by persons who believe in that blessed name, and whose hearts are purified through the belief of the truth. The prayers and praises of such rise up like incense, and the lifting up of their hands as the evening sacrifice. And every worshipper, that is, every believer in Christ, is himself a priest, because he is consecrated and devoted to the service of God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices.

Bishop Hay seems to lay some stress on the expression "pure offering," which he changes into *clean* offering, and which he contrasts under this character with the Jewish sacrifices, as if they had all been *dirty* ones; and, indeed, such they were in a literal sense: for no priest could kill an animal, and separate the parts, without contracting some defilement; whereas it must be allowed that a Popish priest may offer a wafer, and a cup of wine too, without being under the necessity of afterwards washing his hands; but these ideas are childish and carnal; and ought to have no place in the mind of a person who wishes to understand the nature of spiritual worship. The man who slew a bullock as a sacrifice to God, understanding the meaning of what he did, and believing in the promised Saviour, who was to give himself for the sins of the world, offered a pure, or if you will, a clean offering, though his hands and his clothes were besmeared with the blood of the animal; whereas the *clean* offering of bread and wine, or of the body and blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, which God hath not required, is an abomination in his sight.

There is nothing more common, even, in the New Testament, than to speak of the duties of Christians under the name of sacrifices. "To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased," Heb. xiii. 16. And as the believers in Philippi had been mindful of Paul in his affliction, and had sent something repeatedly to relieve his necessities, he speaks of what they had done to him as "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God," Phil. iv. 18. This was the very thing of which Malachi had spoken; it was incense and a pure offering to God among the Gentiles.

I find I have made a mistake in my last Number, p. 279, which I hasten to correct. By reading the first clause of Heb. x. 2, as an assertion instead of a question, I have given an erroneous view of the apostle's argument. I represented him as saying, if legal sacrifices could have taken away sin, they would *not* have ceased to be offered, that is, they would not have been superseded by another and a better one, because they would, themselves, have effected the purpose of an atoning sacrifice, on behalf of those who were interested in them. But the apostle's meaning is, that if such sacrifices could have taken away sin, they *would have ceased to be offered;* they would not have been repeated on behalf of the same persons; for the worshippers *once* purged, would have had no more conscience of sins. This makes the argument against the repetition of Christ's sacrifice much stronger than I represented it. It is not a sufficient apology for such a mistake, but I mention it as a fact, that my last Number was written amidst innumerable interruptions; and I had not much time for revision.

No. LXV.

SATURDAY, October 9th, 1819.

When Melchisedec brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abraham and his troops, he gave an example of hospitality worthy of one who was a king as well as a priest. The example was honourable to him who gave it, and to him who received the benefit; and this is all that we are taught by the narrative of the inspired historian, so far as relates to the bread and wine which were presented on the occasion. But unless we allow that Melchisedec made a sacrifice of his bread and wine, and a propitiatory sacrifice too, we can find nothing in the circumstance which in the least resembles the sacrifice of the mass; and though the action of Melchisedec had been that of a sacrifice, as he offered nothing but bread and wine, and not the real body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, it would be no example to the Popish priests of the present day, who do not profess to make a sacrifice of the elements, but of the real body and blood of the Saviour.

All Popish writers of any note, for three or four centuries, have laboured hard to press Melchisedec into the service of their church,

and to make his hospitality an act of sacrifice; but they find that this alone will not serve their purpose: they must have the priesthood of Christ, which is declared to be after the order of Melchisedec, to consist principally, if not entirely, in the continual offering of himself, by the hands of his priests, under the forms of bread and wine; and without this they say, he cannot be a priest for ever of the order of Melchisedec. The holy doctors of Rheims, in their annotation on Heb. vii. 17, endeavour to establish this point, upon the authority of ancient fathers, and having lost their temper, they fall a cursing, and say, in relation to such authority, "If nothing will serve our adversaries, *Christ Jesus confound them!* and defend his eternal priesthood, and state of his New Testament established in the same."

There is nothing more common than for persons who have lost temper, to show that they have lost reason too. In their simplicity, the grave doctors, in a note upon another passage of the same Epistle, let out the secret, that the apostle did not teach the doctrine of the mass-sacrifice, or any thing like it, but that it was one of those things which he could not inculcate, on account of the people's want of capacity to learn. I will give their own translation, and their note upon it, Heb. v. 8—11. "And truly whereas he was a Son, he learned by those things which he suffered, obedience: and being consummate, was made to all that obey him cause of eternal salvation, called of God a high priest according to the order of Melchisedec. Of whom we have great speech and inexplicable to utter: because you are become weak to hear." Annotation, "Inexplicable.] Intending to treat more largely and particularly of Christ's or Melchisedec's priesthood, he forewarneth them that the mystery thereof is far passing their capacity, and that through their feebleness in faith, and weakness of understanding, he is forced to omit divers deep points concerning the priesthood of the new law. Among which (no doubt) the mystery of the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar, called MASS, was a principal and pertinent matter; which the apostles and fathers of the primitive church used not to treat of so largely and particularly in their writings, which might come to the hands of the unfaithful, who of all things took soonest scandal of the blessed sacrament, as we see, John vi. He spake to the Hebrews (saith S. Hierom, ep. 126) that is, to the Jews, and not to the faithful men to whom he might have been bold to utter the sacrament. And indeed it was not reasonable to talk much to them of that sacrifice which was the resemblance of Christ's death, when they thought not right of Christ's death itself. Much the apostle's wisdom and silence our adversaries wickedly abuse against the holy Mass."

As I am one of those adversaries, whom nothing that the church of Rome has yet advanced in defence of her mass-sacrifice will satisfy, I suppose I must be classed with those whom the reverend fathers call upon Christ Jesus to confound. But big words are not always great argument; and without the past fear or dread of their great anathema, I maintain that the Church of Rome has not produced the authority of any one of the ancient fathers in support of her mass-sacrifice, as it is defined by the Council of Trent, and taught in her catechisms. If the fathers had been such children as to believe and teach the doctrine of the mass, I would not give a farthing for their authority; and indeed, great men though some of them were, I attach no importance to their writings, further than as they bear witness to matters of fact which came within their own knowledge, and as affording specimens of the literature of their times. In matters of Christian doctrine, which are contained in the Bible, they had not better access to know the truth than we have, and few of them such good opportunities as we possess, with the entire volume of inspiration in our hands, and liberty to study it night and day if we please.

But in point of fact, I have seen nothing quoted from any of the ancient fathers which gives the least countenance to the Popish doctrine of the mass. It is true, some of them use very improper and unscriptural language with regard to the Lord's supper, such, for instance, as, "This tremendous sacrament." "A host or sacrifice that cannot be consumed." "An host which being taken away there would be no religion." "A perpetual oblation and a redemption that runneth or continueth everlastingly." (Chrysostom, Cyprian, and others, as quoted by the Rhemish doctors, on Heb. vii. 17, and other annotations on this Epistle.) Such expressions prove nothing more than that such authors had an erroneous veiw of the subject, and an absurd and fanciful way of speaking of it: but there is not the least hint of their having believed the bread and wine in the eucharist, as the Lord's supper was called, to be converted into the real body and blood of Christ, and as such, offered to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Besides, we ought to be very cautious in receiving any thing which Papists profess to give as the sentiments, or even the words of the ancient fathers. We have in Glasgow a man who professes to know something of literature, who subscribes himself AMICUS VERITATIS, that is, a friend of the truth, and who follows one of the learned professions, who had the effrontery to give to the Glasgow public what he called an extract from the works of Luther, in which he broke off in the middle of a sentence, and substituted a period for a comma; by which means he made Luther speak very differently from what he intended: of which see an exposure in my second Number. This writer had the still greater effrontery to

refer me to the volume and folio of Luther's works, in the library of the Glasgow University, and to challenge me to go and see if Luther did not teach the lawfulness of adultery. I did go, and I found that the pretended friend of truth was a publisher of falsehood; for Luther's words, given entire, bear no such meaning.

Now, if such a circumstance could happen in the nineteenth century, in the enlightened city of Glasgow, what may not have happened in the comparative darkness of the sixteenth century, and in places where few could read? In point of fact there happened innumerable instances of forgery and imposition at an earlier period than this, of which I have in my possession a numerous catalogue, in a volume entitled "Roman Forgeries." * Works were ascribed to certain fathers, and some even to apostles, which such apostles and fathers never saw or heard of: and the works of the fathers which are allowed to be genuine, have been so garbled, as in many instances to conceal their real meaning: of which take the following account from a lively and interesting pamphlet by the Rev. Mr Carlile of Dublin.

Speaking of the authority which the Church of Rome exercises, he says,—"They exercise a singular authority over the writings of the fathers. They have carefully examined them, and made out a list of passages that are to be expunged as erroneous, which they call the *Index Expurgatorius*. They prohibit the publication of these passages; and when they get copies of the fathers within their reach, they correct them as they call it, according to the Index. If any one wishes to see an instance of this with his own eyes, let him examine the copy of the edition of St Hierom's works, published by Erasmus, in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. He will see on the title pages of the different volumes, a certificate, signed in the name of the Inquisitor General, who derives his authority from the Pope, stating that the volume had been examined and corrected according to the Index Expurgatorius; and, on turning over the leaves of the book, he will find passages carefully blotted out with ink. He will also observe, that wherever the name of Erasmus occurs, he is styled a damned author, "*auctor damnatus*;" and the reason of this title is stated to be his editing the book without purgation. There is a kind of melancholy pleasure in seeing the hand-writing of an Inquisitor in the execution of his office, when one is out of his reach—a similar pleasure to what one feels on seeing a tiger in his cage."

I have not quoted Mr Carlile as an authority for the existence of the Index Expurgatorius, for this is known to every man who has read what is called church history; but for the information which he gives of an example of the manner in which books are garbled according to the Index, of which he was an eye-witness, and which may be seen by any person who will visit the library of Trinity College, Dublin. Now, it is very evident that no credit is due to what Popish writers are pleased to give as the words of the fathers; for their works are mutilated by authority, so as not to speak what they did speak. If one of them, for instance, should have called the Lord's supper a sacrifice and have added that he meant it only eucharistically and spiritually, and not as propitiatory; then, according to the rules of the Index, the last clause would be expunged, as not according to the faith of the church; and so, by suppressing the author's explanation of his meaning, they make him speak what he did not mean.

The clergy of the Church of Rome were in possession of almost all the literature in Europe for several centuries. They alone had access to the writings of the fathers; and, in taking copies of them, before the art of printing was invented, it was easy for them to make such additions and omissions as would represent the fathers as speaking whatever they pleased. Or, supposing that the monks and priests of the dark ages were men who had some conscience, and would not be guilty of such imposition, we know what villany was practised in a more enlightened age; when, after the invention of printing, the Church of Rome was publicly and avowedly guilty of the very imposition above mentioned. By her Index Expurgatorius she makes the fathers teach what she pleases, though it should be the very opposite of what they actually did teach; and when an honest man like Erasmus, (honest in this point I mean), takes upon him to publish the genuine works of the fathers, without interpolation or omission, they call him a "damned author."

Without ceremony, therefore, I dismiss the fathers and their opinions, as adduced by the Rhemish translators and other Popish authors, as of no weight whatever with regard to the point in hand; and I shall now take up the argument of the Rhemish doctors, in support of the mass, which they affect to find in the v.th of Hebrews, v. 8—11, above quoted.

They find out that the mass "was a principal and pertinent matter" among those things which the apostle did not think proper to make known to the Hebrew believers. That he did not teach any such thing is certain; and that he had such a thing among many things which were hard to be uttered, and which he forebore teaching, remains to be proved. If the mass sacrifice were, as Papists represent it, the principal part of Christian worship; if it were, as they say, that essential and solemn rite, without which there is no Christianity, it

* See a very copious list of Romish, as well as heathen literary forgeries, in Arlis' Pocket Magazine for last month, p. 144.

would seem very strange that the apostle should be silent on the subject. He must have, in that case, departed from his usual course of integrity and faithfulness. To the Ephesian elders he could say, I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God; and therefore, as he says, he was pure from the blood of all men, Acts xx. 26, 27. But he did not declare the whole counsel of God to the Hebrews; he was not pure from their blood, if he allowed them to remain ignorant of the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, and to die without the benefit of it: nay, if the mass-sacrifice be of the counsel of God, and of such importance as the Church of Rome says it is, then the Apostle must have been guilty of the blood of those who died ignorant of it. But I hope every Christian will pronounce a verdict of not guilty, in favour of the apostle, till it be proved that he received a command from Christ to teach the doctrine of the mass.

But it will perhaps be objected, that the apostle did keep back something which he would have told the Hebrews had they been able to understand it; to which I reply, that no such thing appears from his own words. Concerning Melchisedec and his priesthood, as typical of that of Christ, he had much to say, not inexplicable, as the Rhemists make it, not a thing in itself unintelligible; but a thing difficult to be explained to persons whose minds were so imbued with Jewish prejudices as to give tardy and hesitating admittance to evangelical truths. There are many truths which appear to a mathematician as certain and evident as that two and three make five, which he would find it difficult, and even impossible, to bring down to the understanding of a person who had not studied mathematics. Though the apostle's own mind was perfectly clear upon the subject of Christ's priesthood, and the termination of that of Aaron, he found it hard to bring the subject down to the understanding of persons who were still wishing to cling to the priesthood of Aaron, and other Jewish institutions. Notwithstanding, however, the dulness of their apprehension, the apostle proposes nothing less than to lead them on to perfection; and he does tell them all that he had to say about Melchisedec and his priesthood, in the seventh chapter of his epistle. It is therefore unjust and injurious to the memory of the apostle to say, that he kept any thing back that he was commissioned and inspired to teach.

But this is not all,—the Rhemish doctors represent the holy and faithful apostle as a time-server and a Jesuit; as teaching what was agreeable to the people, and keeping back what he supposed would be disagreeable and unpopular. The apostles and fathers of the primitive church, they say, "used not to treat so largely and particularly (of the mass) in their writings, which might come to the hands of the unfaithful, who of all things took soonest scandal of the blessed sacrament, as we see, John vi." The passage in John vi. does not refer to the sacrament at all, as any one may see who will read it; but supposing the mass to have been a doctrine which the apostle was commissioned to teach, the circumstance of its being the soonest to excite scandal, so far from inducing him to keep it back, would only have led him to give it a more prominent place in his ministrations. He knew that the doctrine of Christ crucified was the most scandalous thing in Christianity. It was a stumbling-block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Gentiles; but instead of keeping it back on that account, he declared that he would know nothing else —he would make it the sum and substance of all his discourses to both Gentiles and Jews. So he did: and had the mass been a part of Christianity, the more it was contemned by the world, the more zealously he would have maintained it. It is said, indeed, that some Jesuits in China, and other heathen countries, conceal those parts of Christianity that are likely to be offensive to those whom they wish to convert; but the apostolical character was not formed upon the model of Jesuitism.

The Rhemish doctors seem to take it for granted, that the apostles were such men as themselves. They did not, they say, treat largely and particularly of the mass sacrifice, lest their writings should come into the "hands of the unfaithful." Here it is insinuated, that they had something to conceal from adversaries; something that would not bear the light. Now, though this may be true of the sacrifice of the mass, it is most untrue of any thing that apostles preached and wrote. They had nothing to conceal. What Christ had told them in private, he commanded them to publish upon the house tops. The apostles addressed themselves to adversaries. They demanded their attention, and invited them to scrutinize in the strictest manner, all that they spake and wrote. Had the mass, therefore, been a part of what they were commanded to teach, they would not have attempted to conceal it from adversaries. It is this smuggling, this attempt at concealment, that has given infidel writers such a footing in countries called Christian. It is the boast of such writers that Christianity cannot bear the light; that therefore it is an imposition; and those who see Christianity only in the light of Popery can scarcely come to any other conclusion. Thus the Church of Rome has added to all her other guilt that of the infidelity which her impieties and absurdities have produced. Infidels are without excuse, because they ought to view Christianity as it is laid down in the word of God; but the Church of Rome has done what she could to keep this from them.

Our grave doctors of Rheims next introduce St Hierom talking as great nonsense as themselves. The apostle, says he, "spake to the

Hebrews, that is, to the Jews, and not to the faithful men to whom he might have been bold to utter the sacrament." The apostle was indeed speaking to Jews,—to Jews who laboured under many mistakes, and who were very dull of apprehension with regard to many things; but who were, upon the whole, not enemies, but friends—real believers in Christ, concerning whom he says, "God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which you have shown to his name," chap. vi. 10. Again, "Ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing that ye have in heaven a better, and an enduring substance," chap. x. 34. This is not such a speech as an apostle would have made to adversaries of the gospel; it was an address to friends, to whom he might, in the fullest confidence, have opened up all the mysteries of the mass, had there been any such mysteries in his time; he might have been as bold as he pleased upon this subject; for he was speaking to faithful men, to whom he says many bold things, and things likely to have been more offensive than the doctrine of the mass, had he been authorised to teach such a doctrine.

"And indeed," say the Rhemish doctors, "it was not reasonable to talk much to them of that sacrifice which was the resemblance of Christ's death, when they thought not rightly of Christ's death itself." They proceed upon the notion that the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to the unbelieving Jews, who were avowed enemies of Christ and his gospel; but this was not the case, as any man may see who reads the epistle itself. The apostle addresses the Hebrews as brethren in the faith of the gospel, notwithstanding their mistakes and imperfections. Indeed there are none of the apostolic epistles addressed to persons of an opposite character. The apostles preached the gospel to sinners of every description, in order that sinners, believing, might be saved; but all their letters are addressed to Christians—to individuals or churches who made a profession of the faith; and who were not therefore understood to be adversaries, to whom it would have been improper or unsafe to intrust any matter of divine revelation, or inculcate any Christian doctrine. It follows, therefore, inevitably, that as the apostles did not inculcate the doctrine of the mass-sacrifice, they had received no such doctrine from Christ; and it must be regarded, as it really is, an impious, human, or perhaps rather diabolical invention.

Protestants are accused of wickedly abusing the apostle's wisdom and silence against the holy mass. It would be well if Papists could find no greater wickedness in Protestants than their not believing what apostles did not teach. On the subject of the mass, it seems by the Rhemish doctors' own account, it was the apostle's wisdom to be silent. Then, one would think, if modern Papists had any wisdom, they would follow his example. The apostles and fathers, they say, did not treat largely on this subject in their writings, lest those should come into the hands of the unfaithful. Why then do Popish writers treat so largely of the mass-sacrifice, and make it the principal part of the Christian religion? Their works are in as much danger of coming into the hands of the unfaithful as the writings of apostles were. The truth is, there is no such doctrine in the Bible, and the holy fathers of Rheims confess as much, when they admit that the apostles were silent upon it.

No. LXVI.

SATURDAY, October 16th, 1819.

Among the numerous errors connected with the doctrine of the mass, there is one which deserves to be exposed by itself. It is that which represents the Romish priests not only as sacrificers, but also as mediators between God and man. The one character might, indeed, be considered as implied in the other, when it is understood that they profess to offer a real propitiatory sacrifice for sins. But they do not leave it to be implied and inferred. They plainly and unequivocally profess to be mediators between God and the people. For this we have the authority of the work entitled "Holy Altar and Sacrifice explained," by "Father Pacificus Baker, of the order of St Francis," which is the most full and particular treatise on the subject of the mass that has come in my way. It is in the form of a dialogue between a teacher and a learner. The teacher having described the use and meaning of the holy vestments, such as the albe, the girdle, the stole, the maniple, and the chasuble, the learner is introduced as saying, "What you have said is extremely *entertaining and instructive;* will you add a word or two concerning the priestly function, and of the respect due to priests? for certainly as they are ministers of God, and *mediators* between him and his people, a proper respect and reverence is due to them from those, in whose regard they are thus consecrated ministers of God." This shows, no doubt, a very amiable and teachable disposition on the part of the young disciple, and a willingness to be initiated into all the duties and reverences which he ought to pay to his ghostly fathers; and the ghostly father of a teacher does instruct and encourage him as follows:—"You say very right: their function being to offer up sacrifices, as all ages and laws declare. There were priests set apart in the law of nature, as well as in the Mosaic institute, whose peculiar business was to offer sacrifices for themselves and others. In the

new law, priests are ordained to offer up the great sacrifice of the mass: for this they are consecrated, and, in their ordination, the bishop says to them, 'Receive power of offering sacrifice in the church, for the living and the dead.' Consequently to this, there is most certainly a due reverence to be paid to them; as, first, on account of their dignity, being God's vicars on earth, his ministers to instruct, direct, and feed his people, as so many sheep committed to their care. Hence, St Austin says, 'There is no greater dignity under heaven, than that of God's priests, consecrated to deliver the heavenly sacraments to us.' Secondly, for their utility, and the benefits we receive by them in their preaching, instruction, and administering the holy sacraments. Thirdly, as they are *mediators between God and us*, their business being to pray and intercede in behalf of the people, according to what God said to Moses and Aaron, speaking of the priests: 'They shall invocate my name upon the children of Israel; and I, the Lord, will bless them,' Num. vi. Lastly, in respect of the power given to them by God, to bind and loose on earth; to forgive sins, in the sacrament of penance, and to consecrate the sacred body and blood of Christ in the holy eucharist. Let me add the words of St Chrysostome: 'What can be said but that all power of heavenly things is granted to them by God; for he says, 'Whose sins ye retain, they are retained, St John xx. What power can be greater than this? The Father gave all power to the Son, and I see this power given to priests by God the Son. St Bernard admires it, saying, 'O excellent, and honourable power of priests, to which nothing in heaven, nothing on earth, can be compared.' Hence the admonition of St Francis, to reverence and honour priests; because, says he, 'They administer the most holy body and blood of Christ, which they alone consecrate, receive, and give to others."

The honours thus conferred upon priests will, I believe, be allowed to be sufficiently extravagant; and it must not be forgotten, that all these high things are said of them by persons who are priests themselves, and who have therefore, an interest in maintaining the dignity of their order. It is here intimated, that the same power which God the Father gave to the Son, the Son has given to the priests; and this will, of course, bring them into the station which they assume, that of being mediators between God and man. I am aware that the third article, in the above extract, taken by itself, might be explained as limiting the meaning of the word to persons who merely pray and intercede for the people; but when the words are taken in connection with the other characters given of the priests, as God's vicars on earth, as consecrated to offer propitiatory sacrifices, and having all power in heavenly things granted to them, it is evident that the author means to represent them as mediators, in a much higher sense of the word.

Now, this is one of the greatest instances of impiety and presumption that perhaps ever entered into the mind of man. We are told, in the New Testament, that there is *one* God, and *one* Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. ii. 5. And the language of the apostle points out as plainly the *one* Mediator to the exclusion of all others, as it points out *one* God to the exclusion of all others. To suppose, therefore, that there are many mediators is as impious as to suppose that there are many Gods. And to be sure, as the Church of Rome has set up gods and goddesses without number, under the designation of saints and saintesses, she may be allowed to multiply mediators, in proportion to the number of the objects of her worship.

He that is a mediator between God and man must stand upon a footing of perfect friendship with God—must never have offended him; else, instead of being a mediator for others, he would require a mediator for himself; and he must be one of infinite dignity and worth, that, in consideration of his obedience and suffering for sin, God will grant pardon to the sinner.—Christ stands upon this footing; and he only is qualified to act the part of a Mediator; but as for the Romish priests, who are they? To say the very best that can be said, they are sinners, like other men; and to say the truth, many of them are greater sinners than others. I could give such an account of them, by writers of their own communion, as would shock every reader; and are these fit to be mediators between a holy God and his sinful creatures? The idea cannot be, for a moment, entertained by any person who knows what sin is, and what holiness is. The Reverend Father Baker himself admits the fact, that some, at least, of his *mediators* are of the character here mentioned; for after uttering a prayer, at least an earnest wish, "that all who are called to this high and sacred dignity, would endeavour to adorn their sublime character by suitable, holy, regular, and exemplary lives; to instruct and incite others to piety and holiness of life, by example as well as by preaching; that the sacred function may not be brought into contempt, and made a ridicule, on account of disedifying and irregular behaviour;" he immediately adds, "May God, of his mercy, remove this evil from the sanctuary." The matter of the prayer is good; but it proceeds upon the fact that such an evil did exist, and was suffered in the church; as is evident indeed from all history: and the Church of Rome actually tolerates and makes herself responsible for the evil, by maintaining that the ministry of the most wicked priests is a good ministry; that the sacrifice of the mass offered by them is a good and propitiatory sacrifice; that, in short, they are mediators between God and men, as

if they were perfectly holy and without sin. This certainly is calculated to bring religion into contempt; to give a false view of the character of God, with whom such men are said to mediate, as if he were such a one as themselves, and would treat with the vilest of the human race. Such a misrepresentation of the divine character is calculated to lead to infidelity, and even to atheism itself.

But, though all the Romish priests were as holy men as Noah, Daniel, and Job, they could not be mediators between God and man. This honour is reserved for Christ alone; and the fact of the priests arrogating it to themselves is one, among a hundred evidences, that they put themselves in the place of the Saviour of the world.

It is no doubt a matter of great importance to the Romish priests to get themselves acknowledged as mediators with God, on behalf of their fellow-creatures; for this flatters their pride, and fills the minds of those who confide in them with the most awful reverence of their sacred function, and leads their blinded followers to yield them implicit obedience. But the principal value of the mass-sacrifice consists in the great sums of money which it brings into the coffers of the church. A writer, whom I quoted in my introduction to this subject, justly remarks, that the revenue arising from the mass alone, enables the church to keep more priests in pay than any prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers. Even in our own country, especially in Ireland, the sums which are raised by Popish priests, from the poor people, by means of the mass alone, are beyond all calculation.

A kind friend in Dublin has favoured me with copies of four authentic documents, which exhibit, in a striking manner, the impositions which are practised upon the poor deluded people, by the priests, by means of their masses, in order to extort money from them. My correspondent, along with these documents, writes as follows:—"A few evenings ago, I had occasion to call upon the Rev. Mr C——, when, among other matters, THE PROTESTANT became the subject of conversation. You are aware of its having excited a considerable interest in this place; and that it is the wish of many, who rejoice to see the cause of the Redeemer triumph over the man of sin, to hear of the prosperity, and continued usefulness of that publication. Mr C. mentioned having received, a few days since, four receipts, granted by priests belonging to some of the chapels in town, to individuals, for money paid by them for masses said in behalf of the souls of their departed friends. These documents, he conceived, might be of use to you, and as he knew I was occasionally writing to my brother in Glasgow, requested me to inclose a few lines to you, with copies of these documents. The original receipts I return to Mr C. who authorises me to say, that they will be at your service at a moment's notice, should you at any time have occasion for them. I copy them precisely as they are written, agreeably to their dates."—"It is difficult, even in this country, to get possession of such strong proofs of the dreadful depravity and wickedness of these blind leaders of the blind; for though we hear from undoubted authority, almost every week, of immense sums being obtained in this way from their deluded votaries; yet I believe they are exceedingly cautious of giving any written acknowledgment for the amount to any but those in whom they think they may, without danger, place implicit confidence." The writer of the above, though a stranger to me, is well known in this city; and the reader may rely upon the accuracy of his statement. The copies of receipts, with which he has furnished me are as follow:—

"Oct. 17th, 1798.—An account of the Masses said for the soul of the late Mrs Monaghan:—

St James' chapel,	50 Masses.....	£2	14	2
Denmark St chapel,	20	1	1	8
Stephen St chapel,	20	1	1	8
Ash St chapel,	20	1	1	8
	110 Masses,.....	£5	19	2

Received the above, in full, this 17th Oct. 1798.
M. M'GUIRE."

"Dublin, July 11th, 1809.—Received from Mrs Mahon, two pounds, three shillings and four pence, for twenty Masses, offered up by the Rev. Gentlemen of St James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mr Timothy Mahon.
£2 : 3 : 4. JAS. JOS. CALLAN."

"12th Oct. 1809.—Received from Mrs Mahon, two pounds, three and four pence, for twenty Masses, said by the Rev. Gentlemen of St James' chapel, for the soul of Mrs Mary Monaghan.
JAS. JOS. CALLAN."

"Dublin, Oct. 31st.—Received from Mrs Mahon, three pounds, eight and three pence, for sixty Masses, offered up in St James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mrs Monaghan.
£3 : 8 : 3. JAS. JOS. CALLAN."

These documents will show in what manner our poor deluded fellow subjects in Ireland are cheated out of their money, by their ghostly guides. The apostle Peter, or St Peter as they call him, is one of the great idols of the Church of Rome; but if their practice be right, the apostle was wrong, when he reproved Simon Magus for supposing that the gift of God was to be purchased with money. In the Church of Rome there is no *gift* at all; every thing is matter of purchase; and nothing is to be had without money. The gospel, in-

deed, declares pardon and peace to the soul of every believer, as the free gift of God by Jesus Christ; but the Romish priests do most impudently place themselves between God and men as mediators, and their mediatorship consists chiefly, if not entirely, in receiving money for that which God has promised to bestow freely. Were the same thing to take place in the affairs of this life;—were a rich man, for instance, to invite all the poor of his neighbourhood to come to his hall, and receive a dinner every day for nothing; and were his steward to admit none but those who paid him a price for their dinner, would not all the world cry out against the extortion, injustice, and cruelty, of such a hard-hearted wretch, and reckon that Botany Bay was too good for him? Yet the case which I have supposed is nothing, in point of cruelty and villany, when compared with that of the Romish priests, who set a price upon those spiritual blessings which the Almighty gives without money and without price.

From the tenor of the above receipts it appears, that money was demanded and paid for the purpose of procuring, by means of a number of masses, repose to the souls of certain persons deceased. Had these persons died in the faith of Christ, their souls would have been at rest with him in heaven; and to extort money from their surviving relatives, for the purpose of procuring them rest, was downright robbery. If they did not die in the faith of Christ, but in their sins, it was not in the power of all the priests in Europe, although fee'd by all the wealth of the Indies, to procure one moment of rest to their souls; and, therefore, on this supposition, as well as upon the other, to extort money from surviving friends for the purpose, was downright robbery. Our Glasgow Papists, and their ghostly guides, know better than I can tell them, how much money is picked out of the pockets of the poor every week, under the false pretext of procuring repose to the souls of their deceased friends, by means of masses said in their behalf, which are of no more value, and have no more virtue, than the dust of their chapel would have, if offered as the price of their salvation.

If the mass were really a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead as well as the living, one would expect that one mass would be enough for one dead person. It would be unreasonable, and even unjust, to exact more than that which made propitiation, or atonement, for the sins of the individual in whose behalf it was offered; but, in the case of Mrs Monaghan, above cited, we find no fewer than one hundred and ten masses, said in different chapels; that is, one hundred and ten propitiatory sacrifices offered up for the repose of the soul of one person! What can be the meaning of this? Truly nothing less than that the priests might receive 110 British shillings, each equal to thirteen pence Irish, which, I suppose, is the lowest price of such merchandise in Dublin. Mrs Mahon seems to have paid twice as much when she bespoke only twenty at a time, which would be considered only a retail job; but when she engaged the wholesale number of sixty, she got them for the slump sum of £3 : 8 : 3d. which is only a trifle more than a shilling a piece. Even this would likely be considered a high price by such foreign merchants as knew of a cheaper market; and I have been informed that a certain Irish gentleman, who had a correspondent in Lisbon, applied to him for a quantity of masses for the soul of a deceased friend, and that he got them 50 per cent. cheaper than they could be had in Dublin; which, I suppose, was owing to the cheapness of labour in Lisbon; priests being there, as weavers are at present in Scotland, too numerous to admit of their being paid a comfortable price for their commodity.

The friends of Mrs Monaghan seem to have sought for the blessing of peace to her soul, upon the same principle as Balak, king of Moab, sought for curses upon the children of Israel. They made trial of four different places; being doubtful, I suppose, that they would not find what they wanted at any one place. This is another of the cheats which the priests practise, in order to rob the poor people of their money. They hold out the accumulated merit of a great many masses, said at many different holy places; but they take care never to tell how many will be sufficient to relieve a soul. Like the grave and the horse leech, they never have enough; and their deluded adherents can never be sure, that the object for which they have given so much money is accomplished. If the soul of Mrs Monaghan required 110 masses, how could Mrs Mahon satisfy her conscience with no more than twenty for her husband, or her son, Timothy? In short there are no limits to the number of masses that a soul may require, but the limits of the purses of surviving friends; and no man can be sure that he has obtained the relief of a soul from purgatory, while he has a shilling left, and a priest to receive it.

In Popish countries, such as Spain, when a person is dangerously ill, the priests and friars beset the house, like so many harpies, waiting till they know the event; and if the person die, they assail the chief of the family with petitions for saying masses for the dead. If the family be rich, the custom is to distribute among the convents and parishes a thousand or more masses, to be said on the day of the burial. "When the Marquis of St Martin died," says Mr Gavin, in his Master Key, "his lady distributed a hundred thousand masses, for which she paid five thousand pounds sterling, besides a thousand masses which she settled upon all the convents and parish churches,

to be said every year for ever, which amounts to a thousand pistoles a year."

But not satisfied with cheating the people out of their money, the priests cheat them also out of the masses, which they have bargained and paid for; for it often happens that they receive more money for masses in a day, than they can say in a month. But they have recourse to a special privilege which the Pope has granted, and which the priests and friars keep as a secret among themselves. Mr Gavin confesses that, while he was among them, he never saw the privilege or bull to that effect, though he wished to see it; but it was a thing secretly understood among his brethren, that they had authority from the Pope to make one mass serve for a hundred. This was called a *centenaria missa*; and the mass which was said in name of the hundred, was understood to have as much efficacy as another one said a hundred times. I have no doubt this was actually the case; and the Pope, by another act of his spiritual power, could easily make one mass serve for a thousand. But it would not do to make this public; for the people give their money under a conviction, that the masses which they pay for, are said in full tale, and to undeceive them would have a deplorable effect upon the ghostly exchequer.

By the author of the "Master Key" we are informed farther, that the dealers in masses keep a sort of stock account, like that which our dealers in foreign and British spirits keep with the Excise Office, out of which, by means of a permit, a quantity may be transferred from one person to another. "If somebody dieth," saith Mr Gavin, vol. 1. page 136, "and the executors of the testament go to a father prior, and beg of him to say a thousand masses, he gives them a receipt, whereby the masses are said already; for he makes them believe that he has more masses said already by his friars to his own intention; and that, out of that number, he applies a thousand for the soul of the dead person."

No. LXVII.

SATURDAY, October 23rd. 1819.

I have received, from some of my readers, pretty broad hints that they are tired of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass; and I will not conceal from them the fact, that I am tired of them too. There is so much of absurdity and impiety involved in the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome, on these two points alone, that there is no more necessary than a small portion of common sense, and knowledge of the Bible, to convince any one who turns his attention to it, that the whole system is antichristian, and no better than mere heathenism. This appears so plainly to my intelligent readers, that they can scarcely perceive the necessity or propriety of such *lengthy* dissertations as I have written on these subjects; but I hope such persons will consider the condition of many Papists who read my papers, and of many Protestants, not so well informed as themselves, who need to be taught the very first principles of Christianity, which are closely connected with the subject of my late Numbers; and though there are many who know these things as well or better than I can tell them, yet, for the sake of others, who have not such knowledge, and who require line upon line, and precept upon precept, they will bear with what I have written, though it should seem to them more than enough, and though I may have made many repetitions.

I have now done with the doctrinal errors of the mass; but, there are some things of a practical nature, which are worthy of being mentioned. These are things of which Protestants know but little, but with which Papists are perfectly acquainted. The latter will, therefore, I hope, bear with me, while I give a detail of some particulars, of which they do not need to be informed. They cannot but consider this a very reasonable request, seeing that, for their sakes, I have imposed upon my Protestant readers the task of perusing some long dry dissertations, which are no better than what they hear from the pulpit every Sabbath day.

In my last Number, I alluded to the Reverend Father Baker's explanation of the use and meaning of the sacred vestments, which are used in the celebration of mass. I introduced a docile young Papist, as acknowledging that this was "extremely entertaining and instructive." Now, I wish my Protestant readers to know and understand what sort of things they are by which Papists are entertained and instructed; and, I am verily persuaded, I shall be told by not a few, that they never heard of such things before.

Know then, that the vestments, or robes, with which the priests adorn their persons, on saying mass, are of five different colours, white, red, green, purple and black; and these colours are used on the following occasions: "White is used on all the feasts of our blessed Lord, blessed lady, bishops, confessors, confessors not bishops, abbots, virgins, and holy women, not martyrs, on the feasts of dedication of churches, within the octaves of festivals, when the mass is said of the octave, on all Sundays, from Easter inclusive, to Pentecost exclusive; on Trinity Sundays, and till the octave of *Corpus Christi*.

"Red is used on the vigil of Pentecost, and during the octave, Trinity Sunday excepted. On the feasts of the holy cross, of apostles

and martyrs, and octave masses of the Holy Ghost.

"Green is used on all Sundays, from Trinity Sunday till Advent, and on the Sundays after the octave of the Epiphany, when mass is said of the Sunday: but, on Sundays within any octave, the colour is of the respective octave. Green is also used on all Ferias, or week days, unless within octaves or Sundays, from Septuagesimo till Thursday in holy week, and during Advent.

"Purple is used on all Sundays in Advent, and on all Sundays from Septuagesimo till Palm Sunday, inclusive; as also on all Ferias during those times; and on all vigils and fasting days, when the mass is of them.

"Black is used on Good Friday, All Souls' day, and while the mass is said for the dead."

To all this, the pupil, whose name is Theotime, replies: "Hitherto you have perfectly satisfied me; tell me now how many are the particular vestments the priest is clad with, how they are called, and the signification of them?"

In reply, says the teacher, Theophilus, "speaking of those which are common to all priests, when they celebrate mass, there are six:—1. The Amice. 2. Albe. 3. Girdle. 4. Maniple. 5. Stole. 6. Chasuble, which is usually called the vestment, as being the chief and principal; and is also styled the priests' vestment, because none but priests use it. The *amice* is a piece of linen cloth with two strings. The priest puts it over his shoulders, on which account, St Bonaventure, with the Greeks, calls it *hummeale*, a covering for the shoulders; and is tied by the two strings, round the middle of the priest's body. Its name, *amice*, is from the Latin word *amictus*, or covered. Being clean and white, signifies, according to Rebanus, the purity and cleanness of heart with which the priest ought to go to the holy altar; and represents the linen with which the Jews blindfolded our Saviour, saying, in derision, "Prophesy unto us, O Christ! who it is that struck thee?" St Luke, chap. xxiii.

"The *albe* is a long white linen garment, representing the white robe which, by Herod's command, was put upon our Saviour, in mockery and derision. It is called *albe*, from alba, which, in Latin, signifies white, or whiteness. Frequent mention is made, in the Old Testament, of white linen garments made for, and used by the Jewish priests. The use of the albe in the Christian church, is as ancient as the apostles' times. St Jerome affirms, that St James used linen vestments, when he celebrated mass. The whiteness of the *albe* signifies continency and chastity; and is a memento, to put the priest in mind of the unspotted purity of life and manners he ought to be adorned with.

"The *girdle*, wove or made of linen thread, is to tie the albe about the priest's body, that it may hang with proper decency; and represents the cords with which our blessed Lord was bound, when seized on by the Jews; and may not unfitly signify the cords of love and duty with which all, especially priests, ought to be close bound to the service of God.

"The *maniple*, which the priest puts on his left arm, represents likewise the cords or binding of our blessed Lord. The priest, before he puts it on, kisses the cross which is in the middle of it, as offering himself to attend our Saviour in his passion, with a will and desire to suffer with him.

"The *stole*, from the Latin word *stola*, is an ornament of dignity and power; and, as such, it is taken, in the sacred text, wherein it is said, that when Pharaoh would honour Joseph, he put on him a stole; and Mordecai was clothed with a stole for his greater honour. The priest, when he exercises his functions, puts on a stole, as representing his dignity, quality, and the power of binding and loosing he hath received from Christ. It also signifies the cord wherewith the Jews dragged * our blessed Saviour to crucifixion.

"The *chasuble* is the last vestment the priest uses, and is put over all the rest, hanging down before and behind. It represents the scarlet, or purple robe, put upon our Saviour by the soldiers, in scorn and derision Before, it has a pillar, representing the pillar to which Christ was tied, during his flagellation. Behind, it has a cross, which signifies the cross which our blessed Lord carried to mount Calvary. This vestment is appropriated to priests alone, and is by them used only when they say mass. The amice, the alba, and maniple, being made use of by subdeacons and deacons. These vestments, which the ministers of the altar are vested with, when they go to celebrate and offer up the adorable sacrifice, are deservedly very rich on great solemnities; but, at all times, ought to be whole, clean, and decent. The priest thus vested, and going to mass, represents the person of Jesus Christ going to his sacred passion. The consideration of which ought to fill both priest and people with sentiments of the profoundest respect and veneration towards the sacred mysteries which one is to celebrate, and the other attend to," &c. &c.

If nobody else should thank me for this long extract, I am surely entitled to the gratitude of those citizens of Glasgow, and those strangers, who lounge away the Sabbath in the Popish chapel, in Clyde-street. I have often heard of such persons complaining that they could not understand the meaning of the vari-

* Christ was not *dragged*; he went voluntarily to suffering and death; but it seems as if it were not possible for Papists to give a just statement of any Scripture fact or doctrine.

ous pieces of gorgeous finery, with which the priests decorate their great and *sacred* carcases. I advise all, who shall hereafter attend mass, in said chapel, to buy this Number of THE PROTESTANT, and take it with them, as they do the play-bill, when they go to the theatre, that they may know the different pieces as they come to be represented.

The reverend Franciscan divine, from whose work I have quoted so largely, argues the propriety of using the above vestments, from the fact of similar ornaments having been divinely appointed to be worn by Aaron and his sons. "God himself," says he, "commanded Moses to make various kinds of garments for Aaron, and the other inferior priests and Levites; as the ephod, rationale, tunic, linen garments, girdle, and mitre. Those for the high-priest were to be exceeding rich and magnificent. If this was done in the old law, for the greater splendour of those legal sacrifices, wherein all those things were but types and figures, with how much more reason ought the priests of the new law to have vestments, or garments, suitable to their function and ministry, in offering up the true and real sacrifice ordained by Jesus Christ himself?"

The proper answer to this imposing question is that with which an apostle hath furnished us, that such things, being weak and unprofitable, were abolished at the coming of Christ. They are, by this apostle, called weak and beggarly elements; he calls the persons foolish who sought to put themselves again under the bondage of such things; and, therefore, what sort of fools must they have been, in his esteem, who thought that the New Testament worship, in which the believer is invited to contemplate the fulfilment of legal types and shadows, should retain such shadows and types with an increase of splendour? Upon the same principle, the whole system of Judaism ought to be retained in the Christian church, and not only retained, but greatly augmented in the number and variety of rites and ceremonies. This, indeed, is what the Church of Rome professes to do; but, in doing so, she makes it manifest that she has departed from the simplicity and spirituality of evangelical worship.

The Mosaic dispensation exhibits the church of God in a state of nonage; as a son under tutors and governors, until the time appointed by the father. In this state, God thought proper to appoint certain carnal things, as the means of giving knowledge of spiritual things —to instruct the children of Israel in the spiritual and heavenly glory of Christ's priesthood, by the rich attire, the breastplate, the mitre, and the urim and thummim of the high priest; but these things could be of no use after Christ came, and had fulfilled all that was signified by them, and had given his disciples more perfect knowledge of himself directly, than they could possibly acquire through the medium of such shadows. To a child at school, the horn-book, or A, B, C, is a thing of great value; but of what use is it when the child has become a man, and a man of literature and science? According to the Popish mode of arguing, it would be of more importance than ever. If it was thought necessary to give the child a horn-book finely gilt, when he was a child, how much more now, when he has become a learned man, ought we not to give him a horn-book, adorned with gold and precious stones? This is precisely the argument which Papists use for imitating and exceeding the splendour of Jewish worship.

Before I leave Father Pacificus Baker, I must point out the gross imposition which he practises upon his readers, when he represents the apostle James, as having used linen vestments, when he celebrated mass. Whether St Jerome said so, or not, is of no importance; for he lived so many ages after, that he could know nothing, with certainty, of the apostle's practice, but what he found in the New Testament, that is, nothing more than we know; and we know for certain, that there is nothing of either the mass, or the white vestments, in the apostolic record. In another section, the author speaks of the liturgy of St James, which contains the order of the mass, and many other things which favour Popery; but it is a bare-faced forgery, the work of a later age, and known to be such by Popish writers themselves, though they do not scruple to take advantage of it, and things like it, when it serves the purpose of giving to the ignorant people the semblance of apostolical authority for their errors and superstitions. This, and other such pieces of imposition, may occupy a Number or two of my work, at a future period.

I proceed now to give my Protestant readers some farther information about things which they know not, though they are quite familiar to Papists. Let it be remembered, that a small piece of bread in the form of a wafer, is the real Christ of the Church of Rome; this is their God and Saviour, and the object of their worship; but they have never yet found out a way to preserve their Christ from seeing corruption. In summer, their host will corrupt, and breed worms in a few days; and in order to prevent this, they consecrate every week, in the hot season; but only once a fortnight in winter. After the host has begun to corrupt, even after it has begun to breed worms, the priest must eat it, if his stomach will let him; but if he find it impossible to swallow the real body of his Christ, in this state, it is disposed of in the following solemn manner, of which Mr Gavin was an eye-witness:—"I say," says he, "that a priest did not eat the host and worms, as I saw myself, on pretence of the loathing of his stomach, and after the mass was ended, he carried the host, two priests accom-

panying him with two candles, and threw it into a place called piscina, a place where they throw the dirty water after they wash their hands, and which runs out of the church into the street. What can we say now? If the worms and corrupted host is the real body of Christ, see what a value they have for him, when they throw it away, like dirty water; and if that host comes out of the running piscina into the street, the first dog or pig passing by, which is very common in Spain, may eat it."—*Master Key*, vol. 1. p. 145.

In general, however, they are very careful to keep the host out of the reach of dogs; and if it should, by accident, happen that a dog should eat a holy wafer, it is considered such a piece of sacrilege, that his owner must pay dearly for his trespass, of which take the following example from the work just quoted, page 147:—

"In the Dominican's convent, it happened that a lady, who had a lap-dog, which she always carried along with her, went to receive the sacrament, with the dog under her arm, and the dog looking up and beginning to bark, when the friar went to put the wafer into the lady's mouth, he let the wafer fall, which happened to drop into the dog's mouth. Both the friar and the lady were in deep amazement, and confusion, and knew not what to do; so they sent for the reverend father Prior, who did resolve this nice point upon the spot, and ordered to call two friars and the clerk, and to bring the cross and two candlesticks, with candles lighted, and to carry the dog in form of procession into the vestry, and to keep the poor creature there, with illuminations, as if he was the host itself, till the digestion of the wafer was over, and then to kill the dog, and throw it into the piscina. Another friar said it was better to open the dog immediately, and take out the fragments of the host; and a third was of opinion that the dog should be burnt upon the spot. The lady, who loved dearly her Cupid (this was the dog's name) intreated the father Prior to save the dog's life, if possible, and she would give any thing to make amends for it. Then the Prior and friars retired to consult what to do in this case, and it was resolved that the dog should be called for the future, *El Perillo del Sacramento*, that is, the Sacrament's dog. 2. That if the dog should happen to die, the lady was to give him a burying in consecrated ground. 3. That the lady should take care not to let the dog play with other dogs. 4. That she was to give a silver dog, which was to be placed upon the tabernacle where the hosts are kept. And, 5. That she should give twenty pistoles to the convent. Every article was performed accordingly, and the dog was kept with a great deal of care and veneration. The case was printed, and so came to the ears of the Inquisitors, and Don Pedro Guerrero, first Inquisitor, thinking the thing very scandalous, sent for the poor dog, and kept him in the Inquisition, to the great grief of the lady. What became of the dog, nobody can tell."

I conclude this Number, and, I hope, this subject with the following literal translation of a few passages of the "Roman Missal," as given by Lord Kames, in his "Sketches of the History of Man," vol. iv. book iii.:—

"Mass may be deficient in the matter, in the form, and in the minister. First, in the matter. If the bread be not of wheat, or if there be so great a mixture of other grain that it cannot be called wheat bread, or if any way corrupted, it does not make a sacrament. If it be made with rose-water, or any other distilled water, it is doubtful whether it makes a sacrament or not. Though corruption have begun, or though it be leavened, it makes a sacrament, but the celebrator sins grievously.

"If the celebrator, before consecration, observe that the host is corrupted, or is not of wheat, he must take another host; if after consecration, he must still take another and swallow it, after which, he must also swallow the first, or give it to another or preserve it with reverence."——

"If any remains of meat, sticking in the mouth, be swallowed with the host, they do not prevent communicating, provided they be swallowed, not as meat, but as spittle. The same is to be said, if, in washing the mouth, a drop of water be swallowed, provided it be against our will."——

"If any requisite be wanting, it is no sacrament; for example, if it be celebrated out of holy ground, or upon an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three napkins; if there be no wax candles; if it be not celebrated between day-break and noon; if the celebrator have not said matins with lauds; or if he omit any of the sacerdotal robes; if these robes and the napkins be not blessed by a bishop; if there be no clerk present to serve, or one who ought not to serve,—a woman, for example; if there be no chalice, the cup of which is gold, or silver, or pewter; if the vestment be not of clean linen, adorned with silk in the middle, and blessed by a bishop; if the priest celebrate with his head covered; if there be no missal present, though he have it by heart.

"If a gnat or spider fall into the cup, after consecration, the priest must swallow it with the blood, if he can; otherwise, let him take it out, wash it with wine, burn it, and throw it with the washings on holy ground. If poison fall into the cup, the blood must be poured on tow or on a linen cloth, remain till it be dry, then be burnt, and the ashes be thrown upon holy ground. If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted.

"If the blood freeze in winter, put warm cloths about the cup: if that be not sufficient, put the cup in boiling water. If any of Christ's

blood fall upon the ground by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, and the place scraped; the scrapings must be burnt, and the ashes buried in holy ground.

"If the priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, it must be licked up most reverently. If a nausea prevent that to be done, it must be kept till it be corrupted. If the species do not appear entire, let the vomit be burnt, and the ashes thrown upon holy ground."

It will be expected, perhaps, that I should give a more elegant finishing to a subject that has served me so long; but, as transubstantiation and the mass are abomination all over, I shall leave the above disgusting directions, without comment, to have their own effect upon the reader's mind; and it will be well for him if nothing but his mind be affected by the nausea.

No. LXVIII.

SATURDAY, October 30th, 1819.

I HAVE discussed, at great length, the idolatry of the Church of Rome, as it consists in worshipping saints, images, and relics, and particularly the consecrated wafer, which, she says, is really her Christ and Saviour, and which she worships under this character. I come now to show the conformity of Romish idolatry with that of the heathens of ancient Rome, and other heathens, whose rites were adopted by what has falsely been called Christian Rome, and which, at this day, constitute the leading parts of Popish worship, and are that by which the Church of Rome is chiefly distinguished from other churches, at least so far as relates to external rites and ceremonies.

Three centuries had not elapsed, when the Church in Rome, whose faith, in the apostles' days, was spoken of throughout the whole world, had become so deplorably degenerate, that she readily received into her bosom persons who had no faith at all; mere worldly men, who were heathens both in principle and practice, and who were quite incapable of making a common cause with the disciples of Christ, or maintaining the purity of Christian worship. Such persons, instead of seeking to promote the glory of Christ, and the salvation of men, would follow the natural bias of their own minds. Christianity was, by this time, rising into some degree of respectability in the world. There were many great men who professed to be Christians; and there were many, no doubt, ready to join them, if they could but satisfy themselves that, by doing so, they would promote their interest. When Constantine, called the Great, took Christianity under his protection, and gave it a legal establishment, it became very evident that the way to rise in the world, was to be of the emperor's religion. Thus many made a profession of Christianity who were really heathens, and whose influence, after being admitted into the church, was exerted to reduce Christian worship to a conformity with that of the heathen temple.

The spirit of proselytism still continued; but it was no longer a desire to win souls to the Saviour; but merely to gain men to the church; and if they were great men, and noble princes, the leading men in the church were ready to concede almost any thing for the sake of securing them. It was no longer necessary that men should deny themselves, and take up the cross, and become followers of Christ, in lowliness of mind, deadness to the world, and liveliness towards God and spiritual things. It was enough that they submitted to baptism, that they took the name of Christian, and that they paid due respect to the image of the cross. They retained all their heathenish notions and affections; and to keep them quiet in their Christian profession, it became necessary to indulge them in their heathen practices and modes of worship. The Church, by degrees, became full of such members; and her worship became that which is practised in the Church of Rome to this day,—no better than the profane mummery of heathen superstition.

I shall proceed to prove this by a number of instances, furnished by one who was an eye-witness of the different parts of Romish worship, as practised in Rome itself; and whose extensive and intimate acquaintance with the writings and practices of ancient heathens, qualified him, in an eminent degree, for tracing the Romish rites to their heathen original. I refer to Dr Middleton, whose "Letter from Rome" supplies abundant materials for this part of my subject. The remaining part of this Number shall be occupied by extracts from this letter. I do not believe the work is much known among the readers of my Papers, and therefore I make no apology for treating them with so much matter that is not original. I am following the example of a writer in The Times newspaper, under the signature of Ignotus, who, about two years ago, published a number of letters in that paper, and afterwards in the form of a three shilling pamphlet, of which Middleton's Letter is confessedly the basis:—

"Many of our divines have, I know, with much learning and solid reasoning, charged, and effectually proved, the crime of idolatry on the Church of Rome: but these controversies (in which there is still something plausible to be said on the other side, and where the charge is constantly denied, and with much subtlety evaded) are not capable of giving that conviction, which I immediately received from my senses—the surest witnesses of fact, in all cases; and which no man can fail to be furnished with, who sees Popery, as it is exercised

in Italy, in the full pomp and display of its pageantry; and practising all its arts and powers without caution or reserve. The similitude of the Popish and pagan religion seemed so evident and clear, and struck my imagination so forcibly, that I soon resolved to give myself the trouble of searching it to the bottom; and to explain and demonstrate the certainty of it, by comparing together the principal and most obvious parts of each worship: which, as it was my first employment after I came to Rome, shall be the subject of my first Letter."——

"The very first thing that a stranger must necessarily take notice of, as soon as he enters their churches, is the use of incense or perfumes in their religious offices: the first step which he takes within the door, will be sure to make him sensible of it, by the offence that he will immediately receive from the smell, as well as smoke of this incense, with which the whole church continues filled for some time after every solemn service. A custom received directly from paganism; and which presently called to my mind the old descriptions of the heathen temples and altars, which are seldom or ever mentioned by the ancients without the epithet of perfumed or incensed."—Pages 132—134, 4th ed. I forbear giving the authorities, and the Greek and Latin quotations, which the author gives in the margin. Readers who wish to see these, will have recourse to the work itself.

"In some of their principal churches, where you have before you, in one view, a great number of altars, and all of them smoking at once with steams of incense, how natural is it to suppose one's self transported into the temple of some heathen deity, or that of the Paphian Venus, described by Virgil?

> "Her hundred altars there with garlands crown'd,
> And richest incense smoking, breathe around
> Sweet odours," &c.

"Under the pagan emperors, the use of incense, for any purpose of religion, was thought so contrary to the obligations of Christianity, that, in their persecutions, the very method of trying and convicting a Christian, was by requiring him only to throw the least grain of it into the censer, or upon the altar," page 135. This was, it seems, the test of a man's being, or not being, a Christian. How few Protestants, in the present day, would bear the test? To throw the smallest grain of incense, that is, to give the smallest possible degree of countenance to idolatrous worship, was equivalent to a renouncing of Christianity: yet, how many of our citizens are there, who reckon themselves very good Christians, and who can, without scruple, voluntarily join in the service of the idol's temple, in Clyde-street, and snuff up, with the utmost complacency, the fumes of incense which are offered to the Popish idol.

Our author proceeds:—"Under the Christian emperors, on the other hand, it was looked upon as a rite so peculiarly heathenish, that the very places or houses, where it could be proved to have been done, (*i. e.* where incense had been offered,) were, by the law of Theodosius, confiscated to the government.

"In the old bas-reliefs, or pieces of sculpture, where any heathen sacrifice is represented, we never fail to observe a boy in a sacred habit, which was always white, attending on the priest, with a little chest, or box, in his hands, in which this incense was kept for the use of the altar. And, in the same manner still in the Church of Rome, there is always a boy in surplice, waiting on the priest at the altar, with the sacred utensils, and among the rest the thuribulum, or vessel of incense, which the priest, with many ridiculous motions and crossings, waves several times, as it is smoking, around and over the altar in different parts of the service."—Page 136.

Dr Middleton's Letter, when it was first published, excited almost as much rage and wrath among the Papists of his day, against the unhappy author, as are excited, at this day, against THE PROTESTANT. The author of a work, entitled "The Catholic Christian Instructed," thought himself called upon to write something that should pass with his brethren for a Reply to the obnoxious Letter; but after a great deal of quibbling and vapouring, he left the Letter just as he found it, without invalidating any material fact contained in it. This writer attempts to vindicate his church from the charge of conformity with heathenism in the matter of offering incense, because this was used, according to divine appointment, in the service of the temple of God under the Mosaic dispensation: to which Middleton replies, in a preface to his fourth edition:—"Should we grant him all he can infer from this argument, what will he gain by it? Were not all those beggarly elements wiped away by the spiritual worship of the gospel? Were they not all annulled on account of their weakness and unprofitableness, by the more perfect revelation of Jesus Christ? If then, I should acknowledge my mistake, and recall my words; and, instead of pagan, call them Jewish ceremonies; would not the use of Jewish rites be abominable still in a Christian church, where they are expressly abolished and prohibited by God himself?"—"He tells us, that there was an altar of incense in the temple of Jerusalem; and is surprised, therefore, how I can call it heathenish: yet, it is evident, from the nature of that institution, that it was never designed to be perpetual; and that, during its continuance, God would never have approved any other altar, either in Jerusalem or any where else. But, let him answer directly to this plain question: Was there ever a temple in the world, not strictly heathenish, in which there were several altars, all smoking with incense, within

one view, and at one and the same time? It is certain, that he must answer in the negative: yet, it is certain, that there were many such temples in Pagan Rome; and are *as many* still in Christian Rome; and since there never was an example of it but what was heathenish, before the times of Popery, how is it possible that it could be derived to them from any other source? Or, when we see such an exact resemblance in the copy, how can there be any doubt about the original?"

"The next thing that will, of course, strike one's imagination, is their use of holy water; for nobody ever goes in or out of a church, but is either sprinkled by the priest, who attends for that purpose on solemn days, or else serves himself with it from a vessel, usually of marble, placed just at the door, not unlike one of our baptismal fonts. Now, this ceremony is so notoriously and directly transmitted to them from paganism, that their own writers make not the least scruple to own it. The Jesuit, La Cerda, in his notes on a passage of Virgil, where this practice is mentioned, says, 'Hence was derived the custom of holy church, to provide purifying or holy water at the entrance of their churches.' '*Aquaminarium* or *Amula*,' says the learned Montfauçon, 'was a vase of holy water, placed by the heathens at the entrance of their temples, to sprinkle themselves with.' The same vessel is by the Greeks called Περίῤῥαντήριον; two of which, the one of gold, the other of silver, were given by Crœsus to the temple of Apollo, at Delphi; and the custom of sprinkling themselves was so necessary a part of their religious offices, that the method of excommunication seems to have been by prohibiting to offenders the approach and use of the holy water-pot. The very composition of this holy water was the same also among the heathens as it is now among the Papists, being nothing more than a mixture of salt with common water; and the form of the sprinkling brush, called by the ancients *aspersorium*, or *aspergillum*, (which is now the same with what the priests make use of,) may be seen in basreliefs, or ancient coins, wherever the insignia, or emblems of the Pagan priesthood are described, of which it is generally one.

"Platina, in his lives of the Popes, and other authors, ascribe the institution of this holy water to Pope Alexander the first, who is said to have lived about the year of Christ, 113; but it could not be introduced so early, since, for some ages after, we find the primitive fathers speaking of it as a custom purely heathenish, and condemning it as impious and detestable. Justin Martyr says, that it was invented by demons, in imitation of the true baptism signified by the prophets, that their votaries might also have their pretended purification by water: and the emperor Julian, out of spite to the Christians, used to order the victuals in the markets to be sprinkled with holy water, on purpose either to starve or force them to eat, what, by their own principles, they esteemed polluted.

"Thus we see what contrary notions the primitive and Romish church have of this ceremony: the first condemns it as superstitious, abominable, and irreconcileable with Christianity: the latter adopts it as highly edifying and applicable to the improvement of Christian piety. The one looks upon it as the contrivance of the devil to delude mankind; the other as the security of mankind against the delusions of the devil. But what is still more ridiculous than even the ceremony itself, is to see their learned writers gravely reckoning up the several virtues and benefits derived from the use of it, both to the soul and the body; and to crown all, producing a long roll of miracles, to attest the certainty of each virtue which they ascribe to it."—P. 136—140.

"I do not at present recollect whether the ancients went so far, as to apply the use of this holy water to the purifying or blessing of their horses, asses, and other cattle; or whether this be an improvement of modern Rome, which has dedicated a yearly festival peculiarly to this service, called, in their vulgar language, the benediction of horses; which is always celebrated with much solemnity in the month of January; when all the inhabitants of the city and neighbourhood send up their horses, asses, &c. to the convent of St Antony, near St Mary's the Great, where a priest in surplice, at the church door, sprinkles with his brush all the animals singly, as they are presented to him, and receives from each owner a gratuity proportionable to his zeal and ability. Amongst the rest, I had my own horses blessed at the expense of about eighteen pence of our money; as well to satisfy my own curiosity, as to humour the coachman; who was persuaded, as the common people generally are, that some mischance would befal them within the year, if they wanted the benefits of this benediction."

"I have met, indeed, with some hints of a practice not foreign to this among the ancients, of sprinkling their horses with water in the Circensian games; but whether this was done out of a superstitious view of inspiring any virtue, or purifying them for those races, which were esteemed sacred, or merely to refresh them under the violence of such an exercise, is not easy to determine. But allowing the Romish priests to have taken the hint from some old custom of Paganism; yet this, however, must be granted them, that they alone were capable of cultivating so coarse and barren a piece of superstition, into a revenue sufficient for the maintenance of forty or fifty idle monks."—P. 141, 142.

Middleton afterwards acquired more information with regard to the origin of this rite; for he writes as follows, in the preface to his fourth edition, in reply to his opponent:—

"But though our Catholic seems so much ashamed at present of this benediction of horses in their church, I can give him such light into the origin of it, as will make him proud of it, probably, for the future, from a story which I have observed in St Jerome, which shows it to be grounded on a miracle, and derived from a saint: I mean St Hilarion, the founder of the monastic orders in Syria and Palestine. The story is this: 'A citizen of Gaza, a Christian, who kept a stable of running horses for the Circensian games, was always beaten by his antagonist, an idolater, the master of the rival stable. For the idolater, by the help of certain charms, and diabolical imprecations, constantly damped the spirits of the Christian's horses, and added courage to his own. The Christian, therefore, in despair, applied himself to St Hilarion, and implored his assistance; but the saint was unwilling to enter into an affair so frivolous and profane; till the Christian urged it as a necessary defence against these adversaries of God, whose insults were levelled not so much at him, as at the church of Christ. And his entreaties being seconded by the monks who were present; the saint ordered his earthen jug, out of which he used to drink to be filled with water and delivered to the man; who presently sprinkled his stable, his horses, his charioteers, his chariot, and the very boundaries of the course with it. Upon this the whole city was in wondrous expectation. The idolaters derided what the Christian was doing, while the Christians took courage, and assured themselves of victory; till the signal being given for the race, the Christian's horses seemed to fly, whilst the idolater's were labouring behind and left quite out of sight! so that the Pagans themselves were obliged to cry out, that their god Marnas was conquered at last by Christ.' —*Pref.* p. xvii.

"No sooner is a man advanced a little forward into their churches, and begins to look about him, but he will find his eyes and attention attracted by a number of lamps and wax candles, which are constantly burning before the shrines and images of their saints. In all the great churches in Italy, says Mabillon, they hang up lamps at every altar: a sight which will not only surprise a stranger by the novelty of it, but will furnish him with another proof and example of the conformity of the Roman with the Pagan worship; by recalling to his memory many passages of the heathen writers, where their perpetual lamps and candles are described, as continually burning before the altars and statues of their deities."—"The primitive writers frequently expose the folly and absurdity of this heathenish custom. 'They light up candles to God,' says Lactantius, 'as if he lived in the dark: and do not they deserve to pass for madmen, who offer lamps to the Author and Giver of light?'

"In the collection of old inscriptions, we find many instances of presents and donations from private persons, of lamps and candlesticks to the temples and altars of their gods: a piece of zeal which continues still in modern Rome; where each church abounds in lamps of massy silver, and sometimes even of gold: the gifts of princes, and other persons of distinction: and it is surprising to see how great a number of this kind are perpetually burning before the altars of their principal saints, or miraculous images: as St Antony of Padua, or the Lady of Loretto; as well as the vast profusion of wax candles with which the churches are illuminated on every great festival; when the high altar, covered with gold and silver plate, brought out of their treasures, and stuck full of wax lights, disposed in beautiful figures, looks more like the rich side-board of some great prince, dressed out for a feast, than an altar to pay divine worship at."—P. 141—145.

"The mention of Loretto puts me in mind of the surprise that I was in, at the first sight of the holy image; for its face is as black as a negro's: so that one would take it rather for the representation of a Proserpine, or infernal deity, than that which they impiously style it, of the queen of heaven. But I soon recollected, that this very circumstance of its complexion, did but resemble the more exactly the old idols of Paganism, which, in sacred as well as profane writers, are described to be black with the perpetual smoke of lamps and incense.

"When a man is once engaged in reflections of this kind, imagining himself in some heathen temple, and expecting as it were some sacrifice, or other piece of Paganism, to ensue, he will not be long in suspense, before he sees the finishing acts and last scene of idolatry, in crowds of bigot votaries prostrating themselves before some image of wood or stone, and paying divine honours to an idol of their own erecting. Should they squabble with us here about the meaning of the word idol, St Jerome has determined it to the very case in question, telling us, that by idols are to be understood the images of the dead; and the worshippers of such images are used always in the style of the fathers, as terms synonymous and equivalent to heathens and Pagans."—P. 156.

No. LXIX.

SATURDAY, November 6th, 1819.

GREGORY the Great is allowed to have been one of the best of the Popes; yet, he had no objection to mix up a little heathenism with his Christianity. "Witness," says Dr Campbell, in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 74, "the advice which he gave to the monk Augustine, who had been sent into Britain for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons,

not to abolish their paganish ceremonies, but rather adopt them, and give them a new direction, that so the conversion of the people might be facilitated, and their relapse to the superstition of their fathers prevented." This took place as early as the latter part of the sixth century; * and there can be no doubt, that what was called Christianity in Italy, had, by this time, gone great lengths in conformity with heathenism, when the head of the church could, without shame, give such instructions to one of his missionaries in a distant part of the world. Conversion had now become a very different thing from what it was in the days of the apostles. It was then a turning from idols to serve the living God; it was now a turning from God to the service of idols; for the Romish Christians, instead of converting heathens to the faith of Christ, were, by the seducing influence of the latter, turned from the faith, and converted to heathenism; if that can be called conversion which accords with the natural depravity of the human heart. In point of fact, idolatry is as palpable in Rome at this day, as it was in the days of Nero; for the Pantheon which had been dedicated to Jove, and all the gods, was, by Pope Boniface IV. consecrated to the Virgin Mary, and all the saints. With this single alteration, it serves as exactly for all the purposes of Popish, as it did for the pagan worship: of which see a more particular account in my forty-third Number, p. 199.

Middleton shows the exact conformity between Popery and Paganism, in a number of particulars, which it is not my intention to quote at length, though I intend to give some more of the most prominent. My object is to show that the great leading features of the two systems are the same, and that the one was evidently derived from the other. Pope Gregory the Great, who gave the above instructions to the monk Augustine, for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, plainly confessed that images and pictures were set up in churches for the sake of the pagans; that those who did not know, and could not read the Scriptures, might learn from the images what they ought to worship. (See Middleton, p. 243.) The images and pictures were not, at first, professedly objects of worship; but, with the increasing darkness and growing ignorance of persons called Christians, they soon came to be so. The first admission of such things as helps to devotion, was an open departure from the simplicity of spiritual worship; and it prepared the way for all the idol worship that followed. Doubtless there were many in the apostolic churches who could not read, who were yet taught to worship God in spirit and in truth, without the aid of pictures and images. In fact, there are no images that can represent those things, by the knowledge and belief of which sinners are saved, and taught to offer to God acceptable worship. It is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent. That is, to know and acknowledge God in those characters of justice and mercy, by which he makes himself known in the gospel of his Son. Here he is revealed as the just God and the Saviour; as a Being of such holiness and purity, that he cannot look upon sin; and yet so rich in mercy, as to devise a way for the salvation of sinners, consistently with these characters of holiness and justice. It is by the knowledge of this, as revealed to us in the Scriptures, that sinners are saved; and this is the foundation of all Christian worship. But these things cannot possibly be represented by material images or pictures. What figure would any man use to represent the love of God the Father? Is it possible to paint on canvass, or cut in marble, a resemblance of infinite holiness and justice? Is it possible to represent by sculpture, or painting, the anguish of mind which Christ suffered on account of sin, when his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death? It certainly is not possible to make images of such things. No man could think of it, unless his mind were diverted from the God who is a Spirit, and directed to a creature of his own fancy, to which he wishes to give that honour which is due to God alone. Hence it is, that it was so peremptorily forbidden to worship God by means of any figure of any thing in the heavens, or in the earth; for this could not be thought of, without the alienation of the mind from the knowledge of the true God.

The image of the cross, indeed, is thought to represent the sufferings of Christ on account of sin; and this, I suppose, was one of the first images that was set up in any Christian church. But, in fact, it represents no such thing; and it can be of no more use in Christian worship than the image of Jupiter, or any piece of heathen sculpture. Death, by crucifixion, was a common punishment among the Romans; and the figure of a cross, with the figure of a man extended upon it, can give no more idea of the sufferings of Christ, than of the sufferings of any other man, put to death in the same way. It may tend to preserve the remembrance of the fact, that Christ was crucified, and so it may perpetuate the name of Christian, where there is nothing of real Christianity: but the knowledge of the fact is of no value without the knowledge of its meaning, and the knowledge that the principal part of Christ's sufferings were not those of his body upon the cross, but those of his soul, when God exacted of him the penalty of the transgressions of all his people. This cannot possibly be represented

* Christianity had been planted in Britain several ages before this, and when the Bishop of Rome was no greater than another bishop; but the Christians had been driven by the new comers to take shelter among the mountains of Wales, where their descendants continue to this day.

by an image; and the very attempt to represent the sufferings of Christ in such a way, shows that the person who does so, has false and degrading notions of the death of Christ. —such as, in fact, show that he is no Christian; and the devotion of such a man, however ardent it may be, is nothing but devotion to an idol which he has set up in his own mind.

It is pleaded by Popish writers, that the image of the cross is calculated to excite devotion and gratitude to Him who died upon it; but if the image could effect this, surely the reality would have been much more likely to do so. If a wooden cross, and a wooden image upon it, be so effectual in producing sentiments of piety and devotion, it might have been supposed, that when Christ himself hung upon the cross, in the view of all Jerusalem, many thousands would have been moved to devotion by the sight; but we know that such was not the case. The multitude were moved by no feeling more amiable than rage, and hatred of him whom they had crucified; and we know that, in subsequent ages, men calling themselves Christians, have exhibited the same hatred and rage against Christ and his cause, when they put thousands to death, and that too, under the banner of the cross, for no greater crime than confessing his truth according to his word. In short, the cross is one of the great bloody idols of the Church of Rome; and has occasioned, I suppose, a greater waste of human life than any one idol known in the heathen world.

But, to return to the conformity between Popish and Pagan worship, there is in Rome, at this day, a practice of presenting children before the image of a saint, which has evidently been borrowed from a fable respecting Romulus, the founder of the city—"From the tradition," says Dr Middleton, "of the wonderful escape which Romulus had in this very place, when exposed, in his infancy, to perish in the Tiber; as soon as he came to be a god, he was looked upon as singularly propitious to the health and safety of young children; from which notion, it became a practice for nurses and mothers to present their sickly infants before his shrine in this temple, in confidence of a cure or relief by his favour. Now, when this temple was converted afterwards into a Christian church, lest any piece of superstition should be lost, or the people think themselves sufferers by the change, in losing the benefit of such a protection for their children, care was taken to find out, in the place of the heathen god, a Christian saint, who had been exposed too in his infancy, and found by chance, like Romulus, and for the same reason, might be presumed to be just as fond of children, as their old deity had been: and thus, the worship paid to Romulus being now transferred to Theodorus, the old superstition still subsists, and the custom of presenting children at this shrine continues to this day, without intermission; of which I, myself, have been a witness; having seen, as oft as I looked into this church, ten or a dozen women decently dressed, each with a child in her lap, sitting with silent reverence before the altar of the saint, in expectation of his miraculous influence on the health of the infant.

"In consecrating these heathen temples to the Popish worship, that the change might be less offensive, and the old superstition as little shocked as possible, they generally observe some resemblance of character and quality in the saint whom they substitute to the old deity: 'If, in converting the profane worship of the Gentiles,' says the describer of modern Rome, 'to the pure and sacred worship of the church, the faithful use to follow some rule and proportion, they have certainly hit upon it here, in dedicating to the Madonna, or holy Virgin, the temple formerly sacred to the Bona Dea, or good goddess.' But they have more frequently, on these occasions, had regard rather to a similitude of name between the old and new idol. Thus, in a place formerly sacred to Apollo, there now stands the church of Apollinaris; built there, as they tell us, that the profane name of that deity might be converted into the glorious name of this martyr; and where there anciently stood a temple of Mars, they have erected a church to Martina, with this inscription:

'Mars hence expell'd, Martina, martyr'd maid,
Claims now the worship which to him was paid.'

"Whatever worship was paid by the ancients, to their heroes or inferior deities, the Romans now pay the same to their saints and martyrs, as their own inscriptions plainly declare; which, like those mentioned above of St Martina, and the pantheon, generally signify that the honours, which of old had been impiously given in that place, to the false god, are now piously and rightly transferred to the Christian saint: or, as one of their celebrated poets expresses himself in regard to St George:

'As Mars our fathers once ador'd, so now
To thee, O George, we humbly prostrate bow.'
Pages 167, 168, 177.

"But what gave me a still greater notion of the superstition of these countries, was to see those little oratories, or rural shrines, sometimes placed under the cover of a tree or grove, agreeably to the descriptions of the old idolatry, the sacred as well as profane writers; or, more generally, raised on some eminence; or, in the phrase of Scripture, on high places, the constant scenes of idolatrous worship in all ages; it being an universal opinion among the heathens, that the gods, in a peculiar manner, loved to reside on eminences or tops of mountains; which pagan notion prevails still so

generally with the Papists, that there is hardly a rock or precipice, how dreadful or difficult soever of access, that has not an oratory, or altar, or crucifix at least, planted upon it."—P. 184.

"When we enter their towns, the case is still the same as it was in the country; we find everywhere the same marks of idolatry, and the same reasons to make us fancy that we are still treading pagan ground; whilst, at every corner, we see images and altars, with lamps or candles burning before them; exactly answering to the descriptions of the ancient writers; and to what Tertullian reproaches the heathen with, that their streets, their markets, their baths, were not without an idol. But, above all, in the pomp and solemnity of their holy-days, and especially their religious processions, we see the genuine remains of heathenism, and proof enough to convince us that this is still the same Rome which old Numa first tamed and civilized by the arts of religion: who, as Plutarch says, by the institution of supplications and processions to the gods, which inspire reverence, whilst they give pleasure to the spectators, and by pretended miracles, and divine apparitions, reduced the fierce spirits of his subjects under the power of superstition."—P. 187.

"The descriptions of the religious pomps and processions of the heathens come so near to what we see on every festival of the virgin, or other Romish saint, that one can hardly help thinking these Popish ones to be still regulated by the old ceremonial of Pagan Rome. At these solemnities, the chief magistrate used frequently to assist, in robes of ceremony, attended by the priests in surplices, with wax candles in their hands, carrying upon a pageant, or thensa, the images of their gods dressed out in their best clothes: these were usually followed by the principal youth of the place, in white linen vestments or surplices, singing hymns in honour of the god whose festival they were celebrating, accompanied by crowds of all sorts, that were initiated in the same religion, all with flambeaux or wax candles in their hands. This is the account which Apuleius, and other authors, give of a heathen procession; and I may appeal to all who have been abroad, whether it might not pass quite as well for the description of a Popish one. Monsieur Tournefort, in his travels through Greece, reflects upon the Greek church, for having retained, and taken into their present worship, many of the old rites of heathenism; and particularly that of carrying and dancing about the images of the saints in their processions, to singing and music. The reflection is full as applicable to his own as to the Greek church; and the practice itself, is so far from giving scandal in Italy, that the learned publisher of the Florentine Inscriptions takes occasion to show the conformity between them and the heathens, from this very instance of carrying about the pictures of their saints, as the pagans did those of their gods, in their sacred processions.

"In one of these processions, made lately to St Peter's, in the time of Lent, I saw that ridiculous penance of the flagellantes, or self-whippers, who march with whips in their hands, and lash themselves as they go along, on the bare back, till it is all covered with blood; in the same manner as the fanatical priests of Bellona, or the Syrian goddess, as well as the votaries of Isis, used to slash and cut themselves of old, in order to please the goddess, by the sacrifice of their own blood; which mad piece of discipline, we find frequently mentioned and as oft ridiculed by the ancient writers.

"But they have another exercise of the same kind, and in the same season of Lent, which, under the notion of penance, is still a more absurd mockery of all religion; when, on a certain day, appointed annually for this discipline, men of all conditions assemble themselves, towards the evening, in one of the churches of the city, where whips or lashes, made of cords, are provided, and distributed to every person present; and after they are all served, and a short office of devotion performed, the candles being put out, upon the warning of a little bell, the whole company begin presently to strip, and try the force of their whips on their own backs: during all which time, the church becomes, as it were, the proper image of hell, where nothing is heard but the noise of lashes and chains, mixed with the groans of these self-tormenters; till satiated with their exercise, they are content to put on all their clothes; and the candles being lighted again, upon the tinkling of a second bell, they all appear in their proper dress.

"Seneca, alluding to the very same effects of fanaticism in Pagan Rome, says, 'So great is the force of it on disordered minds, that they try to appease the gods, by such methods as an enraged man would hardly think of to revenge himself. But, if there be any gods who desire to be worshipped after this manner, they do not deserve to be worshipped at all, since the very worst of tyrants, though they have sometimes torn and tortured people's limbs, yet have never commanded men to torture themselves.' But, there is no occasion to imagine, that all the blood which seems to flow on these occasions, really comes from the backs of these bigots; for, it is probable, that, like their frantic predecessors, they may use some craft, as well as zeal, in this their fury; and, I cannot but think there was a great deal of justice in that edict of the emperor Commodus, with regard to these Belonarii, or whippers of antiquity, though it is usually imputed to his cruelty, when he commanded that they should not be suffered to impose upon the spectators, but be obliged to cut and slash themselves in good earnest."—P. 188—193.

I would gladly give more extracts from this interesting work; indeed it would be doing a service to the public to reprint the whole; but this is the less necessary, as the Letters of Ignotus, to which I referred in my last Number, contain the greater part of it, with a confirmation of some material facts from other authors. In particular, he has shown the exact conformity of the water idolatry of our Papists in Ireland with that of the Hindoos, from Mr Grant's Observations on India, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 15th June, 1813. "Of holy rivers," says Mr Grant, "dedicated to one or other of the deities, Brahma, Vishnow, or Mahades, there are twenty-eight, named in the Institutes of the emperor Akber, beginning with the Ganges, and traversing the whole continent, to the Indus; so that all the professors of Hinduism are within reach of an antidote against the consequences of guilt." "The virtues of the river Ganges are universally allowed to be pre-eminent;—the water of it assuredly purifies from all sin: ablutions in it are used continually to this end, as Europeans daily see: and the dying, when within a moderate distance of it, are carried to its edge, and their feet are placed in the river, that thus they may have a happy passage out of life. Its water is conveyed to distant parts for the same purpose; and, if persons are not within reach of it—thinking of it, and invoking it, when they bathe in any other water, will still give them all the efficacy of it."

"Now," says Ignotus, p. 60, "the analogy between the practices of heathen Rome and India, and the practices of the Church of Rome and her priests in Ireland, although forming a part of our Protestant empire, and lying immediately under our own eyes, is very remarkable. A main part of the worship of Irish Roman Catholics, is made by their priests to consist in this water idolatry. St Patrick's purgatory is an island situate in the midst of a lake in the county of Donegal, called Lochderg, or the Red Lake, reputed to be sacred; and to this place, immense shoals of misguided Papists are sent by their spiritual guides to wash away their sins, precisely as is done in India, under the tuition of the heathen priests." The author then gives a long account of the ceremonies practised at this holy lake; but they are so similar in extravagance, impiety, and folly, to what I gave in my fifty-fourth Number, that I need not repeat them.

I conclude this subject with the remark, that it would be unreasonable to expect to find any thing better than idolatry in Popish worship. Popery, as I have said in some of my Papers, is the religion of corrupt human nature. Every man by nature is an idolater; that is, he places his chief delight, and pays his chief respect, nay, he pays the whole devotion of his heart to something else than the true God. Real Christianity produces such a change in the heart and character of men, that they are led to renounce dependence on every thing else, and to devote themselves entirely to the service of God. This change is nothing less than being created anew by the power of the Holy Spirit. It is what Christ himself calls being born again: and without this, there is no real Christianity. But, in Popery, there is no new creation—no change greater than that which a priest can effect by the act of baptism. To speak of the necessity of any other change, would be no less than heresy; and those who are deluded by this, and other errors of Popery, must continue idolaters in one form or another.

No. LXX.

SATURDAY, November 13th, 1819.

Having been occupied for about six months in exposing the idolatry of the Church of Rome, it is now time to proceed to something else. I propose to myself a serious investigation of some other Popish errors, such as are taught concerning purgatory and prayers for the dead; but before entering upon such grave subjects, I shall treat my readers with a number or two of lighter matter, and a specimen of my correspondence.

Though I have received almost a chestful of letters on the subjects of my work, I have had only one from a professed Papist, besides the two from Mr Scott, printed in my 8th, and the short note from Mr Simeon in my 50th Number. I have, indeed, had one also from a Papist in disguise; or, perhaps, a weak-minded Protestant, who misnames himself "liberal minded," who has descended to act a Popish and Jesuitical part, in a silly attempt to defend Mr M'Hardy: but there is only one avowed Papist who has condescended to address me, with remarks upon my publication, and a defence of his Church. As he writes with pretty good temper, and some degree of modesty; and as I believe he expresses the sentiments of the more sensible Papists in this country, I shall give his letter entire, and follow it with a few remarks:—

Edinburgh, 14th August, 1819.

"Sir,—I take the liberty of writing you concerning the charge you have made and promised, 'Deo volente,' to pursue against the system of Popery and its adherents; I never intended to write a word on the subject, (though it merits attention if properly handled) until I read in your fifty-first Number, your intention of treating on the errors of Popery; which, according to your belief, are not few. Among the first and greatest are,

'idolatry of the mass, purgatory, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, clerical celibacy, extreme unction, cruelty of the Jesuits,' &c. &c.: and a good many more supposed errors, which it is not necessary for me to mention here. The only point I intend to speak of is idolatry, which is the most infamous charge against the Church of Rome, notwithstanding every one of her children has as much hatred against idolatry as any man in the world, or even the purest puritan in the city of Glasgow. If our Saviour's prophecy was to be fulfilled, 'that the gates of hell would never prevail against that church which he purchased with his blood,' this promise, in my opinion, shakes the foundation of the Reformation, and every branch that has sprung from it. I would wish very much to be informed when the supposed errors of Popery came to be fashionable, without any records of them. There is no heresy whatever, nor any point of discipline, that is, or ever was practised in the Church of Rome, or any other church whatever, but what is recorded by some historian: but we have no such records of the supposed errors of the Catholic church; surely, then, they have dropped from the clouds, and got full possession of the universal church without being perceived by any body, till the clear-sighted Martin Luther made the happy discovery; for, truly, I can think of no other way to render it possible that it should get admittance all at once, without any opposition whatever. This, however, being somewhat out of the way, and proper only for machinery exploits upon the theatre, we must rather suppose Protestants will say it came in by degrees; be it so, but then it is reasonable they should give us a satisfactory answer to a few questions, and prove the truth of the facts from unquestionable records: as, who was the first priest that said mass, who invented the custom of praying for the dead, who instituted confession, extreme unction, invocation of saints, the custom of having images in the churches, and of giving them a relative honour, celebrating mass in Latin, the doctrine of transubstantiation, &c. &c. If these questions can be answered, from unquestionable records, to favour the Reformation, then, no doubt, Popery is leading us upon the ice; if the church be in an error, which most certainly is contrary to the promises of God in the Bible, and of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. The Reformation was not only erroneous, but open rebellion against the majesty of heaven and earth. We can easily trace the Church of Rome back to the apostles, by an uninterrupted succession of bishops in the chair of St Peter, to the present Pope. There has been about two hundred and fifty-three Popes in the chair of Peter the apostle, (himself being the first of them) since the commencement of Popery. I shall now say something of the charge of idolatry, as it is the greatest error a Christian can fall into. I never could find a Protestant that would tell me who was the first priest who said mass, but I have seen some of the writings of St Ignatius, the disciple of St John, St Irenæus, St Cyprian, St Martial, and Tertullian, teaching the doctrine of the mass, the substance or essence whereof consists precisely in its being an unbloody sacrifice offered to God, by the priests of the new law, upon the altar; or what amounts to the same, an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine. St Irenæus says, That Christ taught a new oblation in the New Testament, which the church, receiving from the apostles, does offer throughout the whole world. Iren. l. iv. c. 32. St Cyprian says, That the priest is Christ's representative, and offers sacrifice to God the Father. Cyp. l. ii. c. 3. And the Fathers, in all ages, have declared the same doctrine, which makes Popery as ancient as Christianity in every fundamental point: and as for the cruel charge of idolatry, I shall here insert what every child, that is brought up in the Catholic faith, will answer from their Catechism. 'Q. Do Catholics pray to images? A. No, by no means! we pray before them, indeed, to keep us from distractions, but not to them, for we know that they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us. Q. What benefit then have we by them? A. They movingly represent to us the mysteries of our Saviour's passion, and the martyrdom of his saints. Q. What benefit have we by honouring and canonizing saints? A. It strongly moves us to imitate their example, by showing their rewards. Q. How do we honour saints and angels? A. With an inferior honour, as the friends and creatures of God, not as gods, nor with God's honour. Q. Is it lawful to honour relics of saints? A. Yes, with a relative honour, as above explained; for the handkerchiefs and aprons, which had but touched the body of St Paul, cast out devils, and cured all diseases, Acts, xix. chap. and 12 verse.' I will finish this subject with another quotation from another work, which, perhaps, you have not perused so much as 'Free Thoughts:' it speaks as follows, 'Cursed is he who commits adultery, (it should be idolatry) who prays to images or relics, or worships them for God, R. Amen. Cursed is every goddess worshipper, who believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature, who worships her, or puts his trust in her more than God, who believes her above her son, or that she can in any thing command him, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers, who prays to them as such, or who gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever, R. Amen. Cursed is he who worships any breaden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes that

priests can forgive sins, whether the sinner repent or not, or that there is any power on earth or heaven, that can forgive sins without a hearty repentance, and serious purpose of amendment, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes there is authority in the Pope, or any other person, that can give leave to commit sin, or that for a sum of money can forgive him his sins, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes, that independent of the merits and passion of Christ, he can obtain salvation by his own good works, or make condign satisfaction for the guilt of his sins, or the pains eternally due to them, R. Amen.' Papist Misrep. and Rep. p. 98-99.—I shall not trouble you with any more quotations, as very possibly it will be but time and labour lost; but I am very much surprised that a gentleman, of any merit or candour, would conduct a controversy in the manner you have hitherto done: if you would banish prejudice from your mind, you would see that their own doctrine is the system you ought to engage, and not charge them with doctrines they hate as much as you do yourself. I do not suppose that any of them is so very stupid, as to expect that an image of any creature can give them any help or assistance whatever. If you would give their religion from their own books, (without misrepresentation) and then condemn them, if you can, with cool reasoning and fair argument, then your undertaking may be of some service. I suppose you would not wish to be tried by your enemies before a court of justice, if your life or character was at stake? Another cruel and unjust charge you have made against us is, that our mode of practice is 'rebellion against God:' very well, then, be it so: let us be justified by the doctrine of the church of Scotland, part of it as follows: 'Q. What are the decrees of God? A. The decrees of God are his eternal purpose according to the counsel of his will, whereby for his own glory he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass,' Short. Cat. page 1, 2. According to this doctrine, all our actions, good and bad, are all set before us, without exception, nor can we escape one of them. If this doctrine be true, what comes of our free-will? Likewise, if this doctrine be true, why are we lost in the esteem of other Christians, if every thing we do is laid before us as a necessity? Lastly, If this doctrine be genuine, all Europe is guilty of the same rebellion since the foundation of the world. If any person is guilty of treason, murder, or theft, he is tried and punished for it; and is it not rebellion against God to punish a man for doing what is not in his power to avoid? Be this doctrine true or false, Mahomet I. was the inventor of it; yet if you can prove the Church of Rome to be in an error in any one point of faith, I shall leave her as soon as I see any proof, for I am but a late convert from the church of Scotland, in which I was educated from my youth, and if I thought it possible to obtain salvation in any other, I would not be another day in her communion, but yet I believe that those who wish earnestly to know the truth may be saved, in whatever church he is in, if he is a Christian, provided he wish earnestly from his heart to serve God with all his strength.

"I am very sorry that the distance between us is so far, or else I would have wrote a larger sheet; however, I shall see what you will say against Papists in future, and if you can prove them (from undoubted records) to be so bad as you call them, I shall soon be reconverted back again: but you must bring better testimony than you have hitherto done; and, likewise, you must not twist the quotations you bring from Papist books, or else you may depend on being less respected. For my own part, I am no way bigotted, I wish to see the weight of both sides of the question, and then I am better able to see which is the most just. I have only to recommend to you to give the faith of Papists from their own books (without any misrepresentations or false constructions) and you will be more respected by Protestants and Papists.

"I remain, Sir, your very humble servant, a lover of the truth, W. D."

There is one thing in which W. D. and I are agreed, and which I shall notice first. I believe that a man may be saved whatsoever church he is in, if *he be a Christian.* There never was a more important if; and *if* W. D. be a Christian, I call upon him to keep his word, and leave the Church of Rome immediately. He says, "If I thought it possible to obtain salvation in any other, I would not be another day in her communion." Well, he admits that he may be saved in any church, if he wishes earnestly to know the truth, and if he be a Christian, provided he wish earnestly from his heart to serve God with all his strength; then, surely, it is possible for him to be saved in the church of Scotland, to which I invite him to return. If he shall remain another day in the Church of Rome, after reading this, he is not a man of his word, and is therefore not a Christian, but only a Papist, and one who does not wish from the heart to serve God with all his strength. I am disposed, however, to hope favourably of this person, from his candid declaration; and whatever church he may join, when he has left Rome, I advise him to serve God in reality, and not to satisfy himself with *earnestly wishing* to do so. There is, I am afraid, a great and very prevalent error couched under these words. Persons who are conscious that they are not serving God, but their own lusts, attempt to quiet their consciences by an idea, that they earnestly wish to serve God if they could; and they hope he will take the will for the deed; but no man, who does not really serve God,

ever earnestly wished to do it. When God, by his grace, brings a sinner to himself, he teaches him both to *will* and to *do*.

From the short acquaintance which W. D. has had with the Church of Rome, he seems to have found out that she is no better than she should be; for he declares he would not stay in her another day, if it were *possible* to obtain salvation in any other. This is as much as to say, that he is heartily tired of her communion; he has no attachment to her for her own sake, or for the sake of her head, but merely because somebody has persuaded him that he cannot be saved in any other, though he immediately disavows this persuasion. But let him join the true church of Christ, in whatsoever form she appears in the world, and *if he be a Christian*, he will love her communion for its own sake, and for the sake of Christ, who is the head of the church, and who not only *will* save him, but who has saved him already, *if he be a Christian*.

The reader will observe, I use the word *Christian* in the Bible sense. A Christian is one who believes the gospel, who is born again, who is really a disciple of Christ; that is, one who believes what Christ teaches, and does what he commands: for they were disciples who were called Christians first at Antioch, and the inspired writers never gave the name to any other. Now, the apostle Paul says to such, not merely ye *shall be* saved, but "by grace ye *are* saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God," Ephes. ii. 8. Again, he "*hath* saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began," 2 Tim. i. 9. It is true that, in respect of perfect holiness, and perfect happiness, salvation is future; but every Christian in this world is so far a saved person, that he is delivered from wrath and condemnation, is justified before God, and created anew for his service; and without this a man is not a Christian, whether he belong to the church of Rome, or any other church. I hope my readers will not suppose I am going to give them another Sermon; I am only dropping a word for the instruction of my correspondent, who, I suspect, has not found peace to his conscience in the Church of Rome.

I would farther advise W. D. not to meddle with the high doctrine of liberty and necessity, or fate and free-will, at least till he has become acquainted with the plain and simple truths contained in the Bible. Let him not imagine that he may safely do evil from a belief that he was predestinated to do it. The church of Scotland never taught such doctrine; and if this was the cause of his leaving her, he ought to return, and confess his mistake, and "be reconverted *back again*."

My correspondent is much offended by the charge of idolatry which I bring against his church; but I appeal to himself whether I have not proved her guilty, to the conviction of every one who believes the testimony of his own senses; and there is no possibility of proving any thing to persons who do not believe their senses; for though I were to set down a mathematical demonstration in every page, they would not be sure that they saw it. What I made and meant for a square, they might call a triangle or a circle; and what I knew to be good black ink, they might maintain to be butter-milk. There was, however, a time when W. D. believed his senses, if he was, as he says, a member of the church of Scotland. He cannot have forgotten this. If, then, he had seen a man adoring a piece of bread, he would have called him an idolater. If the worshipper should have told him it was not bread, but the God that made him; instead of being convinced, I suppose W. D. would have called him mad as well as idolatrous. Now, though W. D. himself has become a believer in the wonderful conversion of a piece of bread into the real substance of the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, and of course sees no idolatry in worshipping it, he must allow those who do not believe this doctrine, to think of the worship of a piece of bread as he once thought of it, that it is downright idolatry. This, I think, I have proved in some of my late Numbers, to which I refer him, if he is willing to believe his own senses; if not, he may save himself the trouble, for it will be of no avail. He cannot be certain whether he is reading my print or his own manuscript.

I know that Papists disclaim idol worship, and that they do so with the most bitter cursing, of which W. D. has given a specimen from Gother's Papist Misrepresented and Represented; but this is no more than heathens do, except the cursing part of the disavowal, which, I suppose, is peculiarly Popish. No man professes to worship an idol, believing it to be an idol, but because he believes a divinity to reside in it, or that it is itself a divinity. Every man who worships a creature is an idolater; and he is not the less so, because he believes it to be the Creator; and though he should pronounce ever so many curses against idol worshippers.

My correspondent proceeds upon a mistake, into which he, and, I suppose, all his brethren, have fallen,—that the church which Christ purchased with his blood, and of which he promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against her, is the visible organized Church of Rome. This they all seem to take for granted; but it is a mere assumption, without a shadow of reason to support it. The church of Christ are the redeemed of all nations and of all ages; and the gates of hell shall never prevail so as to prevent the salvation of any

one of them. Those of them who are upon earth are scattered among a number of visible organized bodies, which, in an inferior sense, are called churches. The church in Rome was one of these, while she held the true faith and pure worship, as instituted by Christ; but in her purest state she had no superiority over other churches; she never had any right to call herself by way of eminence, much less exclusively, *the church*. Christ never gave to her, or to any national, provincial, or particular church, a promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against it; but he gave warning to all, that if they departed from the faith, they should be cut off. This has been notoriously the case with Rome; and though she retains the name of Christian, she has become the reverse of what the name implies; and is conspicuously the place where Satan has his seat.

In short, the promise of Christ holds out no security to either churches or individuals, but in the way of persevering in faith and holy practice. Christ said to his disciples, on one occasion, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," Luke xii. 34. Now, if Judas had argued as Papists do, he needed not to have thought himself in danger of perdition, though he had betrayed his Lord. He might have said, If Christ's word be true, I am sure of the kingdom of heaven. But Judas had not the presumption to reason like modern Papists. He apostatized, and he perished; yet Christ spoke the truth, and his word will be verified in the salvation of all true disciples. The Church of Rome also apostatized; and though Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against *his* church, he has suffered them to prevail against that of Rome. He has removed the candlestick, that is the branch of his church that was once in Rome, out of the place, as he did to many other churches, for the same reason. Of some, indeed, the memory is perished from the earth; but for reasons known fully to himself alone, he suffered the Church of Rome to retain a name and a visible form, after the spirit was gone, and to become the antitype of Babylon, the oppressor and persecutor of the church of God.

To know that a church is in error, it is not necessary to prove when, and by whom the error was first broached; yet W. D. seems to express great triumph, because nobody can tell who said the first mass. Had he been a servant of the husbandman, in whose field tares had been sown, and had sprung up, he would not have believed that tares were in the field, though he saw them with his own eyes, unless somebody could tell who sowed them. To the master, and the wise servants, it appeared that the tares were sown while they were off their guard, and that it was the work of an enemy. This was evident from the actual state of the field, though they could tell no more about it. So the Church of Rome is now full of errors, though it be not easy to fix the precise time, or to name the persons by whom they were all introduced. She has departed from the unerring standard, she is many degrees distant from it; we are therefore sure that she has erred, though we should not be able to tell who made the first wry step.

A few farther remarks on W. D.'s letter in my next.

No. LXXI.

SATURDAY, November 20th, 1819.

My correspondent, W. D., whose letter I gave in my last Number, refuses to admit that the Church of Rome is in any error, because no Protestant can tell him who was the first that erred, or who said the first mass: to which I replied, that we found her far removed from the unerring standard; and that, therefore, we were sure that she had erred, though we could not tell who made the first wry step. I shall illustrate this by the following incident:—

I happened to be in Greenock a few weeks ago, in a very foggy night, when some gentlemen hired a boat to ferry them over to Helensburgh. They could not see above ten yards round them, and they had no compass. The men rowed with all their might for about two hours, when they made land, supposing it to be Helensburgh; but it turned out to be Cartsdyke, on the Greenock side of the river, and not half a mile distant from the place from which they started. Now, had W. D. been one of the company, he must, according to his mode of reasoning, have maintained that Cartsdyke was Helensburgh, unless somebody could tell which of the rowers had gained so upon the other, as insensibly to turn about the boat. But the sensible part of the company, seeing how matters stood, would confess that they had erred from their course, though they could not tell who gave the first stroke of the oar that led them astray.

In the thick and long-continued darkness of Europe, it is not surprising that the great body of the people went astray from the truth, and wandered in the mazes of error. Indeed, it could not have been otherwise, without a perpetual miracle. But W. D. will admit of no error having been broached, unless we can produce a distinct record of its introduction; while the very darkness which facilitated the propagation of error, rendered it difficult, if not impossible, in many instances, to preserve such record: yet, this writer most confidently assures us, that "there is no heresy whatever, nor any point of discipline that is, or ever was practised in the Church of Rome, or any other

church whatever, but what is recorded by some historian; but we have no such records of the supposed errors of the Church of Rome." It is impossible that W. D. can know what he asserts in the first part of this sentence without inspiration; therefore we may let this pass till he shall make it appear that he is possessed of the gift: and as for the errors of the Church of Rome, we have enough on record to show us when some of the principal ones came to be publicly acknowledged as what is called Catholic doctrine. This is well known to every reader of Church history, but I am afraid I cannot rank W. D. among the number. Let him read Milner's Church History, or even his own Dupin, and he will see reason enough to be "reconverted back again."

He speaks of the succession of Popes from Peter, who, he says, was the first of them, with as much confidence as if it were a thing as clear and undisputed as the succession of our royal family from king James the First; but, if he be not a novice indeed, he must know that this is all nonsense. I defy him, and the whole Church of Rome, to produce a sentence from the genuine writings of any one of the Fathers, which distinctly proves that Peter ever was in Rome, much less that he was bishop of that see. But as I intend to discuss this subject at length in some future Numbers, I shall not enter farther upon it here. My correspondent gives a list of Fathers, whose writings, he says, he has seen; but if I may judge from the manner in which he writes English, I suspect he cannot read these Fathers in the original languages. He must trust, therefore, to mere garbled scraps of translations, or barefaced forgeries, such as his priests are pleased to show him, and which are of no authority whatever. It is well known that the Church of Rome has, by her Index Expurgatorius, expunged from the works of the Fathers every passage that she judged contrary to her own doctrine; and that she has actually foisted into the blank spaces which the Index made, words which the authors never wrote, expressing sentiments which they never held. From such corrupted editions of the Fathers, Popish writers make their quotations. Indeed, if they were to use other editions, and give the genuine words of the Fathers, it would be at the peril of falling under the vengeance of the Inquisition, if they should ever come within its reach. If W. D. did not know of the existence of the Index, I hope he will thank me for the information; and as the fact is as notorious as the existence of the Fathers themselves, I hope he will hereafter pay little attention to what his ghostly guides may please to present him from St Irenæus, or any saint of the Pope's making; and that he will have recourse to his Bible, which will not lead him astray.

He quotes, apparently with approbation, Gother's curses upon those who believe, or do not believe, certain matters, or whose worship is not perfectly according to rule: thus, for instance, "Cursed is he who worships any breaden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine;" and the Respondent is taught to say, "Amen." This great curse leaves room enough for worshipping what appears to be bread and wine, though not as bread and wine; just as the curse pronounced upon every goddess-worshipper, leaves persons at full liberty to worship the Virgin Mary, provided they do not put their trust in her *more* than in God, or suppose that she is *above* her Son, or can *command* him. These are mere quibbles, intended to deceive simple Protestants, and to conceal the notorious fact that Papists do worship idols; and their denying the fact with such bitter cursing, only shows that they have no *honest* way of clearing themselves. We do not read that ever the apostle Peter had recourse to cursing, but when he was guilty of another great crime, and wished to conceal the truth.

In this article the Church of Rome shows herself to be the very opposite of the true church of Christ, whose motto is, "Bless and curse not." The promise of God to Abraham extends to the whole church—"I will bless thee, and make thee a blessing." She looks with a benign aspect towards the whole human race. She prays, and labours, that all men may be brought into the fold of Christ, that they may enjoy the blessing of Abraham, which is come upon the Gentiles. But if men will not come into the fold, in the way of believing in Christ, as God has commanded; if they will continue heathens and idolaters, Christians pity them, and pray for their conversion, but they are by no means warranted to curse them. I suppose W. D. thinks it his duty, most devoutly, to curse "THE PROTESTANT," in imitation of his brethren here, by whom he was, about a year ago, most heartily cursed, even from the pulpit; but I should reckon myself guilty of a great crime were I to curse either him or them. I shall be told, perhaps, that an apostle says, If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha. An apostle does, indeed, say so; but he is speaking by inspiration, and declaring the righteous judgment of God against the enemies of Christ, which shall be executed upon all the finally impenitent; and the company of the saved will cordially acquiesce in that sentence; but this is not a rule by which we are warranted to deal with fellow creatures in this world; or an example which we are to imitate, by cursing all whom we believe to be in error.

One remark more on this letter, and I shall have done with it. The writer very kindly advises me to give the religion of Papists from their own books, without misrepresentation, and then condemn them, if I can, with cool

reasoning and fair argument. Now this is the very thing I have done all along. I have in no instance, so far as I recollect, ascribed any doctrine to the Church of Rome, at least no one of any importance; and I have founded no argument upon any doctrine ascribed to her, without laying down the doctrine in the very words of her own authors. I have been very liberal in my extracts from these; but when any fundamental doctrine was in question, I have not satisfied myself with the authority of any individual author, however high in rank and reputation, though this should be enough in a church, in which the faith of one is declared to be the faith of all; but I have given the authority of Councils and Colleges, and Catechisms, which are admitted to contain and express the real doctrine of the Church of Rome. On the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, I gave the words of the Council of Constance, and showed how the doctrine was practised under the sanction of that Council. On the subject of withholding the Bible from the common people, I gave the words of the College of Rheims, and of the Council of Trent, and of several modern authors. On the subject of worshipping saints and images, I gave a number of extracts from approved books of devotion; and on transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, besides the words of several Catechisms, I cited the supreme authority of the Council of Trent. From such authentic sources I have carefully given the doctrines of the Church of Rome; and I defy W. D. to show that I have misquoted a single sentence.

In some instances, indeed, I have given the words of Popish authors as quoted by others; by such men, for instance, as Archbishop Usher and Archbishop Tillotson, whose names are a sufficient security against imposition; and, in a few instances, from the author of "Free Thoughts," who, though he chose to publish his work without his name, is well known to have been a respectable Presbyterian Professor of Divinity, and in nothing that became a minister of Christ inferior to the above named primates of England and Ireland. I do not however rest so much upon the personal character of these great divines, as upon the fidelity of their quotations. They had access to more books than I have. I have given the words of Popish authors, as given literally, or translated by them, with reference to the books and pages; so that any man who has access to the original works, may try whether they have given the words or meaning faithfully. Had they made any misquotation or mistranslation, they would soon have been detected and exposed; and as this was never done that I have heard of, I have no hesitation in taking the correctness of their quotations as admitted. And with regard to the last mentioned writer, the author of "Free Thoughts," though his book be anonymous, his quotations are not so, because he gives the names, and refers to the works and pages of the authors from whom he quotes. Authorities thus given are as authentic as if they came from the lips of the Pope of Rome; and, perhaps, more so. I know that some modern Papists do not admit the authority of the word of God, as given by the Protestant translators, though the words should be precisely the same as in their own version; so, perhaps, they will not admit the *very words* of their own authors as they appear in Protestant books; but this only shows that they cannot be reasoned with, according to any rule of reason or common sense.

In matters of fact, relating to Popish worship and practice, I do not think it necessary to confine myself to Popish authors. I know it is a rule with Papists, to believe nothing, and to deny every thing, which is attested by Protestant writers, however high in reputation, if it shall have the least tendency to expose the idolatry and superstition of the Church of Rome; but this only shows that their system cannot bear the inspection and the verdict of honest men. No candid person would reject the evidence of such men as Dr. Middleton, or of any man, whatever be his private religious sentiments, who gives a credible account of what he saw and heard, and when there appears no motive that he could have to deceive his readers. Besides, it is affirmed by other travellers, and not denied by Papists themselves, that all that Dr. Middleton ascribes to Popish worship is true; and of its conformity with heathenism, any classical scholar is able to judge.

I am quite aware that our Scottish Papists, who feel themselves unable to answer the arguments of THE PROTESTANT, and who feel hurt by the exposure which, from time to time, he makes of their impieties and extortions, endeavour to satisfy themselves and one another, with the reflection that he brings all his materials from books written by enemies of the Church of Rome. The assertion is not true; but if it were, they ought not to reject the evidence which he brings against them; for, in nine instances out of ten, the enemies of Rome will be found to tell the truth.

Having done my Popish correspondents the favour of printing every word that they have addressed to me, under their true character, it will be allowed to be but fair that I should treat my readers with one or two of the immense file of letters which I have received from Protestants. The following, which relates to the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, is from a clergyman in the country, who kindly authorizes me to give his name. I omit part of the first paragraph, which relates to matters of which my readers have had enough in my 50th Number, and in my Letter to Mr M'Hardy. The paragraph concludes by assuring me, that

I may depend on the truth of the statement; and that the "circumstances are recorded in the court books of the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright."

Kilbride, July 16th, 1819.

SIR,—In the month of July, 1812, I was called to join in marriage two persons, the man a Papist, and the woman a Protestant. At the period of their marriage, the intended husband vowed, in the most solemn manner, not only to allow the woman the liberty of worshipping God according to her conscience, but also of having the female children who should proceed from the marriage, baptized by a Protestant clergyman, and brought up in the principles of the Protestant faith: she agreeing, at the same time, that the male children should be under his direction; it being understood by both parties that when the children came to years of understanding, they should have liberty of judging for themselves. All things went well till the month of June, 1813, when a female child was born. Immediately after, I was spoken to about baptism; but the husband had also applied to his priest to come forward and baptize it. At the earnest request of both parties, I was present at this intended meeting for baptism. I heard the afflicted mother, pale and weak from recent illness, tell her story with all the mildness of a Christian. I heard the priest, with sternness in his countenance, tell her there was no help for her, that the principles of their church bound all their adherents to bring up all their children in the principles of the Church of Rome, and to have their children baptized by a Catholic clergyman. I reminded him that this was a particular case, —there was a solemn promise. It is a bad promise, said he, and therefore must be broken. I asked him to give me the definition of a bad promise. The answer I received was, *Any promise inconsistent with the principles and practice of our church.* Mr Andrews, I hope, will observe this is not the assertion of a poor ignorant being, who could neither read nor write; but the declaration of a man to whom the *infallible* Church of Rome has committed the charge of the interests of four or five hundred immortal souls. He will observe, I trust, that the vow was not made under constraint, but emitted voluntarily, and made in the most solemn manner, in the presence of that God who hath said, he will not hold him guiltless that takes his name in vain. According to his own declaration, that in the Church of Rome, the faith of one is the faith of all, the meaning of the whole in plain English seems to be this, —That no promise or vow, however solemn, is binding on any Papist, when it will further the interest of the Church of Rome to break it. As Mr Andrews calls for facts, if this one will serve you, you are at liberty to use it in the manner you see most proper. I remain, Yours, &c. ROBERT CAMERON."

From the above, I beg leave to repeat the warning which I gave to my Protestant countrywomen on a former occasion, that they beware of connecting themselves with Papists. They may be assured it will be a miserable connection, unless they shall go over to their husbands' religion, and renounce the gospel of Christ, for the mass and the Virgin Mary. Then, indeed, they may be as happy as Papists can be under the iron rod, and the endless extortions of their ghostly guides: and if they have money to pay the priest, they may receive such assurances as he can give of happiness in another life; but if they are poor, they must shift for themselves. There is no mercy in the Church of Rome. With her there is nothing but pay or perish.

The above certified case is only a sample of what very frequently takes place in such mixed marriages. The baptism of the first child is that which brings parties to the test. It was this that originated the quarrel between M'Murray and his wife, and which led to his maltreating and abandoning both her and his child. Indeed, Papists are confessedly taken bound to have all their children baptized and brought up in what they call the only true church. If there be one more good natured than the rest, who chooses to indulge his Protestant wife in this matter, and allow her to get baptism to her child, in her own church, he is teased and tormented by his priest every time he goes to confession: and no wonder, as the priest considers himself robbed of his dues, which are no light matter, as we shall see by and by; and the poor man is also scouted at by all his brethren, as a lukewarm son of the church, and as a poor henpecked husband; an accusation which is not to be endured by any man of spirit. Hence he must compel his wife to yield to him the point of baptism by the priest, else he will wreak his vengeance on her, and make her life miserable.

A case lately occurred which will illustrate this matter. A Papist was brought before our Police-court for maltreating, and threatening to murder his Protestant wife. Another gentleman and myself got the history of the case from the woman while she was in waiting in the office. She had been married little more than a year; and her husband had treated her pretty well till she had the child which was in her arms, and which appeared to be about two months old. She gave her consent, at least she did not hinder him from applying to Mr Scott for baptism; but on application, the priest demanded half a guinea, and would not take less. This being more than the poor man was able to pay, he went home to his wife in dudgeon, and consented to go with her to her own minister, from whom she received baptism to her child for nothing; but he soon appeared to have repented of his compliance. Whether this was owing to the taunts of his brethren, or

the severe penance imposed by his priest, I cannot tell; but from that time he began to look down upon his wife; repeatedly beat her, as was declared by herself and some of her neighbours in open court: and she declared that she was in fear of her life.

The husband, when called upon for his defence, admitted that he was one of Mr Scott's people, and did not deny the fact of beating his wife, which was indeed distinctly proved; but he pleaded that he did not beat her because *she* was a Protestant, but because *he* was *drunk;* and that he could not well restrain himself when in that state. He was dismissed with a reprimand and suitable advice; and I heard the woman say, after leaving the court, that she durst not for her life go home to him; but that she would go with her infant to her friends in the north, if she should beg her way. This, I suppose, she has done, for on making inquiry lately of the elder of her district, to whom she had been known, I could hear nothing of her. The minister who baptized the child had previously told me the fact of a man and a woman coming to him, as described above, and particularly, that the man gave as his reason for coming to him, that Mr Scott demanded half-a-guinea for the baptism; but whether this was the neat price of the job, or whether it might not include some arrears, I cannot tell. Be this as it may, it must be allowed by every good Papist, that it was better that the child should perish under the guilt of heretical baptism, or without baptism, than that the priest should go without his half-guinea.

The man was one of the wildest looking fellows I had ever seen. His body was covered with a few woollen rags; so far as appeared, he had no shirt; he accused his wife of having taken some things out of his house; and in her defence, she stated, what was not denied by him, that she had put her blankets into a neighbour's house to save them from being taken away by him, and sold for liquor. This is a specimen of "Mr Scott's people." This is a true son of the church; one who has been regenerated by baptism, and who wants nothing but the absolution of Mr Scott, when he comes to die, to carry him right to heaven, at least to heaven by way of purgatory: but, what is of more importance than all, this is one of the subjects from whom the priest humanely exacts half-a-guinea for his baptism of a child, which really is not worth half-a-farthing.

More of such matter in my next.

No. LXXII.

SATURDAY, November 27th, 1819.

In my last Number, I alluded, in general terms, to the subject of mixed marriages, and showed the great misery that was likely to result from the union of Protestants with Papists. I have never heard of such a union being productive of happiness, in so much as one instance; and I am verily persuaded, that happiness, in the very lowest sense of the word, cannot be the result of such a connection, without the entire sacrifice of principle on both sides; and then, to be sure, the parties may be as happy as other heathens in the married state;—or without the Protestant party falling into the religion of the Papist, so as to do away the distinction between them; and then they may live like other good and quiet children of Rome.

A man or a woman, being under the influence of Christian principles, would, I think, be very cautious with regard to the principles, as well as the character, of the person with whom he or she was to be united for life. There is, perhaps, little danger of such persons as the above forming a connection with Papists. Real Christians have learned not to be unequally yoked; and the inequality between a real Christian and a real Papist, is so manifest at first view, that I cannot contemplate the possibility of such a union, without supposing a dereliction of principle, at least on the part of the former. The danger exists chiefly among thoughtless young persons, who have been born and brought up among Protestants, but who have received no religious education, and who do not know what real Christianity is. They are chiefly young females who, in this part of the kingdom, are in danger of becoming victims; for the influx of males from the Popish part of the empire, in search of employment, is much greater than that of females; and there must, of course, be many Popish young men willing to take wives of our Protestant women, while there are few or none of our Protestant young men, who would think of taking Popish wives.

Now, what is the consequence of a union between a Popish husband and a Protestant wife? Suppose the wife is like a great part of our female population, merely a creature for this world, who has never been taught to look forward to another world, or to consider her interest in it; she will, of course, look upon one religion as quite as good as another; and she cannot think of a better one than that of her husband, if he be but tolerably kind to her; she is therefore easily prevailed upon to fall into it. The husband, on the other hand, looks upon his religion as every thing to him. He may be a very sober man, or he may be ever so licentious. The difference of character will make no difference in his relation to the Church of Rome, or in his zeal for her glory and increase. He will imagine no action so meritorious in itself, or that will recommend him more to his brethren, than the conversion of a heretic; his heart, in short, becomes set upon this object; and as the only heretic under his influence is his wife, he will never rest till he has brought her fully over to his mother

church. It is in this way, I am credibly informed, that Popery has of late increased so much in England. Mixed marriages generally issue in bringing the Protestant party over to Popery; because the Protestant originally had no fixed religious principle of any kind, while the Papist was, in heart and soul, devoted to Popery: and all the children of such marriages are usually baptized and educated in the Church of Rome. I do not believe that Popery, in Glasgow, has yet increased much from this cause. I question if Mr Scott has, in his whole flock, half-a-dozen of adults who were born in Glasgow. The great bulk are Irish; there are a few from the North Highlands; and a few foreigners.

Sometimes, indeed, as in the case mentioned by a correspondent in my last Number, there is a mutual stipulation, that the children of one sex shall be baptized and educated in the father's religion, and of the other sex in the mother's. In the case referred to, the agreement seems to have been made by the Popish husband, without considering himself bound to observe it; at least it appeared, when he was brought to the test, that he paid more regard to the dispensation of his priest, than to his own solemn oath; and that he did not scruple to break faith with his wife. Indeed, it would be foolish to expect any thing else, without absolute indifference on both sides; for the side on which party zeal predominates will carry it against the more liberal. If both are equally zealous, the family will become a scene of perpetual discord; and the weaker vessel, whether it be the man or the wife, must ultimately give in.

It must be an odd sort of a schism that exists in families subject to such an arrangement as the above; and the effect must be extremely pernicious to the children. A friend of mine had, last year, an opportunity of witnessing this at one of the English watering places. There happened to lodge, under the same roof, a lady governess, having under her charge several children, the family of a baronet, whose lady was a Papist. It seems the agreement between the father and the mother of the children was, that the boys should be bred Protestants, and the girls Papists; and so far as is known, the agreement had been adhered to; but this said governess was the teacher of all the children, male and female; and she found herself in the awkward predicament of honest Cuddy, in "Old Mortality," who, between the clashing lessons of his tory lady and his whig mother, could not help, when he was catechised, blending the chief end of man with godfathers and godmothers, so as to mar the sense of both the Catechisms which he had been set to learn. This lady actually complained of the hardship of her lot, in being obliged to teach the English prayers to the boys, and the Romish ones to the girls. She had no preference of the one above the other, but only grudged the double labour of teaching and listening to both: and she actually asked my friend's opinion, whether it would not be lawful to go over to the Church of Rome, especially as her ladyship's confessor, who lived in the family, had offered her ten guineas (which, she said, would buy many fine things) if she would become a convert, using as an argument, that they had had no converts for some time, and it kept up their spirits to have one now and then.

I make use of this anecdote merely to show the miserable condition of the children, where such an arrangement as the above has been made. It is impossible for a conscientious Christian, father or mother, to witness, with indifference, their children of either sex, educated in what they heartily believe to be a false religion. If, therefore, both parties adhere to the agreement, both must abandon the children to some mercenary creature, who has no religion at all; for if they were to pitch upon a religious person to be the teacher, they could not prevent the religion of the teacher from being inculcated upon the children. In the case of the family referred to, it is easy to see what will be the issue with regard to the children of both sexes, seeing there is a priest living in the family, and a governess, almost willing to become his tool, for the slender bribe of ten guineas.

I return now to a subject of a more private and local nature. My readers have already been informed of the numerous extortions practised upon the poor Papists in Glasgow, in order to raise and uphold the magnificent establishment in Clyde Street. In addition to my former statements on this subject, take the following case, which is officially certified by the Clerk of the Town's Hospital, and is introduced by a letter from him, as follows:—

Glasgow Town's Hospital,
September, 1819.

Sir,—At the desire of the gentlemen of this institution, I transmit to you the following facts, that you may make use of them, if you think proper, in your Paper, The Protestant. The gentlemen of the Committee were much surprised at the conduct of Mr Scott in the affair, and were desirous to be personally informed of the case. A part of their number accordingly called upon the woman, when, in the presence of four individuals, she went over the facts stated in the Superintendent's Report; and declared, that she was ready to depone upon oath, as to their verity.

She then farther stated, that Mr Scott would not recommend her children for admission into the Catholic Schools, till she threatened, that if he would not, she would apply to get them admitted into one of the Protestant Charity Schools. And, in corroboration of the fact, regarding the *charge* made by Mr Scott, she

mentioned that it was a gentleman, named Mr Kerr, whom she employed to wait on the priest, in order to obtain baptism for her child. The gentlemen of the Committee also waited upon this person, who resides in High Street. I forget the number, but I was in his house. He being a Catholic also, soon suspected the drift of the inquiry; and, with their characteristic cunning on such occasions, did all in his power to elude giving the information wanted.

He, however, distinctly *admitted*, that though he used a good deal of entreaty with Mr Scott in behalf of the poor woman, yet, that he found it necessary to pay to Mr Scott the eight shillings mentioned in the woman's story, before he would consent to baptize the child. This man's wife, who was not a Catholic, was strongly inclined to give some additional information respecting the case, but was silenced by her husband.

The Committee have frequently had occasion to believe that some of their pensioners were in the habit of contributing towards the erection of the chapel; but they thought this case too particular a one to be passed over in the customary silence. Here follows the Superintendent's Report, read to the Committee, which he made up in his annual visitation of the Hospital poor:—

"20*th August*, 1819. Betty Dochie, alias Widow Hanlin, 44, Bridgegate, aged 36, has three children:—Helen, 5 years and 3 months; Michael, 3 years; and Alice, 8 months. Has thirty shillings quarterly from the hospital; no other supply. She strips feathers; has three other children variously employed. Her husband died in January last; had, before his death, given to Mr Scott *four pounds;* but had fallen back in his payments, in consequence of which, Mr Scott refused to recommend the children for admission to the Popish Schools. Nor would he baptize the infant, which was only two months old at its father's death, till the mother pawned a pair of blankets, for five shillings, and borrowed three shillings from a friend, and paid Mr Scott eight shillings; partly for christening the child, and partly for her husband's arrears. She says she will declare the above to be truth, before God and man."
—I am, &c. WILLIAM SYM, *Clerk.*

Thus it seems we are assessed, not for the support of our own poor brethren only, but also for the support of widows and orphans of Papists, who have been impoverished by the extortion of their priests; and thus the good citizens of Glasgow, who lately made so bold a stand against being taxed for the purpose of building parish churches, are actually, though indirectly, taxed for the building and support of a Popish chapel!

Thus far I had proceeded in composing the present Number, when I received some farther information, from the same authentic source, with regard to Mr Scott and Widow Hanlin, which justice to both parties requires me to communicate. On Martinmas day, when the widow called at the hospital for her half-quarter's allowance, she stated that, about a month before that, Mr Scott had called upon her, and that without upbraiding her for divulging the story which I have given above, he returned to her the eight shillings which he had extorted from her for the baptism of her child, &c.; and farther, that he had given her 12lbs. of meal per week, for three weeks; and that, moreover, he had charged her to tell this to no man.

I hope Mr Scott will believe me, when I say that this is the best thing I ever heard of him; and as I am assured that he had been informed that the widow's case had been communicated to me, he will allow me to congratulate myself, as the happy instrument, of not only relieving the widow, but also of producing a benevolent feeling in his mind, to which, perhaps, he had been too long a stranger. If Mr Scott be possessed of human feelings, he must have had more pleasure in returning these eight shillings to the poor widow, and in giving her a little meal, than in the many thousand pounds which have been extorted from persons almost as poor as she. Nay, I will venture to assert, that he never felt so much pleasure in contemplating the lofty minarets of his chapel, or the spacious rooms of his manse, with the extortions, by means of which they were reared, as he felt when he put the silver into the widow's hands.

This, however, is not the first instance of restitution that is on record. The reader will recollect a case, in my ninth Number, in which a whole shilling was restored, after having been extorted from a poor sick person; and if more instances had been communicated to me, I should gladly have recorded them. It is pleasant to see that the work of restitution has begun, and proceeded so far; because this is one evidence, that the extortioner has begun to repent; and though the extortion itself has produced nearly twenty thousand pounds, and though the amount of the restitution is, upon the whole, only nine shillings in money, and four pecks and a half of oatmeal, we must not be discouraged, but hope for the best, knowing that the greatest things in the world, even Rome itself, arose out of small beginnings.

Protestants have no idea of the immense sums of money which are levied upon Papists by their ghostly instructors. The Clyde Street chapel is, indeed, a standing monument and proof that the priest has access to the purses of the people, in a manner almost incomprehensible by Protestants. The following will show in what manner money is raised among the poor in Ireland. I copy the document from the Sun newspaper, of February 2d, 1819:—

"CIRCULAR SUGGESTED FOR PAROCHIAL

SUBSCRIPTIONS. To appoint a person in each parish to make individual application to each householder.—This person shall take with him to each village, or farm, a list of the householders, and shall apply to each of them, whether he was willing to contribute *tenpence,* or any higher sum, toward defraying the expenses of the Catholic petitions.—Each person paying should be marked down as paid, and the sum inserted in the margin.—Each person refusing, should have the words *refused to contribute tenpence,* added to his name.—And a second application should be made to those who refuse, *with an intimation, that the list would be read in the chapel the ensuing Sunday.*—The list should be read at the chapel, as soon as it was ascertained that no more could be collected.—The more wealthy persons will, of course, contribute more than tenpence; but no sum should be received from any person, save what he can afford to give, with the most perfect convenience.

"Sir,—I am directed by the Committee of accounts to send you the above plan, and to request your attention to it. It will not be easy to carry this plan into effect, without the countenance of the Catholic clergy; but it is presumed, from their constant attention to the interests of their countrymen, that they will give the plan the support of their advice. It is also expected that you will transmit to the board, an account of the parishes in the county in which you reside, in which this plan shall be carried into effect. You cannot do a greater service to the Catholic cause, than by exerting yourself, on this occasion, as the funds of the Board are quite exhausted, and it will be impossible to transmit our petitions to Parliament, unless subscriptions are collected. The mode of carrying this plan into effect is, of course, left with you; but it is hoped you will not refuse to give your zealous and active assistance. I have the honour to be, your very obedient humble servant, "DANIEL O'CONNELL."

On the above circular, a correspondent of the Sun writes:—"Here's an engine, Sir, strong enough to lift the Protestant establishment off its centre; and at work nearly these five years, unchecked and unnoticed! But I will forbear all comment, until I startle your readers with a little gentle instruction about the sum which the "circular" motion of this steam-engine was calculated to raise.

"The Popish Board, under whose authority the above curious document was issued, reckons, by its accredited "statement," the enumeration of the "emphatic" people of Ireland, the Papists, at four millions, two hundred thousand; reckoning then the subscribing patriots at *two-thirds,* their tenpennies would produce an impost of one hundred and sixteen thousand, six hundred and sixty-six pounds. I will, however, be candid enough not to take them upon their own deliberate exaggeration, but on a truer and more moderate standard. I will count them only as two-thirds of their vaunted number, and, of course, at two-thirds only of the above contribution. Still there will remain a subscription for the use of the Board, of SEVENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIX POUNDS, without calculating "the more wealthy persons, who, of course, contribute more than tenpence." Supposing this, as we well may, a monthly contribution, it has produced the annual sum of nine hundred and thirty-three thousand, three hundred and twelve pounds: which for the last four years, from 1814, it would not be fair, Sir, to include the ways and means of 1819, as already raised, makes an aggregate sum of more than three millions, seven hundred thousand pounds, collected from the Papists of Ireland, by her controlling and managing Board.—Talk of the King's taxes after this!"

I think this writer must be mistaken in supposing the above tenpennies collected monthly. I see no evidence of this in the circular itself; and I should rather suppose them collected only annually, according to the annual occasion of petitioning. This reduces the sum to a twelfth part of what is above stated; and yet it is sufficiently enormous to justify the following remarks, by the same writer:—

"Now, Sir, what occasion, what honest and lawful occasion, had the Board for such a sum? I acquit its members of pocketing this money among themselves: but, after accounting for all their public expenses—their agents' bills for prosecutions and defences, their counsellors' fees, the fines of their convicted libellers, the salaries of their seditious newspapers, the secret service money of their threshers, and carders, and ribbon men, the annuities of their suffering patriots, and the representatives of their executed martyrs; nay, their presents to one another of cups and side-boards, a tolerable sum will remain; of which, *unless expended in the purchase of boroughs,* I call upon the Board and its collectors to state the application. Silence will convict them.

"If you knew, Mr Editor, the delusions practised upon the poor ignorant Papists in Ireland, the irritations with which they are perpetually fevered, and the more than despotic authority with which their priests trample upon both body and soul, you would readily believe the facility of levying, even the enormous sum which I have stated. The means too of compelling the refractory, are more "emphatic" than even tax-gatherer or tithe-proctor can adopt. To read the name of the recusant in the public chapel, was an especial mode of enforcing contributions."—"Protestants! Look to yourselves, Popery is awake,—ye are asleep:—Popery is busy,—ye are idle:—Popery is ever doing something—ye are never doing any thing."

One cannot but perceive a little of the Jesuit in the plan above recommended for raising subscriptions. It is ordered, that no sum shall be received from any person, save what he can afford to give with the utmost convenience. Now this serves as a ready, and will be considered by many, as a sufficient reply to any person who shall accuse the Board of oppression and extortion. But then every person, *without exception*, who refuses to pay tenpence, is to have the fact written opposite his name; and his name, and his refusing to pay tenpence for the sake of "Catholic emancipation," are to be publicly announced in the chapel. This is hanging a sword over the head of the very poorest; and, though he should not have a potatoe to his supper, woe be to the man who does not pay tenpence!

No. LXXIII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 4TH, 1819.

A CORRESPONDENT has favoured me with a lively description of a Popish ceremony, which he had an opportunity of witnessing, and which, without farther preface, I shall lay before my readers:—

"DEAR SIR,—It was my fortune last year to visit Canada, where I had an opportunity of witnessing some of the delusions of Popery. An account of some of these scenes may, perhaps, be useful, and it is certainly incumbent on all who have it in their power, to co-operate in the good fight which you have so manfully undertaken, and are so successfully maintaining, against those who put darkness for light, and substitute the doctrines of devils for the precepts of God's word. While in Montreal, in the month of November, last year, I learned that two new bells were about to be placed in the steeple of the principal church, and that, previously to being suspended, it was necessary that they should be baptized. The baptism of a bell, a piece of inanimate matter, was to me a novelty: I had often seen the ordinance administered both by those who believe in infant baptism, and by those who do not, but such a profanation of that sacred rite being no longer heard of in my native country, I never expected to have had an opportunity of witnessing it. Surely, thought I, these priests are either themselves most pitiable dupes of the deceiver, or they are most bare-faced impostors. Common sense seems by them to be laughed at; and they appear to put their ingenuity to the stretch to discover the way of most effectually insulting the understandings of the ignorant Canadians, and of most openly degrading and ridiculing the institutions of the kingdom of Christ. As it happened to be on a week day, I resolved to be a spectator; had it been on the Lord's day, I should not have felt myself justifiable in so appropriating holy time. About two o'clock, the principal bell (for there are several in the steeple) began to ring, and I repaired to the church: the people were assembling in considerable numbers, and from the eagerness with which they scrambled over the pews to get into a good situation for seeing, I suspect the greater number present, even of the papists, were influenced more by curiosity than devotion; one proof among many that the Popish religion consists chiefly of ceremonial mummery, incapable of instructing the understanding, or touching the heart, and is not intended to regulate the affections or influence the conduct of those who profess it. The two bells were suspended from a temporary erection of wood in the centre of the church; in the vacant space round them, a table and chairs were placed for the principal performers. The candles on the altar at the upper end of the church were lighted in readiness for the exhibition, and in a short time a door on the left of the altar opened, and forth came the procession. At the head of it were two boys dressed in white, carrying two immense candles, each of which, with the candlestick, might probably measure seven or eight feet. After them came the priests, some in gorgeous silken robes, some in white, others in black, and some flaring with bright colours and gold; other boys also in white followed, one of whom bore a silver vase with water, and another a small vessel of oil. Some of the priests in black took their seats near the altar, the rest came forward to the bells; the large candles were placed upon the table, and beside them the vase and the vessel of oil. One of the priests, an old man dressed in white, then got up into the pulpit at the side of the church, to address the people; but he seemed not a little offended with the want of decorum that appeared in the assembly, for there was a good deal of pushing and squeezing, and most were standing on the seats that they might see over the heads of those before them;—he told them, in a pretty long harangue, in the French language, that this was a religious ceremony, and must be attended to with solemnity and decorum: he talked to them of the pious feelings which ought to be produced in their minds by seeing bells baptized, and the veneration and awe which it was to be expected they would feel. The people, however, were far from being so profoundly devout as he wished them, and a little noise still interrupting his reverence, he clapped his hands, and very angrily told them that if they did not behave better he would turn them all out. Descending from the pulpit, he put on a robe of various bright colours, and proceeded to the ceremonial. After chaunting a hymn he read Latin prayers over the water in the basin, and thus, I suppose, consecrated it; another of the priests

then carried the basin to the bells, and the first dipped a pretty large brush in the water, and with it made the form of the cross upon the bell, pronouncing words which I could not hear, but which could be nothing else than the solemn form used on such occasions, *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti;* a third priest, with another brush, completed his work, making cross after cross, and then carefully brushing the intermediate places till the bell was wetted all over; the second bell was crossed and recrossed, in the same manner, and immediately large clean towels were produced, and the bells were carefully wiped dry. Returning to the table, singing and reading of prayers succeeded, and the oil was next blessed and made holy; the principal priest then dipped his finger in the oil, and made the sign of the cross on one place on each bell, carefully wiping the place with cotton wool, he then repeated it on a great many places on the bells both inside and outside, carefully wiping them as before with cotton. During the singing which followed, one of the boys went out and brought in a silver censer with red coals in it: a small box of incense stood on the table, out of which the priest took a spoonful and threw it on the coals, reading prayers over it as before; the incense smoked up and perfumed the air; then, after waving the censer with great solemnity three times, he carried it first to the one bell and then to the other, holding it under them till they were filled with the smoke. An important part of the ceremony yet remained, the bells had to get their names, for without that they could not be Christian bells, and as the baptismal vows could not be taken by themselves, the holy infallible church thought it necessary that sponsors should do it for them; accordingly a god-father and a god-mother for each bell, were in waiting,—two reverend old couples, who were sitting with the priests beside the tables; these were now brought forward and stationed, the one gentleman and lady at the one bell, and the other two at the other. The principal priest then put some questions to the first old gentleman and lady, which they answered; but I was not near enough to hear what they vowed on behalf of the bell: the bell then received its name, and the priest taking the clapper gave three strokes against the side; the old god-father then took hold of it and did the same, and last of all the old lady the god-mother. The priest leaving them went through the same ceremony with the couple at the other bell, and thus the two bells were baptized, got their names, and were made to speak. The name of the one, as I afterwards learned, began Pierre Marguerite, with some addition which has escaped me: I do not know that I heard the name of the other. All was not yet over, the god-fathers and god-mothers, to crown the whole, produced their presents to their adopted children, and certainly nothing could be more suitable than clothes to the orphans; a large piece of linen was given to one of the priests, who with much solemnity wound it several times round the bell, next a large piece of crimson silk which was put over the linen, and last of all fringes and white silk ribands, which served to tie all on: the other couple were not to be outdone in generosity, and their linen, and silk, and ribands were also produced, and the second bell duly and decorously clothed; it was even somewhat gayer than its neighbour, for the silk bestowed upon it was very richly figured. Thus ended the sacrilegious rite of baptizing church bells! The boys elevated the large candlesticks, and the procession of priests departed as it had entered. In a day or two after, the bells were suspended in the steeple, fully qualified to ring souls out of purgatory, and perform all the other important duties of Popish bells. Let not your readers start at the idea of bells effecting the release of the souls of the departed from the fangs of the tormentor; I believe, indeed, that this is far beyond the ability of our heretical presbyterian bells, but nothing is too hard for a bell that has received Papistical baptism. While I remained at Montreal, *All Saints' day* came round, which is one in which the bells have their hands full of work; prayers are then offered up for the souls of all departed saints; high mass is performed for their benefit; and the bells are rung loud and long to effect their release. Passing the church door in the evening, I stepped in to see what was going forward; the services of the day were over, and there was no light in the church, except from the glimmering of a small oil lamp, which is kept constantly burning before the altar. In different places were several of the poor ignorant Canadians on their knees, praying for the souls of their dead relations, crossing themselves with great fervour; taking care, as they went out and came in, not to omit a daubing with holy water. In the middle passage a platform was erected, painted black, adorned with skulls and crossed bones, and on the top of it lay a coffin. This was emblematical of the dead for whom they were praying, and was intended to increase the fervour and the efficacy of their prayers. The bells were kept ringing almost the whole day; and according to the time that they were rung, and the number of masses and prayers that were said, a proportionate number of the dead were to be released from purgatory. That afternoon the bells are allowed to be rung by all who choose, and the poor creatures pulled away without intermission, vainly believing that the harder and the longer they rang, the sooner they would get their friends emancipated from Satan's house of correction. Next day, and for several days after, I saw a painted board suspended on a church door, inscribed, '*Indul-*

gence plenière pour les morts,' 'Plenary indulgence for the dead;' and I was informed, that whoever, during these days, confessed to a priest, should have forty days remission, after his death, of the pains of purgatory.

"These are some of the 'doctrines of devils' which are taught by the holy Roman Catholic Church; and this is a faithful account of some of the rites and ceremonies of which I was an eye and ear-witness.—I am, &c. J. M. D."

Another correspondent has favoured me with a description of a similar ceremony at Naples, extracted from a letter of an English traveller, in the London Magazine for 1780. A noble lord was god-father to the bell, and a lady of quality was god-mother. Most of the prayers said on the occasion, ended with the following words: *Ut hoc tintinnabulum cœlesti benedictione perfundere, purificare, sanctificare, et consecrare dignareris:* "that thou wouldest be pleased to rinse, purify, sanctify, and consecrate this bell with thy heavenly benediction." The following were the words of consecration: *Consecretur et Sanctificetur signum istud, in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.* "Let the sign be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The bishop then turning to the people, said, The bell's name is Mary. He had previously demanded of the god-father and god-mother what name they would have put upon the bell, and the lady gave it this name.

The Canadian Popish ceremony above described reminds me of the communication of another correspondent, which has been lying past me for a long time. The writer is an American gentleman, who has made a tour of some of the United States, and into Canada, as far as the Falls of Niagara. I received the communication, indeed, before the commencement of my work, so that it cannot be considered as having any reference to my controversy with the Church of Rome. But along with a great variety of particulars, which would form an interesting little volume, there is an account of two or three convents and nunneries, which, I think, will be interesting to my readers, and which, therefore, I shall extract. The writer had the privilege which few Protestants have had, that of examining the interior of a nunnery:—

"The greatest objects of curiosity," says my correspondent, "which Montreal afforded, in my estimation, were the convents; but most of our acquaintances being Protestants, we had been several days in the city, without finding any person who had the influence to procure us admission.

"I mentioned this circumstance to a gentleman, in whose house we were one day dining, and I met with a reply which led to the object in view. The morning following we received the compliments of his family, with an offer of conducting us through the convents that afternoon. Upon going to the house, we found that professional duties had called Dr ——— from home; but his lady (who holds some religious function in the Romish church) and her daughters were ready to accompany us. The first to which we were led, was that of the order of St ———. After shutting the wall gates, and sending a ceremonious message to the priest, we were admitted into the medicine room. The door was opened by a very old nun, to whom we were formally introduced. Nothing being here, but an extensive assortment of drugs, kept with great cleanliness, we ascended a stair, and were conducted through a number of large rooms, appropriated to the several religious rites through which the nuns go. Many of these rooms are most gorgeously decorated with the symbols of the Popish faith; such as crucifixes, representations of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, Scripture paintings, portraits of the Popes, and of the most eminent priests of the convent, &c. After a long succession of such apartments, the number of which I do not recollect, we were ushered into a large hall, used as a sitting-room by the nuns, a great number of whom were in it at the time. On our entrance, two of the oldest stepped forward, to whom, being introduced by Mrs ———, we were requested to take seats. I was not a little surprised by this invitation, which appeared to me so much more familiar than, by general accounts, the manners of a nunnery would admit. Guided, however, in my conduct entirely by that of Mrs ——— and her daughters, I seated myself between one of the latter and an old nun, who bounded the row we had formed. I at first addressed myself to the nun, asking several questions relative to the convent, and was answered in the best English she could speak; but my questions probably multiplying too fast for her command of English, she referred me to the young lady at my right hand, who, she observed, had been educated in a convent, and could inform me of every thing relating to them. Turning round, I repeated what the venerable nun had said to Miss ———, who acknowledged the mentioned education, and answered all my interrogatories.

"Rising again from our seats, we were led through a long entry, on each side of which was a row of bed chambers, till coming to the end of it, where there was a window communicating with the chapel, we looked to see whether admittance could be gained. On our first arrival at the window, there appeared a priest in the act of devotion before the altar. The continuance of his prayer, however, was not long, or we should have lost our view of the chapel. While we waited in the entry, the idea occurred to me, of peeping into one of these chambers. In case of committing an offence in doing so, I asked at one of the young

ladies, if indulging my whim would be improper; to which she, with a smile, replied, 'Not more improper than going into any lady's chamber!" I hesitated no longer, but seeing the old nun's back turned, gently opened one of the doors, and gratified my curiosity. My correspondent describes the size and furniture of the room; but the only object which distinguished it particularly from such apartments in our own country, was an image of Christ's ascension, placed conspicuously on a table.

"The priest in the chapel had by this time finished his prayer, upon which I shut the chamber door, and followed our party. We now descended the stair again, and were taken by a circuitous course to the great door. The chapel is a large and elegant apartment, extending to the full height of the building, which is three stories. The style of it is a demi-gothic, large pillars intersecting the wall, at short distances, and meeting at the top in arches. In the middle stands the altar, most superbly decorated with paintings, images, and all other ornaments that are used for such purposes. A handsome parapet divides the whole into two parts; one of which is occupied by the nuns, the other by the young females who are educated within the convent. We were about retiring, when one of the young ladies, pointing to a corner, which I had passed unnoticed, desired me to look where all the sins were confessed. On casting my eyes to the place, I saw a box, resembling a projecting closet; and addressing my informant, I asked, if so small a place could contain all her sins? To this question she made no reply, but, 'step forward, and hear some of them.' She walked into the open division; and I, to humour the joke, entered the priest's place. At this she barred the door, and, stepping out, desired me to follow. I had certainly now come under penance for this act of sacrilege, had not the fear of the old nun's eye hastened my release.

"Into the school-room, which projects from the main building, we were led up by a different stair; and, passing through one large room, entered another, in which were the scholars. There were no less than forty girls in the room, all at their respective tasks, in the different branches of reading, writing, arithmetic, and sewing. The ages of these children might probably be from seven to fourteen. The term of education in the convent is five years, during which period, the pupils are permitted only once a month to go beyond the walls; a confinement which, at so early an age, can hardly be productive of good consequences."

My correspondent was conducted to another nunnery, in which one of his lady companions had been educated, and where of course, they felt more at home. "We had not sat long," says he, "before I observed a great intimacy between Miss ——— and one of the young nuns. Wishing to join in their conversation, I took the liberty of interrupting it with a remark of my own; and as both happened to have a great share of affability, I soon succeeded in becoming a party in the discourse. The young nun, I found, possessed a mind extremely well cultivated, together with an exterior gracefulness, which seemed more a polish received from the liberal circles of fashion, than an acquirement from the reserved manners of a nunnery. The great variety of ages among the nuns induced me to ask her how the employments were shared among them; to which I was answered to the following effect:—'The youngest of us are chiefly employed in making clothes for the pupils, and for the old nuns who are incapable of doing it for themselves; those of a more advanced age, teach, and employ themselves often with sewing for charitable purposes; sometimes also in doing work for the mantua-makers, from whom the convent receives a compensation. Conserves, cordials, and many such things, are made by those who best understand them.' 'And by these means, Madam,' I observed, 'those who seem superannuated, are left at rest.' 'Yes,' replied Miss ———, inadvertently, 'the old ones are good for nothing.'

"This abrupt unlucky expression proved a finishing stroke to our talk: a general smile was observed throughout the room, at which Mrs ——— thought it proper to rise. In continuing our course through the building, we were accompanied by the young nun and several old ones, who all seemed willing to converse, and were much more affable than I could have supposed, by judging from general accounts of monastic manners."

My correspondent found out, and communicated to me, the name and rank of the young nun who interested him so much; but I forbear giving particulars, lest they should meet the eye, and give pain to some of her relations, seeing my work is finding its way into very remote parts of the world. Suffice it to say, that she had voluntarily forsaken her father's house, where she enjoyed all the gaieties which this world can afford, that she might be immured for life within the walls of a nunnery.

Some of my readers may, perhaps, be disposed to reckon this a very innocent and happy life; and my correspondent will be understood as giving a most favourable view of Popery. For my own part, without intending any thing particular in the conduct of the Canadian sisterhood, I have no hesitation in pronouncing the life of a nun, as well as that of a monk, a wicked and a miserable one. God has not required either men or women to seclude themselves from the world in this manner; and as the thing originated with the prince of darkness, it would be easy to show that the fruit has been an abundance of the works of darkness. But on this subject I do not choose to enter farther at present.

No. LXXIV.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 11TH, 1819.

FOR the following letter I am indebted to a gentleman who is personally known to me, and who has seen a good deal of Ireland. His narrative confirms what I have already related of certain Popish superstitions which are practised in that kingdom; and it contains besides, some original matter, which will, I think, be interesting to the reader:—

"TO THE PROTESTANT."

"SIR,—In confirmation of much that you have advanced in "THE PROTESTANT," on the subject of consecrated wells, the gross ignorance of the Catholic population of Ireland, and of the priests professing to forgive sins, I beg leave to mention to you some particulars of a visit which I paid to that country, in the year 1812, every circumstance of which is founded in truth. Educated as a member of the church of Scotland, and having never till then had any connection with Roman Catholics, their faith had not become an object of much attention to me. Early did I hear that their church was described in the Apocalypse; and in advancing years I was convinced, that it was the "Man of sin," mentioned by the apostle Paul, in one of his epistles to the Thessalonians. Farther, I thought little about the Church of Rome, or her members, except sometimes indulging a feeling of pity that so large a portion of Europe was enveloped in such thick darkness.

"I arrived in Dublin about the middle of June, and soon heard that an immense collection of people were to assemble on the eve of St John's day, the 24th of that month, to receive absolution from their ghostly fathers, for penances performed at certain wells near that city, or for observing other ceremonies. I was at first incredulous; but, as the distance was not more than two miles, I was induced to go and see what was to take place.

"We arrived at a large field, which either was, or had been, a burying ground, as certain rude pillars, and some grave stones, sufficiently demonstrated. In the middle of the field was a rising ground, and on one of the slops, was pitched a great number of tents, in which were persons of both sexes, dancing, drinking, and singing. It occurred to me at once,—Can this be a religious ceremony? Are these persons in deep contrition for their sins? or are not these the orgies of some heathen deity? I was instantly roused, at ideas so incongruous to all devotional feeling; and with some dread, I confess, I approached and entered some of the tents, to inspect more narrowly this strange thing "Catholicity," as it is now called. I very soon found that, though a heretic, I was a welcome visitor, and that the amusements in that quarter were any thing but of a serious cast. Prompted by increasing curiosity, I perambulated the immense field, where many thousands of both sexes were collected, and at last I reached the sacred well. Around this were assembled a vast multitude of men and women, hawking sweet-meats, toys, ballads, &c., many girls, well advanced, half naked, and young children, many of whom were held down under a pretty strong cascade of water, by their older friends or relations; and this appeared to be the *penance* part of the field, for the girls were, to appearance, very much disinclined to endure the cold bath. They were frequently encouraged by the deaconesses, as I termed them, to endure a little longer, and the appointment of the priest would be completed. I was not at first inclined to approach nearer; but, by this time, finding my curiosity and boldness increase, and happening to be dressed in black, I repeated these fantastic words in Latin, "*Artium societatus socius.*" Instantly a call was made, to allow his reverence to get nearer the holy well. So much for the use of a dead language, in reference to their religious ceremonies. Here I was kindly offered a drink of this absolvent water; but as I was not accustomed to assume the sacred character, I deemed it proper to make my escape from such company as quickly as possible. I afterwards learned that many miracles had been performed that evening, by the cure of diseases at this well. In ordinary cases, a church yard is calculated to excite solemn feelings. Here it was quite otherwise; and that not in an obscure corner of the province of Connaught, or among the wild Irish, improperly, I confess, so called, but within two or three miles of the capital of Ireland!

"From particular circumstances, I afterwards became connected for a time, with Roman Catholics of some consequence in that kingdom. It is not to be expected that I should divulge confidential matters in any shape; but I will mention, that business led me to the county of Galway. Travelling in a post chaise, I arrived at the Abbey, or Monastery, I know not which, of ———. This being partly in ruins, but being fine ones, I was requested by the driver to alight, and proceed a little off the road to take a view of them. I did so, and knocking at a gate, I was admitted by a female, who very politely told me that the proprietor was absent, which he would lament, as he was partial to travellers, and was acquainted with the present Pope; but that she would be happy to show me the buildings. One part of them, I found, was devoted to a chapel; and behind, within the walls, was a burying place. My attention was instantly arrested by a vast quantity of human skulls, and other bones, which lay above ground, and which seemed to have been recently disinterred. On inquiring the reason of this, my conductress was at first a

little shy in giving an answer, but at last she told me, it had been done by the vulgar in quest of relics. Proceeding to another section of the building, I was still more astonished to find thousands of human skulls, packed up precisely as bottled liquor is, in the catacombs of a wine cellar; and they appeared very much whitened, as I supposed by long exposure to the weather. I inquired what these were? 'These, Sir,' said my informant, 'are the bones of the faithful, slain at the time your countryman, king William, visited Ireland.' Let the advocates of emancipation attend to this circumstance. This solemn '*memento mori*' is not kept above ground, and in the view of the '*faithful,*' of the present day, for nothing.

"Leaving the Abbey, I could not but reflect how it was that the proprietor, who I understand had seen much of the world, and was well educated, could allow his neighbours to wander here in search of relics, which are of no more use than the bones of a dead horse lying by the road-side? and why he suffered these bones, after having been dug up, to remain unburied?

"Proceeding to Galway, the same evening, I fell in with a very uncommon person, even one who traced up distinctly his pedigree to one of the ancient families of this county, who had been deprived of their estates during the troubles of Ireland, about two hundred years ago. He described the estates, gave the names of the present proprietors, and frequently said, that, under a new order of things, they would revert to him and his heirs as a matter of right. He often mentioned the name of king William the Third with strong terms of reprobation. Politeness in the party, who, with exception of himself, were all Protestants, made them only at first hint their dissent from his opinions. His warmth became greater, and his avowed abhorrence of king William, and of all Englishmen, only increased by our moderation; and the most violent expressions escaped him. At last he was reminded that the Union had a tendency to make us all brethren; and that old quarrels should be forgotten, that one mind might animate the inhabitants of the three kingdoms; but this had no effect upon him. He having declared his firm adherence to the Catholic faith, I asked him, 'Do you know any thing of the fifth commandment; that is our sixth, Thou shalt not kill?' To my surprise, he instantly fell on his knees to me, and kissing my hand, declared that he now knew I was a priest, and begged I would go home with him, and hear the confessions of himself, his wife, and family, as it had been delayed too long. I begged him to rise, assuring him, that I was a sinner like himself, and not a priest; but he only became the more importunate, and I was forced to leave the place. Previously to this, I had mentioned what I had seen at the monastery; and I asked him, if he had ever seen such a collection of human bones at any other place in Galway? He said he had, about two years ago; but that the apostles, Peter and Paul, accompanied by the Virgin Mary, had lately come down, and buried them all in one night!

"I became intimate with a gentleman, a Catholic, of no ordinary talents, finely educated on every subject of literature and philosophy, and a man of very just thinking on matters of business; but sadly prejudiced on matters of religion. I was led, from certain circumstances, to suppose that he had been originally intended for the priesthood. At all events he had received his education among the Jesuits. Seeing me frequently at chapel, he had, I suppose, formed a favourable opinion of me, and he proposed to make me an *honorary Catholic,* as he termed it. This I did not well understand; but said I had no objection to become Catholic if he could remove certain difficulties; and hoped that if I could remove his, he would become Protestant; but he did not very frankly acquiesce in this stipulation. I told him my difficulties were the invocation of saints, praying to the Virgin Mary, transubstantiation, auricular confession, and forgiveness of sins by the priests. Notwithstanding my quoting the standards of their church as used in Ireland, he denied the invocation of saints, and prayers to the Virgin Mary; but admitted transubstantiation, and the remission of sins by the priests. I put the question very strongly, Seeing we are all fallible creatures, suppose a priest should commit sin, to whom does he confess? who forgives him? My new acquaintance became ghastly and breathless; and after a pause of a few moments, he replied, 'They confess to one another every Saturday, and are absolved.' 'If,' said I, 'it is a doctrine of your church, that a sinful man can pardon a sinful man, I shall not become a Catholic.' Here the matter ended.

"In Ireland, I often heard the Catholics speak as if they were quite confident that we, and all their strayed brethren, would return to the true church, as they style theirs. Look, say they, at the Manichean Schism, more extensive in its effects, and of longer duration than your churches of Germany and England, and where is it now? I am, &c. A. O."

The following relates to Popish superstitions nearer home, even in the midst of Protestant Scotland. The writer has given me his name, which is indispensable in communications which relate to matters of fact; and I have no hesitation in saying that the statement may be relied on, as strictly true in every particular.

"TO THE PROTESTANT."

'SIR,—As connected with a late number of your seasonable and informing paper, I beg

leave to send you some particulars of which I myself have been an eye and ear-witness. They go to prove that Popery, like the house infected with the plague of leprosy, works secretly in minds once tainted with it, unless eradicated thence by the knowledge and love of divine truth. It is a system that cannot be ameliorated, and therefore the Scriptures denounce its total destruction, without sparing a foundation or corner stone. A liberal education, and intercourse with Protestants, may conceal or disguise its turpitude, and soften its asperities; but those who see its native deformity and tendency, and do not exert themselves to rescue the lower orders from so dire a pest—how dwells the love of God, and of mankind, in them?

"Your correspondent once visited that famed place, St Fillan's seat, at a time when the waters there were reputed to possess the virtues of Siloam's pool of old. The extraordinary virtue of curing lunacy, and even raving madness, and other plagues incident to man, is thought to be derived to the place at the commencement of four terms of the year, from the once residence there of the Saint that gives it name, of whom wonderful things are told. When a worthy Protestant minister was fixed there whom we have once heard preach in this city, and who favoured his countrymen with their present version of the New Testament in Scotch Gaelic, he thought it his duty to preach against the superstition practised on such occasions. His life was threatened, if he did not desist, and some of his cattle are said to have been injured. The rites then practised, which were continued from time immemorial, brought gain to the village, the fear of losing which aroused the people's zeal, as in the case of the damsel at Philippi. After performing various rites and immersions, all thought necessary to complete the process, the patient was bound, hand and foot, to two planks fixed length-ways to the ground, amidst the ruins of a Popish chapel, and there left to pass the night. If found loosed from his bandages, by what was thought to be some supernatural agency, this was construed as an omen or pledge of the patient's recovery.

"But permit me to be a little more particular. The afflicted person, when he came to understand what his keepers had in view, he earnestly begged they would not perform such foolish things, or expect any advantage from them. An old man who attended for the purpose, who probably was once a Romish priest, but now acted as a teacher in the village, conducted all the ceremonies, and fluently expatiated on their origin and virtues. He carried the patient so many times across the ford of a river, and round so many cairns of stones, requiring him to throw one each time into the heap, raised probably in course of time by this means. With the stone was thrown some part of the patient's clothes, the pedagogue probably adding, as usual in such cases, some spell or charm.

"This ceremony over, which took some time, he was guarded to a pool of the same river, ordered to strip and wade into the deep part, and if reluctant, repeatedly immersed over head, and forcibly kept some time under water, while violently struggling, as if alarmed for his life. Females were equally welcome to witness the exhibition in the state of nature as the males, and all lent a hand to overawe and subdue the poor patient.—This pool was supposed to have all the virtue ascribed to it from a grey stone, once in possession of the Saint, and ordered, before his death, to be cast into this pool, where, however, it is now invisible. Long it was famous, even after his death, for giving speedy delivery to women in hard child-labour, and for other distresses, and often sent for, from a great distance to answer such purposes, and greatly relied on in such cases. The virtue of this consecrated stone did not die with the famed Saint, and is supposed to continue periodically in the pool into which it was thrown, at least so far as respects the removal of certain ailments. In vain you ask any questions, you must implicitly receive whatever they hand down from tradition.

"The patient having got dressed, he is conducted next to the side of an adjacent hill, to drink copious draughts from a well, dedicated to some saint. Here the company pledge him, all expecting some benefit from the libations of this holy water. It escapes me whether this did not constitute the last ceremony, or was not preceded by what follows; whether, from this salutiferous fountain, he was not carried to the burial place, where a new place of worship was built, bordering on the ruins of the old Romish chapel. There the patient is made to sit down on a grave stone, on which lay a large hand bell, which is repeatedly rung over his head by the master of the ceremonies, and he is as often crowned with it; all the while money passes from hand to hand, and finally lodges with him, which is deemed a necessary part of this and of all the preceding rites. The pedagogue entertains you all the while, with the miraculous feats of this wonder-working bell, the spectators assenting to the truth of the whole. One of these was, that upon a time some wicked wretch stole it, and carried it all the way to Glasgow, whence it was soon heard returning, ringing all the way in the air, till it alighted on that grave stone where it then lay, to the astonishment of all beholders. These things were as firmly believed, and as gravely told, as if an angel had confirmed them from heaven; and they find professed Protestants silly enough to give them credit, I suppose, even to this day. By such vain stories is the reputation of this place of resort, all along maintained, so that to call them in question, would endanger any man's

safety who visits these bounds.—With great gravity they related a circumstance, which should have happened some time before, and greatly added to the reputation of this wonder-working place. Some man passing in his way to a public market, was heard to ridicule the virtue of the place, as merely delusion, and superstition. To be avenged for such profanation, he ran raving mad in the market, and was obliged to be carried back bound, to the very place which he had dared, so impiously, to ridicule. When professed Protestants are so silly as to expect relief from such rites, and to secure them at the cost of much labour and expense, no wonder they are credulous enough to give credit to such tales.

"The poor passive patient is now conducted to the dreary ruins of the Popish chapel, overgrown with nettles and other weeds, and there bound down firmly with a tether, between the two sides of an old car, with no covering but the heavens, and left thus to pass a long night in sadness and sorrow. The youth who was the subject of this painful operation, having a sense of piety on his mind, was desired to pray, before he was bound down among the prostrate dead. I can never forget one part of his solemn address, in which he expressed his abhorrence of these unhallowed rites, and appealed to God, that his compliance with them was the sole result of compulsion, and that he expected deliverance from quite another quarter.

"Thus have I given you a brief view of this infernal ceremony, so often practised even in highly favoured Scotland. Is it not surprising that any can think lightly of the crime of idolatry, so wicked in its origin, and so fatally degrading in its influence, who have access to know what punishment God inflicted on the Jews for the commission of it, and continues to inflict to this day? I am, Sir,

"A Constant Reader."

I shall conclude my miscellaneous matter for the present, by quoting a writer in the Orthodox Journal, for September last, who has pointed out the most effectual means of affording relief to our starving population. No plan so simple, and at the same time so likely to be effectual, has been suggested by any other author. The writer is a zealous Papist. He speaks of emancipation as if he despaired of obtaining it. He is for petitioning only *once more;* and in the event of the prayer of the petition being refused, which he considers almost certain, he calls upon his *five millions* of brethren to remove, bag and baggage, to Spain, that free and happy country, where he is almost sure the beloved Ferdinand will be most happy to receive them. Let this sublime measure be carried into effect, and there will be employment and provision enough in Britain and Ireland, for those who remain.

"We cannot," says this writer, "we cannot longer hug our misery, or slavishly embrace intolerable chains. Our bondage is more cruel than any death, and continued for ages. We are entirely wearied out under insupportable burdens, and galled to the heart by constant disappointments, in vain expectations. Another failure will show that our countrymen are also wearied of us, and that a separation must take place. We must then go into voluntary banishment. I mean not to America, the Cape of Good Hope, or New South Wales, whither, as we have much reason to fear, all our chains would follow us. *Faithful Spain* offers the fairest prospects to our view, where loving brethren, with stretched-out arms, are ready to receive us into their kind embraces. That kingdom was very much depopulated, even before the late destructive war, which completed its desolation, and left one fourth of that fine country a perfect desert."

"Five millions of good subjects," continues this writer, "is truly a grand object to Spain in its present situation."—"Should our first applications (*i. e.* for emancipation) fail, be you ready, Mr Andrews, to sound the trumpet of emigration. Let the peals of it, like thunder, be heard over all the British dominions, calling our people together. In the event of our being forced to emigrate, which is but too probable, from all the past obstinate resistance of our just claims, I wish you would induce some of your correspondents, who may have poetical talents, to compose a hymn appropriate to the occasion, upon the words, *In exitu Israel de Egypto,* and the rest of the first verse of that psalm. I am for committing the care of the tabernacle, in this holy transmigration, to the eminent Milner.—Sir James Gordon will conduct the Scots."

The writer is not in jest, but in sober earnest; and I do most cordially wish him, and Dr Milner, and Sir James Gordon, success in this "holy transmigration."

No. LXXV.

SATURDAY, December 18th, 1819.

It is time now to take up the solemn subject of Purgatory, which, in my sixty-ninth Number, I announced as the next general head of the plan which I had proposed to myself. As a suitable introduction to a subject of such importance, I quote the following anecdote from the Philanthropic Gazette, of the 27th October last, for the truth of which the Editor of that truly valuable Journal is responsible.

"A gentleman in Dublin lately called on a tenant for rent; the poor woman had been always punctual heretofore; she apologized for not being so now, by telling her landlord,

that the priest came to her lately, and asked her if she had heard from her husband? She answered, how could she, as he was dead? 'Oh! yes,' said he, 'but did you not hear that a great crowd was lately passing over *the bridge from purgatory to heaven;* that it broke down from the weight; that many were left at the wrong side, and amongst the rest your husband; that their lamentations had come to the priests to get the bridge repaired; therefore, he called upon her, who was so much interested, for a good subscription, as the job would be very expensive! The poor woman complied of course. In a few days after, the gentleman brought this nefarious traffic to exposure; the priest declared he only wanted the use of the money for a few days, and played this trick to obtain it, but that he meant to return it."

I will concede to my opponents that this anecdote is not taken from one of their own authors. It is, indeed, given as a fact in a highly respectable Newspaper; it is said to have taken place *lately* in Dublin; and as there are thousands of Papists in that city, where my work is republished in weekly Numbers, they will not only soon have an opportunity of reading the story, but they may, if they please, inquire into the truth of it. If it shall not be contradicted, or even questioned by those who have an opportunity of ascertaining the fact, I will consider its truth as admitted; and if so, it shows to what pitiful arts the holy fathers of Rome have recourse in order to rob people of their money.

I shall not, however, found any argument upon this anecdote, even supposing it to be true, but shall, according to my usual practice, lay down the doctrine of the Church of Rome in the words of her own accredited publications, and then proceed to show that it is contrary to Scripture and to common sense.

Purgatory, it must be confessed, makes no great figure in the Douay Catechism. Instead of giving it the honour of a chapter by itself, as a doctrine of such importance deserves, the compilers, as if afraid of exposing it to the light in this enlightened country, have thrust it into a corner of a chapter which bears the title of "the kinds of sin expounded."

"Q. Whither go such as die in mortal sin? A. To hell to all eternity. Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? A. To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven. Q. What proof have you of this in the New Testament? A. First from our Saviour's own words, Matt. xii. 32. where, speaking of the remission of sins, he says, there is one that will not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come: which words, St Austin says, would not be true, if some sins were not forgiven in the next world; and this implies a purgatory, for there only is a remission of sin, and not in hell or in heaven. Second, From St Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 15, where he speaks of some, under the guilt of sin, that shall be saved, *yet so as by fire.*"

This is all that the Douay Catechism teaches concerning purgatory; and, I think, it will be allowed that here there are some great and fundamental errors. The first that strikes us is that which makes a distinction between mortal and venial sin. From the word of God we learn that sin, and that every sin, without exception, is the object of divine abhorrence; and that the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* unrighteousness, and all ungodliness of men, without any exception. In the whole Bible, there is no such thing as a small or venial sin mentioned, or alluded to. It is declared that he who offendeth in one point is a transgressor of the whole law, because the single transgression, however trivial the matter may appear to men, indicates a state of mind in the offender, which is opposed to the authority of the Lawgiver; and is, therefore, opposed to every precept of the law itself. I allude at present to this subject only in general terms, it may come afterwards more formally in our way, as a distinct subject of discussion.

Another fundamental error plainly avowed by the Douay doctors in the above extract, is, that men must make full satisfaction to divine justice, even for their mortal sins, or they must go "to hell for all eternity." It is supposed that some persons die who have not "fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins;" and these go "to purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them." I believe it is not possible in fewer words, to set aside altogether the atonement of Christ. It was declared of him that he should finish transgression, make an end of sin, make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in an everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24. When he appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh, it was to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 26. His death was an atoning sacrifice for sin, Heb. x. 12. and it is declared that by him we receive the atonement, or reconciliation, Rom. v. 11. He only was able to make satisfaction for the sins of his people, and he alone has done it: the sinner, believing in him, receives the atonement; he sees that satisfaction has been made for his sins by the death of Christ: thus he enjoys peace with God, and the assurance of his favour; and he knows that he is no more able to make full, or even partial satisfaction for his sins, than he is to create a world.

But the Douay Catechism teaches that every individual must make full satisfaction for his sins, either in this world, or in a certain fancied

middle state which they call Purgatory. According to this doctrine, Christ has done nothing for them in the way of satisfaction or atonement, for they must do all for themselves. This, therefore, is the Antichrist, which sets aside the doctrine of Christ, and salvation through him alone. In comparison of this, their baptism of bells, and all their other mummery, are harmless, and not worthy to be named. This subverts the whole system of divine revelation, and brings Popery down to the level of the grossest heathenism. It is a religion without a Saviour; which leaves every man to satisfy divine justice for himself; and is, therefore, no better than that of Mahomet, or of the Grand Lama of Thibet.

The above are some of the fundamental errors of the Douay Catechism relating to Purgatory. I shall reply to what they adduce as scriptural authority for their doctrine, after I have given the doctrine itself more in detail, and that from their own acknowledged publications. The following is from "The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, contained in the Profession of Faith, published by Pope Pius the Fourth, by way of question and answer."

"OF PURGATORY.

"Q. What is the doctrine of the church as to this point?

"A. We constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful: that is, by the prayers and alms offered for them, and principally by the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

"Q. What do you mean by Purgatory?

"A. A middle state of souls which depart this life in God's grace, yet not without some lesser stains or guilt of punishment, which retards them from entering heaven. But as to the particular place where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they suffer, the church has decided nothing.

"What sort of Christians then go to Purgatory?

"A. 1st, Such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call *venial;* as many Christians do, who, either by sudden death, or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented for these ordinary failings. 2dly, Such, as having been formerly guilty of greater sins, have not made full satisfaction for them to divine justice.

"Q. Why do you say that those who die guilty of lesser sins go to Purgatory?

"A. Because such as depart this life before they have repented of these venial frailties and imperfections, cannot be supposed to be condemned to the eternal torments of hell, since the sins of which they are guilty are *but small,* which even God's best servants are liable to. Nor can they go straight to heaven in this state, because the Scriptures assure us, Rev. xxi. 27:—There shall in no wise enter thither any thing that defileth. Now every sin, be it ever so small, certainly defileth the soul. Hence our Saviour assures us that we are to give an account for every idle word. Mat. xii. 36."

The above is a plain statement of the doctrine of purgatory, as laid down by authority of Pope Pius the Fourth. There is then an attempt to prove the doctrine from "Scripture, Tradition, and Reason." I shall examine His Holiness' Scriptural proofs by and bye; those from tradition are scarcely worth examining; and as the argument from reason is comprehended in the answer to one question, I shall give it here, and trust to the reason of every Protestant reader to furnish a sufficient answer.

"Q. How do you ground the belief of purgatory upon reason?

"A. Because reason clearly teaches those two things: 1st, That all and every sin, how small soever, deserves punishment: 2dly, That some sins are *so small,* either through the levity of the matter, or for want of full deliberation in the actor, as not to deserve eternal punishment. From whence it is plain, that besides the place of eternal punishment, which we call hell, there must be also a place of temporal punishment, for such as die in *little sins,* and this we call purgatory."

Mr Gother, who is an oracle among modern Papists, in his work entitled, "The Papist Misrepresented and Represented," writes thus of his true *Papist,* for it did not occur to him that this was a term of reproach, or that his sect had an exclusive right to the term "Catholic:"—"His reason convinces him that there must be some third place, for, since the infinite goodness of God can admit nothing into heaven which is not clean, and pure from all sin, both great and small; and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss, who, as yet, are not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer; there must of necessity be some place or state, where souls departing this life, pardoned as to the eternal guilt or pain, yet obnoxious to some temporal penalty, or with the guilt of some venial faults, are purged and purified before their admittance into heaven. And this is what he is taught concerning purgatory; which, though he knows not where it is, of what nature the pains are, or how long each soul is detained there; yet he believes, that those that are in this place, being the living members of Jesus Christ, are relieved by the prayers of their fellow-members here on earth, as also by alms and masses, offered up to God for their souls. And as for such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or procure masses for their relief, they are not neglected by the

church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office."

So much for the oracle of our English Papists. Let us hear now what another great author says, namely Alexander Natalis, (In Dissert. § 4. Dissert. 41. p. 352.) He distinguishes what is of faith in this matter and what not, and thus resolves, "That it does not at all belong to faith, 1st, Concerning the place, whether it be in this world, or upon earth, or in the dark air, where the devils are; or in the hell of the damned; or in some place underneath, nearer the earth, that the souls are purged. 2dly, Concerning the quality of those sensible pains which the souls held in purgatory undergo; whether it be true or corporeal fire, or whether darkness and sorrow, or any other torment and sorrow inflicted by the justice of God, punishing them after a wonderful and yet true manner. 3dly, Concerning the duration of these purgatory pains, how long the souls are detained there. For though Soto thought that no soul continued in purgatory above ten years, yet it is a matter altogether uncertain, how many years those pains shall last."—See *Preservative against Popery, Title* viii. cap. vi. p. 116.

Though the above learned writer does not pretend to say what sort of pains they are, which are suffered in purgatory, the Catechism set out by order of the council of Trent, determines concerning the pains themselves, that they are caused by fire. "There is," says *Catechismus ad Parochos*, "a purgatory fire, in which the souls of the faithful being tormented for a certain time, are expiated; that so a passage may be opened for them into the eternal country, into which no defiled thing can enter." Part i. Art. v. Sect. 5.

The holy and angelic doctor, St Thomas Aquinas, is yet more explicit. He tells us "not only that it is fire, in which the souls are tormented, but that it is the very *same fire* that torments the damned in hell, and the just in purgatory. And Bellarmine himself confesses, that almost all their divines teach, that the damned, and the souls in purgatory, are tormented in the same fire, and in the same place." —*Preservative*, &c. as above, in which the works are referred to.

But I shall ascend as usual to the highest authority. I am so happy as to be in the possesion of an authentic edition of the canons of the Council of Trent, printed at Antwerp, 1677. As the work is in few hands, I shall give the very words of that high ecumenical council, with a literal translation, by which my readers will be made acquainted with the genuine infallible doctrine of the church of Rome on this subject.

SESSIO XXV.
QUÆ EST NONA ET ULTIMA,
SUB PIO IV. PONT. MAX. CEPTA DIE III. ABSOLUTA DIE IV. DECEM. M. D. LXIII.
Decretum de Purgatorio.

"Cum Catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu Sancto edocta, ex sacris literis, et antiqua Patrum traditione, in sacris Conciliis, et novissimè in hac œcumenica Synodo docuerit. (*a*) Purgatorium esse; animasque ibi detentas, fidelium suffragiis, potissimum verò acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis, ut sanam de Purgatorio doctrinam, (*b*) à sanctis Patribus (*c*) et sacris Conciliis traditam, à Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari diligenter studeant. Apud rudem verò plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores qæstiones, (*d*) quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, à popularibus concionibus secludantur. (*e*) Incerta item, vel quæ specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero quæ ad curiositatem quamdam aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tamquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant. (*f*) Curent autem Episcopi, ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleëmosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera, quæ à fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, secundùm Ecclesiæ instituta piè et devotè fiant; et quæ pro illis ex testatorum fundationibus, vel alia ratione debentur, non perfunctoriè, sed à sacerdotibus, et Ecclesiæ ministris, et aliis, qui hoc præstare tenentur, diligenter et accuratè persolvantur."

COUNCIL OF TRENT, SESSION 25TH,
BEING THE NINTH AND LAST UNDER PIUS IV. BEGUN ON THE 3D, AND ENDED ON THE 4TH DECEMBER, 1563.
Decree concerning Purgatory.

"As the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, from the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the fathers, hath taught in its sacred councils, and lastly, in this Œcumenical Synod, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there confined are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but more especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy Synod instructs the bishops, that they should pay attention, that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory, as delivered by the holy fathers, and the sacred councils, be, by the faithful in Christ, believed, held, taught, and every where diligently preached. But that among uninformed people, the more difficult and subtile questions, which tend not to edification, and from which, there is in general no increase of piety, be excluded from all popular addresses. Also, that they do not allow doubtful matters,

(*a*) Sup. Sess. 6. Can. 30. et Sess. 22. cap. 2. et Can. 3. (*b*) c. Qualis, et seq. Dist. 25. (*c*) Conc. Floren. Ses. ult. in fin. (*d*) 1 Tim. 1. (*e*) Concil. Later. Sub Leone X. (*f*) Infr. cap. 4. de ref.

or such as labour under the appearance of falsity to be talked of and discussed. But that they prohibit those things which have reference only to a certain curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, as scandals and causes of some offence to the faithful. But let the bishops take care, that the suffrages of the faithful who are alive, namely, the sacrifices of the mass, orations, acts of charity, and other pious deeds, which it has been customary for the faithful to perform on behalf of the other faithful who are dead, should be piously and devoutly performed according to the institutions of the church; and that those *(religious services)* which may be owing on the behalf of such, to the legacies of testators, or on any other account, be, by the priests, ministers of the church, and others, whose duty it is to perform those matters not slightly, but diligently and accurately discharged."

I return now to my first authority above cited, to wit, the Douay Catechism; and I shall begin with some remarks on the passages of Scripture, which are alleged in support of the doctrine of purgatory. The first is, Mat. xii. 32. "*There is a sin that will not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come.*" From this the grave doctors introduce St Augustine, as arguing, that there must be some sins which are forgiven in the world to come, and as there is no forgiveness in heaven or hell, it must be in purgatory. Great men, we see, can draw great conclusions from very slight premises. Men of ordinary capacity could never find out, from the declaration, that there is one sin which shall not be forgiven in this world or the next; that there are many sins which shall be forgiven in the world to come; and that there is a place for the purpose, which belongs to neither this world nor the next: but, which hangs between the two, like Mahomet's coffin, between the earth and heaven.

Our Lord's words evidently mean no more, than that for the sin in question, there was no forgiveness, either here or hereafter. The words as recorded by Mark are, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness," chap. iii. 29. According to Luke xii. 10, it is simply, he shall not be forgiven. What stronger expressions could be used, than shall *not*, shall *never* be forgiven? But this has no connection with the subject of purgatory, unless it be taken as a general declaration, that sins which are not forgiven in this world, shall not be forgiven at all, and then it overthrows the doctrine of purgatory altogether.

In Jewish phraseology, the expression, "world to come," signified the kingdom, or reign of the Messiah. It is under this that we live. The church is under a very different sort of administration from that of the old covenant. The Jews expected a great change when the Messiah should come; but he told them that the sin against the Holy Ghost should not be forgiven under the future, any more than under the present, administration of his kingdom; which is, indeed, as much as to say, it shall not be forgiven for ever.

Want of room obliges to defer a farther exposure of the weakness of the proof of purgatory from Scripture. The subject will come before us again.

No. LXXVI.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 25TH, 1819.

MY last Number broke off in the middle of my reply to what the Douay Doctors give as Scripture authority, for their doctrine concerning purgatory. They argue, that there is one sin of which it is declared, it shall not be forgiven in the world to come; therefore, other sins shall be forgiven in the future world. I have already shown that the conclusion is not contained in the premises; but though it were, it would have nothing to do with purgatory, which is not a place of forgiveness, but a place of punishment. Sins which are forgiven are not punished: and sins which are punished are not forgiven. On this subject I cannot express myself better than in the nervous language of Archbishop Wake:—

"But what have we here to do with the remission of sins? Purgatory is a place, not where sins are remitted, but where they are punished with the greatest severity; nay, what is still more, punished after they are remitted; nay, what is still more extraordinary, therefore, punished because they are remitted. For if the guilt were not remitted the sinner could not go to purgatory, nor have the favour of being punished there. And therefore it is utterly impertinent, from the remission of some sins in the world to come, to conclude, that there is a place where all sins, even the least, are exacted; and that so rigidly, that there is no escaping thence, till either by themselves, or their friends, they have paid the very *uttermost farthing.*" *Preservative*, &c. Tit. viii. p. 120.

The next Scripture authority which the Douay Doctors bring forward in support of their purgatory, is 1 Cor. iii. 15, "Saved so as by fire." Let any man of ordinary understanding read the entire passage, and he will see that it does not contain the most distant allusion to a middle state between this world and the next. Besides, it is not said that a man shall be saved *by fire;* but *so* as by fire. The apostle had been speaking of metals. Fire is the instrument by which these are tried, and purified, and separated from things of a gross and more perishable nature. Now, if any Christian were to lose sight of the foundation

of his hope, or so far forget the character of that foundation, as to build improper things upon it, God would, by some trying dispensation, destroy his work. He would suffer the loss of all his labour; and so, *as by fire* the dross is separated from the gold, he would be separated and saved from his errors and corruptions. Whether this will be considered a satisfactory view of a difficult passage, I cannot tell, but it seems very evident that it has nothing to do with purgatory.

These are all the passages of Scripture which the Douay Catechism adduces in support of purgatory. In other Popish books, there are many other passages wrested from their true meaning, in order to prop up this profitable piece of imposition, some of which may come to be discussed before I have done with the subject.

Some of the errors of the Church of Rome are mere novelties; others are of more ancient date. Transubstantiation belongs to the former, as it was not publicly acknowledged as a doctrine of the church, till some ages after the tenth century, which has been called the age of lead: but the doctrine of purgatory is of much greater antiquity; and it will not be difficult to show, that it is more ancient than Christianity itself, meaning, by Christianity, the New Testament dispensation; though, properly speaking, Christianity is as old as the creation, at least as old as the promise of God to Adam and Eve, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent.

Papists lay great stress upon the antiquity of their doctrines and practices; and we must allow that they have antiquity to plead on behalf of their purgatory. When captious Papists have asked us, "Where was your religion before Luther?" we have been accustomed to reply, "In the New Testament;" and this is the truth; and when we ask of Papists, "Where was your purgatory, before Gregory the Great?" they can tell us, if they please, and tell us truly,—"In the writings of heathen poets and philosophers." These are the worthy ancestors of modern, and indeed of ancient Papists; and Cardinal Bellarmine (*Bellarm. de Purgat.* lib. i. cap. 11.) founds an argument on behalf of purgatory upon this very circumstance, that the ancient heathens believed in it; for then, he thinks, it must have been a dictate of right reason; but if the opinions of heathen philosophers are to be received as of authority in this matter; if we must take our notions of Christianity from such teachers, we will soon find ourselves led far enough away from the simplicity of the gospel. We will find that the worship of images, and that every sort of abomination is consistent with right reason, because it has the countenance of some heathen poet or philosopher.

Eusebius relates of Plato, that he divided mankind into three states; some, who, having purified themselves by philosophy, and excelled in holiness of life, enjoy an eternal felicity in the islands of the blest, without any labour or trouble, which neither is it possible for any words to express, nor any thoughts to conceive. Others, that having lived exceedingly wicked, and therefore seemed incapable of cure, he supposed were at their death thrown down headlong into hell, there to be tormented for ever. But now, besides these, he imagined there were a middle sort, who, though they had sinned, yet had repented of it, and therefore seemed to be in a curable condition; and these, he thought, went down for some time to hell too, to be purged and absolved by grievous torments: but that after that, they should be delivered from it, and attain to honours according to the dignity of their benefactors.—See *Archbishop Wake's Discourse on Purgatory, with the reference to Eusebius Præparat. Evangel.* lib. ii. cap. 38.

"The heathens undoubtedly supposed that those who were in this middle state, might receive help from the prayers and sacrifices of the living. This is evident, from the complaints of the ghosts of Elpenor in Homer, and of Palinurus in Virgil, (in Odyss. lib. xii. and in Æneid, lib. vi.) And indeed the ceremonies used for their deliverance, as described by those poets, so nearly resemble the practice of the present Roman church, that were but these poems *canonical*, it would be in vain for the most obstinate heretic to contend with them."

"It must then be confessed," says Archbishop Wake, "that our adversaries, in this point, have at least four hundred years antiquity, not only against us, but even beyond Christianity itself. And I suppose I may, without any injury to the memories of these holy men, who have been our forerunners in the faith, say, that it was the impression which these opinions of their philosophy had made upon them, that moved them, when they became Christians, to fall into conjectures concerning the state of the soul in the time of separation, not very much different from what they had believed before." The truth is, that when Christianity became popular, and the profession of it fashionable, heathens, professing to be Christians, brought into the church all their heathenish notions, and purgatory among the rest.

Origen, St Augustin, and even St Jerome, have expressions that savour of purgatory; or which at least show, that they indulged themselves in some wild speculations about the state of the dead; and though they did not by any means entertain the nonsense of modern Papists upon this subject, they used expressions which have been laid hold of, and pleaded as almost equal to apostolical authority for this most *golden* article of the Romish faith.

It is very evident, that the churches which were planted by the apostles knew nothing of purgatory, for the apostles did not teach the

doctrine, and it was never brought into the church by divine authority; but about the end of the sixth century, Pope Gregory, called the Great, began to give countenance to it; and then it came to have a place among other relics of ancient heathenism, which were first connived at, and then established as *profitable* additions to the religion of Christ. "From henceforth," says the learned prelate whom I have quoted above, "miracles and visions governed the church. The flames of Ætna and Vesuvius were thought to have been kindled on purpose to torment departed souls. Some were seen broiling upon gridirons, others roasting upon spits, some burning before a fire, others shivering in the water, or smoking in a chimney. The very ways to purgatory were now discovered; one in Sicily, another in Pozzueto, a third nearer home, in Ireland,—one found out by the help of an angel, another by the devil; insomuch, that Pope Gregory himself was carried away with these illusions, and which some, even at this day, are not ashamed to support. By these means came purgatory first to be established in the Roman church, in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries: but yet still the article appeared rude and unpolished. Pope Gregory discovered how certain souls, for their punishment, were confined to baths, and such like places on earth, but he had not, as yet, found out any one common place for them to be tormented in, in hell. Nay, for some ages after, it seems not to have been risen to a matter of certainty, so far was it yet from being an article of faith; insomuch, that in the twelfth century, many doubted of it, as we may gather by that expression of Otto Frisingensis, anno 1146, 'That there is in hell a place of purgatory, wherein such as are to be saved, are either only troubled with darkness, or decocted with the fire of expiation, *some do affirm*;' plainly enough implying that all did not believe it.

"But, however, purgatory is now become an article of faith, and of too comfortable an importance to be easily parted with; nor have I the vanity to hope I shall be able to argue those men out of it, who, by this craft, gain their living; and will, no doubt, therefore be as zealous in defence of it, as ever Demetrius was of the great goddess Diana upon the same account. But for those whose interest it rather is to be freed from these terrors after death, which serve only to enrich the priests, and keep the laity all their lives in fear and subjection, I hope to satisfy them that these are only imaginary flames, invented for gain, established upon false grounds, and kept up by artifice and terrors to delude the people, but which themselves, many of them, no more believe, than did that great Cardinal, who minded one day to pose his chaplain, and proposed this question to him:—How many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory? To which, when he appeared, as well he might, unable to reply, the Cardinal thus pleasantly resolved the doubt,—'That just as many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory, as snowballs would serve to heat an oven.'"—*Preservation against Popery*, Title viii. pp. 113, 114.

I have thus given a short history of the doctrine under discussion: in doing so, I have departed from the order observed by some great authors, who give a long history of the thing before they tell what it is. Conceiving it proper to tell what purgatory is, before I said much *about* it, I laid down in my last Number very particularly, what the Church of Rome declares to be of faith concerning it. I request the reader's attention to what is there laid down, in order to his better understanding of the remarks which I am now about to make.

Purgatory connects itself very naturally with the corrupt state of the Church of Rome, both in doctrine and practice. I have often had occasion to remark, that the belief of all the dogmas of Popery, and the practice of all its ceremonies, are perfectly consistent with a life of wickedness. In the Church of Rome, it is not necessary that a man be renewed in the spirit of his mind; it is not necessary that he crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts. If he has been favoured with a sprinkling of holy water by a priest, in baptism, this makes him a new creature, in ecclesiastical reckoning: this they say makes him a member of Christ; and he cannot be deprived of this connection with the Saviour, unless he become a heretic, or be excommunicated. The sins which he commits are all wiped away, so far as regards their guilt and liableness to eternal punishment, every time he confesses and receives the absolution of his priest. He makes confession, and receives absolution, as often as he chooses to apply, and can afford to pay for it; but he makes it evident by his whole conduct, that he is not fit for heaven; that even to the hour of his death he is an unholy person. There remains even in the minds of Papists so much knowledge of natural religion, shall we call it? as existed even among heathens; or rather so much traditional knowledge of the character of God, as to assure them that persons dying with the pollution of sin unremoved, cannot enter into heaven, without undergoing a purification, —and this suggests to them the reasonableness and necessity of a purgatory.

Real Christianity requires no such middle state between this world and the next, in order to purge men either from the guilt or pollution of sin. Through Jesus Christ is "preached the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe, are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 38, 39. Those who are so justified, are also sanctified. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin." "If we

confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity," 1 John i. 9. Such passages of Scripture tell us plainly, that the blood of Christ is not only sufficient as an atonement for sin, but also sufficient for the cleansing of the soul from all its pollutions.

If the greatest sinner that ever trod upon the earth, were to believe in Christ to-day, and die to-morrow, the righteousness of Christ in which he believes, would present him without spot, that is, perfectly justified, and perfectly sanctified, in the presence of God the Judge of all. But, supposing such a sinner to believe in Christ, and live in this world for fifty years, he would make it manifest that he was a new creature; he would be turned from the practice and love of sin, into the love and practice of righteousness. This is the necessary effect of believing the gospel, and where this effect is not produced, the gospel is not believed; for the "grace of God which bringeth salvation, teaches us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this present world." When a person thus interested in Christ comes to die, it is his happiness to reflect, that no debt stands against him; that no satisfaction is required of him; because Christ has made complete satisfaction to divine justice for all his transgressions; and his being made a new creature, and his being enabled to live a holy life, is an evidence to others as well as to himself, that he is a pardoned sinner; and that, like the penitent thief, the day he dies, he shall be with Christ in paradise, without any other purifying process than that which he has already undergone by the blood of Christ applied for his sanctification, and which he shall instantly undergo on the dissolution of the union between his soul and his body, when the one shall return to the dust, and the other to God who gave it.

These are truths which comfort the real Christian, and which support his mind in the view of death, and judgment, and eternity. He knows that to depart out of this world, and to be with Christ, are the same thing; that there is not an intervening moment between the two. If it were otherwise, it would be impossible to meet death with composure of mind, except it were in a state of insensibility. How can a man resign himself to death without the most fearful apprehension, if he believes that there is a debt standing against him in the court of eternal justice,—a debt for which he must make satisfaction, by suffering torments in his own person, for a period, perhaps, much longer than his whole life in this world? But this is what every Papist is taught to believe with regard to himself, unless he shall die a martyr, or perform some signal service to the church, such as it is not possible for one in a million to perform.

It is true, the dying sinner, if he be a rich man, may compound for ages of misery, by bequeathing his wealth to the church; but the comfort which this is calculated to afford, must be greatly diminished by the reflection, that he is leaving his family in poverty; and, what is infinitely worse, he cannot be sure that his whole property, however great, will serve the purpose of saving his soul from ages of torment. His widow and children may become beggars, and yet, for any thing that he knows, he will derive but little relief, from his having robbed them to enrich the church. His ghostly guides are miserable comforters; for, with all their impudence, which in general is not small, they do not pretend to say *for certain*, that so much money will effectually deliver a soul from purgatory. Though it should be thousands of pounds, and as many masses as these can purchase, the utmost that can be effected by them, is only a certain degree of relief, or mitigation, or abridgment of the duration of the torments which a soul is condemned to endure, though for any thing that the sinner knows, or the priest can tell, the abridgment may be no more than one year out of a thousand.

The case which I have supposed is one of the most favourable, for it is the case of a rich man; and it cannot be denied, that Popery is a religion which looks upon the rich with a more favourable aspect than upon the poor. Those who are rich, may buy *some* mitigation of their torments, but those who have nothing to pay, must suffer in their own persons all the torments of the purgatorian fire, until they have made full satisfaction to divine justice. It is true, they may comfort themselves with the belief that their surviving friends will pay money to have masses said for them; but when they reflect how poor their friends are, and what a monstrous debt stands against them, I am afraid, nay, I am sure, no poor sinner can derive much comfort from this reflection.

Gother, indeed, tells us, that "such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or procure masses for their relief, are not neglected by the church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office." This is avowedly a concession in favour of those who "have *no relations or friends* to pray for them, or *give alms*, or procure masses for their relief;" from which it is clearly to be inferred, that those who have relations and friends can expect no relief but by their means, that is, by their giving alms, and procuring masses for them; which, in plain English, is neither more nor less than paying money to the priests.

By this arrangement, the poor who have no friends, are left in a very awkward predicament. They are declared to be in purgatory; but the church takes no particular interest in any one of them, just because there is nobody

to pay money for them. They are brought in by the lump, in "a general commemoration of *all the faithful* departed in every mass." But such a general commemoration must be of little avail, when there is no specific reference to any individual case. In this general commemoration are included all who paid for themselves, by bequeathing money for masses, and all whose friends have paid for them, as well as those who had neither money nor friends to leave behind them; and it may easily be supposed, that the *intentions* of the priests, in saying their masses, will be directed to the souls of those for whom they have been best paid; and the poor in purgatory, as well as the poor in this world, will be esteemed by mercenary priests as little worth.

It is worthy of remark, that, according to this much admired Popish author, there is in every mass, at this very day, a commemoration of ALL the faithful deceased. From the connection of the words it appears, that this commemoration signifies prayers, alms, and masses, offered up to God for their relief; that is, of *all* the faithful that have departed out of this world, I suppose, since the days of the apostles; for surely it will not be said, that the Christians of those days were not of the faithful. Then, according to this doctrine, they are all in purgatory still. The Church of Rome will not avow the inconsistency of offering up masses and prayers to God, for the relief of those who are already relieved, and happy in heaven. Then, according to the Popish notion of St Peter having the keys of heaven, it will appear, that he has most tenaciously kept the door shut; for no sinner has passed thither out of purgatory since he received the commission. Now it may fairly be asked, for what purpose the priests have been saying their masses for so many hundred years? For what have they applied the millions of money extorted from the people, under the pretext of relieving souls from purgatory, when, so far as appears, not one soul has yet been relieved? Prayers and masses are yet offered up to God daily, for the relief *of them all!*

No. LXXVII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 1ST, 1820.

THE holy council of Trent, in the decree concerning purgatory, which I gave in my seventy-fifth Number, prohibits the teaching of "those things which have reference only to a certain curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, as scandals, and causes of some offence to the faithful." At the same time, and in the same decree, it is positively enjoined upon the bishops, that they inculcate the doctrine, "that the suffrages of the faithful who are alive, namely, the sacrifices of the mass, orations, *acts of charity*, and other pious deeds, which it has been customary for the faithful to perform on behalf of the other faithful who are dead, should be piously and devoutly performed according to the institutions of the church."

The council seem to have been aware that some scandal and offence did arise from the pecuniary traffic which had been carried on in relation to their purgatory; and they prohibit such things as "savour of *filthy lucre;*" but we shall very much mistake the meaning of the holy synod, if we suppose that by "filthy lucre" they really mean gold and silver, or even bank notes, had there been such things in their time. They command the bishops to teach the people to perform "acts of charity" on behalf of the "faithful who are dead;" that is, to "give money to the priests for the relief of the souls that are in purgatory."

The practice of many ages will be found a sound commentary on the text. It is by "acts of charity," performed by the faithful alive, for the sake of those who are dead, that Romish priests have found means to bring within their grasp an immense quantity of what they affect to call "filthy lucre," but which is really the delight of their hearts, and the desire of their eyes. For several ages before and after the sitting of this council, the priests contented themselves with what they could extort from rich and poor individuals; but it was reserved for the present age of improvement, to devise a plan, by which the poor might act as a body, in raising contributions upon the small scale of a penny a-week, in order to enrich the priests by purchasing the release of souls which are supposed to be suffering torments in purgatory. The following document, and reflections on this subject, are extracted from a pamphlet by the Rev. James Carlile, of Dublin. I need not make an apology to my Scotch readers for so large an extract, because, I suppose, few of them have seen the original work; and my readers in Dublin, to whom, I suppose, Mr Carlile's book will be as familiar as mine is to the people in Glasgow, will excuse my inserting it, for the information of my own countrymen.

"I request," says Mr Carlile, "the reader's particular attention to the following document, which is reprinted verbatim as it fell into my hands. He has doubtless heard of *penny a-week societies* for various purposes, such as relieving the poor, educating their children, furnishing them with the Scriptures; but he, perhaps, does not know that this system has been adopted by devout and charitable members of the Church of Rome, in this enlightened city of Dublin, for the purpose of raising money to relieve themselves and their friends from purgatory, when they shall go thither. Let him read, then, and be astonished.

'Have pity on me, have pity on me,
At least you my friends.'

PURGATORIAN SOCIETY,

INSTITUTED JULY 1ST, 1813, AND HELD IN SAINT JAMES'S CHAPEL.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—Amen.

'It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.'—Maccabees, chap. xii. ver. 46.

THE members who compose the Society of the Office for the Dead, commenced on the above day, at the said place, adopting the spirit and meaning of the above sacred text, and wishing, in conformity to the divine precepts of the Holy Catholic Church, to extend their charitable views beyond the grave, by relieving, as far as in them lies, the suffering souls in purgatory, and inviting all tender-hearted Catholics, who have a feeling sensibility of the duty they owe their departed parents, relations and friends, who probably may stand more in need of their commiseration at present, than at any period of their life-time, to assist in the charitable and pious purpose of shortening the duration of their sufferings by the most easy means imaginable, have agreed to, and adopted the following Rules:

Rule 1. That the affairs of this institution shall be regulated by the Superior, Rectors, and six of the members who compose the office for the dead, who shall attend on every Wednesday night, at half past eight o'clock, throughout the year, at the above named place, or any other place which may be hereafter appointed, and there, with attention and devotion, recite the office for the dead, agreeable to the intention that shall then be mentioned.

Rule 2. That every well disposed Catholic, wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in purgatory, shall pay one penny per week, which shall be appropriated to the procuring of masses to be offered up for the repose of the souls of the deceased parents, relations, and friends of all the subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general.

Rule 3. That on the first Monday of every month, a mass will be offered up in the parish chapel of St James, at ten o'clock, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the subscribers of this society.

Rule 4. That the Superior, Rectors, and Council shall continue in office for six calendar months, at the expiration of which time, candidates shall be nominated by the persons in office, who shall give due notice to the whole body of members who compose the office for the dead, that they may punctually attend on the first Wednesday night in July, at half past eight o'clock, and on the first Wednesday night in January, for the purpose of electing a Superior, Rectors, and Council, to serve the ensuing six months, and so in succession.

Rule 5. That each subscriber, on entering this society, do purchase a copy of these Rules, in order to defray the expenses incurred by printing and other contingencies, and that the money arising from the weekly subscriptions shall be disposed of to the most necessitated clergymen, who shall be required to give receipts for what they are paid.

Rule 6. That the spiritual benefits of this institution shall be conferred in the following manner, viz., Each subscriber shall be entitled to an office at the time of their death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months after their decease; also, the benefit of masses which shall be procured to be offered, by the money arising from subscriptions, and which shall be extended to their parents, relations, and friends, in the following order: that is to say, their fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, and if married, husbands, wives, and children, if they have any departed who lived to maturity.

Rule 7. That every member of the office for the dead, who serves the society in the capacity of Superior, shall, at the time of his death, be entitled to three masses, to be offered for the repose of his soul; and, also, every member who serves the office of Rector, shall be entitled to the benefit of two masses, and every subscriber, without distinction, shall be entitled to the benefit of one mass, each, provided that such member or subscriber shall die a natural death, be six months a subscriber to the institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of their departure; that care shall be taken, by the surviving Superior and Rectors, that such soul masses are punctually obtained, agreeable to the interest and meaning of this institution.

Rule 8. That the Superior, Rectors, and Council, be empowered to make (as occasion may require) such bye-laws as they shall think expedient, provided they do not interfere with the spirit of these Rules; said bye-laws are to be laid before the body at large, for their approbation, and that four shall form a quorum on the Council.

Rule 9. That the Superior shall on every All-Souls' Day, advance to the parish priest of James's street chapel, whatever sum is necessary for obtaining an insertion in the mortality list of the altar, the names of the parents, relations, and friends, of all the subscribers to this institution, to be recommended to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year.

Subscriptions received, and subscribers re-

gistered at the chapel, on every Wednesday evening, from seven o'clock until nine, and in the school-room adjoining the chapel, on the first Sunday of February, May, August, and November, being quarterly days, from ten o'clock until one.

The books to be opened for the inspection of subscribers. *

Price three-pence.

J. Coyne, Printer, 74, Cook-street.

"Let the reader attend to this document. The Society, he will observe, was instituted about two years ago.† He will also observe that it is countenanced by the clergy, at least those of St James's, for it is held in the chapel. Let him then advert to the objects of it. They are to relieve suffering souls in purgatory, particularly those of the members of the society, when they shall go thither, and their relations who are already there, *by the most easy means imaginable.* And what are these means? Why, paying a penny per week, as the easiest manner of raising money to procure masses. It is natural to ask to whom this money is to go, which is expended in procuring masses? and the answer must be, to the clergy, for they alone can give these masses. But, besides the masses, there is mentioned in the 9th rule, a kind of subordinate help to the poor suffering souls, namely, insertion into the mortality list of the altar, which recommends them to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year; and this privilege, also, is to be purchased of the parish priest of St James's by the society.

"In what a light does this place the priesthood? They believe, or at least they teach, that the friends of their flock are lying weltering in a lake of fire, from which they could deliver them, by saying masses for them, and recommending them to the prayers of the congregation, and yet they will not say these masses, nor so recommend them, unless they be regularly paid for it. How can a man represent himself as such a monster, and yet hold up his head in civilized society! What! shall I believe that a single soul is suffering torments so dreadful; that it may continue to suffer them for ages, that I have the means in my power of relieving it, and yet shall I coolly wait till I be paid, before I use these means? By what process of reasoning can men be brought to believe, that this is the religion given to us for our salvation, by our kind and merciful Father in Heaven? By what arguments can the poor be convinced that a system of extortion, which gives so manifest a preference to the rich, can be that gospel which was to be preached peculiarly to the poor?

"But the reader may be most surprised to learn, that intelligent, upright, and conscientious individuals belong to this society, and conduct it. The very style of correctness with which the rules of it are composed and arranged; the care and foresight with which they are fenced and guarded, show them to be the work of a man of judgment and prudence. The 5th rule provides that the money shall be disposed of to the most necessitated clergymen, who must give receipts for what they are paid. The 6th marks precisely the order and consanguinity in which the benefits of the society are to be extended, to *parents, relations,* and *friends.* The 7th gives encouragement to persons conducting the business of the society, and provides that a subscriber, in order to obtain the benefit of it, must be of six months standing; must die a natural death, *and must be clear of all dues at the time of his departure.* The 9th rule seems to be intended to provide a kind of remuneration for the use of the chapel of St James's, for it confines the money that is to be expended in procuring the prayers of congregations, to the priest of that parish. There is one point, indeed, which seems to be left very vague and indeterminate, namely, what precise effect the masses and prayers will have—whether they will relieve the souls from purgatory immediately, or whether they will only shorten the duration of their sufferings. That they may be relieved at once from purgatory, that they may even be saved from going thither by certain processes, or that the precise relief obtained may be ascertained, is manifest from some of the indulgences quoted above; one of which provides that he who complies with the terms of it shall never see purgatory; another, that if he were there, he shall be delivered from it; and another assures him of 90,000 years of respite. Now it would surely be satisfactory, to those who subscribe to this society, if they knew precisely how much it would take to deliver each soul, or what is the exact diminution of suffering that each mass effects; because, for aught I see, they may be paying for the relief of those who are already finally relieved: whereas, if they knew better what they were doing, they could save that money, and apply it to the relief of those who certainly need relief. I am afraid, however, that the clergy are too cunning to fix this matter with any great precision, for nothing can be more profitable in this traffic than a little uncertainty. The bare possibility of any case being procured by a little money, for a dear friend recently deceased, must be an almost irresistible inducement to bestow it.

"Oh! awful delusion! that men with the

* Since the publication of this curious document, in the first edition of this Examination, the rules of several other similar societies, of still more recent formation, have been published; but as they are similar to those given above, it is unnecessary to insert them. They serve to show, however, that the utility of Purgatorian Societies is very generally acknowledged by Roman Catholics.

† This was written in 1815.

light of the gospel shining on their eyeballs, should persuade themselves, that the God of heaven would actually sell to them, for money, relief from some necessary purgation, or some merited punishment! Look at this society again, and say, whether it might not with much greater propriety be denominated, A SOCIETY FOR THE RELIEF OF NECESSITOUS CLERGYMEN, than for the relief of souls in purgatory. Survey the whole transaction. A self-elected, incorporated body declare, that they alone are commissioned by God, to teach what he chooses should be known, respecting eternity and the world of spirits; and that the truth of what they teach, nay, and the reality of their commission, are not to be examined, further than they themselves think fit to submit them to examination. Among many other doctrines equally profitable to themselves, they teach, that the souls even of those who listen to them implicitly, must go to a place of torment for a time, to be purified, before they enter on the infinite rewards of their implicit faith and obedience: that they, by performing certain mystical ceremonies or incantations, which they call mass, can shorten this torturing purgation, or release the soul from it altogether; that they are warranted, nay, for aught I know, commanded by God, to exact money for performing these masses, which money is to be appropriated to their own use; and they countenance their people in forming societies to raise money, for the purpose of purchasing masses from the most necessitous among themselves. I appeal to any man of common discernment, if ever he met with a transaction, that bore fraud and imposture so legibly written on the face of it, as this does! And yet, where can we look for deliverance to our fellow countrymen, from these tricks that are every day practised upon them, and for the sake of which they are studiously kept in the most profound ignorance? No ray of light is permitted to reach them; and, lest by any chance a passing gleam might shine upon them, they are taught to shut their eyes, and to believe that every one is their enemy, that would persuade them to look around them. 'Tis odds but they may be enraged against me for simply telling them that they are in darkness."*

I shall conclude this Number with some curious particulars relating to purgatory, not taken, indeed, from books of such authority as the Canons of the Council of Trent, but related by a Spanish priest, who was intimately acquainted with the opinions and most secret practices of his own order. He became a convert to the Protestant religion, and in 1715, he received orders in the Church of England. He writes like one who knew perfectly the truth of his statements; and I have never read or heard that they were contradicted.

"Pope Adrian the Third," says Mr Gavin, "did confess, that there was no mention of purgatory in Scripture, or in the writings of the holy fathers; but notwithstanding this, the Council of Trent has settled the doctrine of purgatory, without alleging any one passage of the holy Scripture; and gave so much liberty to priests and friars by it, that they build in that fiery place, apartments for kings, princes, grandees, noblemen, merchants, and tradesmen, for ladies of quality, for gentlemen and tradesmen's wives, and for poor common people. These are the eight apartments which answer to the eight degrees of intense fire; and they make the people believe that the poor people only endure the least degree; the second being greater, is for gentlewomen and tradesmen's wives, and so on to the eight degree, which being the greatest of all, is reserved for kings. By this wicked doctrine, they get gradually masses from all sorts and conditions of people, in proportion to their greatness. But, as the poor cannot give so many masses as the great, the lowest chamber in purgatory is always crowded with the reduced souls of those unfortunately fortunate people, for they say to them, that the providence of God has ordered every thing to the ease of his creatures; and foreseeing that the poor people could not afford the same number of masses that the rich could, his infinite goodness had placed them in the place of less sufferings in purgatory.

"But it is a remarkable thing, that many poor silly trademen's wives, desirous of honour in the next world, do ask the friars, whether the souls of their fathers, mothers, or sisters, can be removed from the second apartment (reckoning from the lowest) to the third? thinking by it, that though the third degree

* The following article in the Quarterly Review for September, 1818, page 109, shows that a Purgatorian Society has been established also in London.

The Roman Catholics in London have an association for Sunday Schools,—and the reader may be edified by the title under which it has been instituted, and by some of its rules. It is called, a spiritual association in honour of the most Holy Trinity, and under the protection of the blessed Virgin Mary, for the relief of souls in purgatory, and instruction of the ignorant.

"All moneys acquired by this charity, from subscriptions or otherwise, shall be destined to provide that the holy sacrifice of the mass be offered for the intentions of the society, and for the support of the schools."

"At the death of any member, mass shall be said three times for the repose of his (or her) soul. Masses shall be said every month for the deceased members of the society in general. The standing intentions of this society shall be: 1st. The soul most in need. 2d. The deceased members. 3d. The welfare of the living subscribers.

"A member may enter the names of his departed parents or friends in the books of the society, and such deceased persons shall be deemed members of the same, and partake of its spiritual advantages, as long as their subscriptions continue to be paid.

"The Rosary of the blessed Virgin Mary shall be said daily, for the intentions of the Society, and on no account whatever be omitted."

The association was formed in 1810.

of fire is greater than the second, yet the souls would be better pleased in the company of ladies of quality. But the worst is, that the friar makes such women believe that he can do it very easily, if they give the same price for a mass that ladies of quality do give. I knew a shoemaker's wife, very ignorant, proud, and full of punctilios of honour, who went to a Franciscan friar, and told him, that she desired to know whether her father's soul was in purgatory or not? and in what apartment? The friar asked how many masses she could spare for it? she said, two; and the friar answered, your father's soul is among the beggars, upon hearing this the poor woman began to cry, and desired the friar to put him, if possible, in the fourth apartment, and she would pay him for it; and the *quantum* being settled, the friar did promise to place him there the next day. So the poor woman ever since gives out that her father was a rich merchant, for it was revealed to her that his soul is among the merchants in purgatory.

"Now what can we say, but that the Pope is the chief governor of that vast place, and priests and friars the quartermasters, that billet the souls according to their own fancies; and have the power, and give for money the king's apartments to the soul of a shoemaker, and that of a lady of quality to her washerwoman."—*Master Key*, vol. I. p. 166.

No. LXXVIII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 8TH, 1820.

I MENTIONED in my last Number, on the authority of the Rev. Mr Gavin, originally a Popish priest in Spain, and afterwards a minister of the Church of England, that purgatory was divided into eight apartments; that the lowest of these was occupied by the souls of poor persons, and the highest by the souls of kings; and that the degree of torment which the souls in purgatory suffered was in proportion to the dignity of the apartments which they occupied; those in the lower vaults suffering less, and those in the higher ones suffering more, for no other reason, than that the friends of the latter are supposed able to pay large sums for relief, while the friends of the former can pay little or nothing; and it must be allowed to be equitable, at least in Popish reckoning, that if the rich heirs of kings and princes do not pay liberally for the repose of the souls of their deceased friends, the deceased must pay the debt of suffering in their own persons; whereas the poor souls whose friends have little to pay, will get off after suffering little.

This arrangement is admirably calculated to enrich the dealers in masses, which are understood to have such efficacy in procuring relief to the souls in purgatory; that is, to enrich the priests, who by means of this doctrine, find ready access to the purses of rich widows, and others, whose deceased husbands and relations gave no evidence, during life, of being fit for heaven. The more wicked they had been, the better for the church, provided they left plenty of money, as the more masses were necessary for their relief, and the price of masses is understood to bear some proportion to the wealth of the persons at whose request and on whose behalf they are said.

In countries where Popery is the established religion, especially in those where no other is suffered to be professed, it is easy for the priests, by dreams and revelations, to extort what they please from the rich dupes of their gloomy superstition. If a priest or a nun has only dreamed that such a one's father or mother is suffering dreadful torments in purgatory, this will be enough to command a thousand masses, and a thousand guineas to pay for them, if the relations of the deceased be able to pay so much; if not, the priests will take what they can give for the present, and more when they can get it.

"In the latter end of king Charles the Second's reign," says Mr Gavin, meaning king Charles of Spain, "a nun of Gaudalajara wrote a letter to his Majesty, acquainting him that it was revealed to her by an angel, that the soul of his father, Philip the Fourth, was still in purgatory, all alone in the royal apartment; and likewise, in the lowest chamber, the said king Philip's shoemaker; and that upon saying so many masses, both should be delivered out of it, and should go to enjoy the ravishing pleasures of an eternal life. The nun was reputed a saint upon earth, and the simple king gave orders to his confessor to say, or order so many masses to be said for that purpose; after which the nun wrote again to his Majesty, congratulating and wishing him joy for the arrival of his father in heaven; but that the shoemaker, who was seven degrees lower than Philip in purgatory, was then seven degrees higher than his Majesty in heaven, because of his life on earth." Philip it seems had been notoriously guilty of a particular vice, of which the nun reminds his son Charles; the shoemaker in this respect had been innocent; but, said she, "all had been forgiven him (*i. e.* the king) on account of the masses."

"When some ignorant people pay for a mass, and are willing to know whether the soul for which the mass is said, is, after the mass, delivered out of purgatory, the friar makes them believe, that the soul will appear in the figure of a mouse within the tabernacle of the altar, if it is not out of it, and then it is a sign that that soul wants more masses; and if the mouse doth not appear, that soul is in heaven. So when the mass is over, he goes to the tabernacle backwards, where is a little

door with a crystal, which the people look through; but O pitiful thing! they see a mouse which the friars keep perhaps for the purpose; and so the poor sots give more money for more masses, till they see the mouse no more. They have a revelation ready at hand, to say, that such a devout person was told by an angel, that the soul for which the mass is said, was to appear in the figure of a mouse in the sacrario, or tabernacle."—*Master Key*, Vol. I. p. 168—170.

This story of the mouse being made use of as a sign, to show whether or not souls were delivered out of purgatory, reminds me of a communication from a reverend gentleman, which has been long lying past me, because I had not sooner a proper opportunity of introducing it. It relates to a sign which the priests give, when they think proper, that certain souls are delivered from purgatory.

"About seventeen years ago," says my correspondent, "a lady, now living in Edinburgh, had occasion to be in Dublin, and through means of a gentleman from this country, was introduced to a Popish chapel, on an occasion when a number of souls were to be translated out of purgatory. The place was very brilliantly lighted. The priest was seated on an eminence, with a table before him. The audience was in expectation, when a relation of each of the deceased persons, whose souls were that night to be released, appeared, and in passing before the priest, each laid an elegant and well filled purse on the table before him, who, after nodding satisfaction, most readily conveyed it to a receptacle, where it might be preserved till a fit opportunity of otherwise disposing of it. Having received his wages, the priest immediately began his operations, and soon intimated that the souls were translated and would immediately make their appearance. Immediately a moveable part of the floor, unoccupied of course, opened, and there issued forth from it living creatures, as black as jet. When the little creatures began to move about, in order to prevent the deception from being detected, the lights were all extinguished, as if by magic. The lady had eyed the souls' representatives very narrowly, and had observed that there was one of them within her reach; and with a degree of courage, which would not have been exerted by every one in her circumstances, she seized on the animal; she put it into her pocket, for ladies wore pockets in those days; she took it home, and showed it to the gentleman who had introduced her to the chapel, when it turned out to be a crab dressed in black velvet. I need scarcely add, that the lady was induced by the entreaties of the gentleman to destroy the creature, and maintain secrecy, at least in Ireland, as she valued her own life. I have the story from a daughter of the lady who laid hold on the emancipated spirit, and I believe her entitled to the highest credit, otherwise I would not have troubled you with the story."

The above is, indeed, such an absurd, ridiculous, and childish piece of imposition, that it is with difficulty one can give credit to it; and yet, from the respectability of the channel through which it has been conveyed to me, I have no doubt of its truth: the credibility of things of this kind, must not be estimated by the rules by which we would judge of the credibility of what is said to take place among well informed persons. No minister in Scotland, of any denomination, could practise such a trick upon his people; because the people in Scotland are accustomed to think for themselves, and to inquire into the meaning and the evidences of things; but the people in Ireland, and, indeed, the people in other places where Popery is predominant, are not allowed to think for themselves: they must receive implicitly what their priests tell them, or be excommunicated, and be made to taste of the pains of purgatory even in the present life.

In the course of my reading, I have met with something similar to the above story of the crabs,—perhaps it may be in the letter of some correspondent, on which I cannot at present lay my hands; and, therefore, I cannot vouch for the fact, though there rests no doubt as to its truth on my own mind; because I believe there is no trick, however absurd, to which the priests will not have recourse, in order to deceive the people, and swindle them out of their money. A country priest had been complaining grievously against his congregation, for their hard-heartedness in not procuring a sufficient number of masses for the relief of the souls of their deceased relations. He invited some of them to come to him at a certain hour of the night, and he would let them see the souls which were in torment, and which called for relief. Some had the courage to accept the invitation; and from a place which overlooked the church-yard, he showed them a number of lights moving about among the gravestones, and declared that these were the souls of persons deceased, which were crying from purgatory, for prayers and masses for their release. Some one was bold enough to try to get more intimately acquainted with one of these moving lights; and it turned out to be a crab with a lighted candle-end fixed upon its back! With half a dozen of such agents, it was easy for an artful priest to impose upon his whole parish; and to make one who had a friend lately deceased, pay his last shilling for his relief, that at least he might be saved from the misery of wandering like a ghost about the grave's mouth.

It will be asked again, how is it possible to make the people believe such things? In reply, I have only to say, that when the priests have got them to disbelieve their own senses, which they do every time that they attend

mass; when they believe what they see to be a wafer, to be the Saviour of the world, it is easy to make them believe any thing else that may serve the purpose of maintaining the authority of their ghostly guides.

The following extract of a letter from a gentleman in Rome, to his friends here, bears some relation to this subject. It refers to a personage, who, if history says what is true, required no small degree of purgation before she was fit for heaven; and yet it seems, that priests were labouring with all their might, saying masses, in order to facilitate her progress through purgatory as fast as possible.

"January 8th, 1819.—The Queen of Spain died here the other day, and is to be buried to-morrow with pomp. I saw her lying in state; and a more ridiculous spectacle I never saw in my life. She was lying dressed in her finest apparel, on cloth of gold, exposed to the view of every person. A guard of honour stood around the bed; and the whole suite of rooms were covered with black, and filled with altars, at which a dozen of priests were constantly saying mass, night and day, for the purpose of facilitating her Majesty's journey through purgatory. I was obliged to submit to a good hard squeeze before admittance could be got, the crowd was so great. Her hair is curled every day, the same as if she was alive. Her dressing maid attends as usual; and breakfast and dinner are served up to her as formerly, which are ate in honour of her arrival at the gates of paradise. To-night, she is to be carried to St Maria Maggiore, preparatory to her funeral ceremony to-morrow."

We learn from the New Testament, that the heathen expected to be heard for their much speaking; that is, from the use of many words, and many repetitions in their prayers. The palace of the deceased queen presented, on the above occasion, a lively example of heathen worship. There were a dozen priests constantly employed, day and night, saying masses for the repose of her soul. Now this was an incessant repetition of the same thing; and those who can suppose that such a service was acceptable to God, or available for the happiness of the deceased sovereign, had they lived in the days of Ahab and Jezebel, must have joined with the worshippers of Baal, in calling upon the idol from morning to night, in the same words, O Baal, hear us. *Hoc est corpus meum*, are the grand mysterious words which are used in every mass, and which produce the miraculous effects for which the mass is celebrated. The continual saying of masses is therefore little more than an incessant repetition of these words, which, though they be a translation of the words which Christ used, in instituting the ordinance of the supper, being thus prostituted to an idolatrous and superstitious use, are no better than a mere heathenish incantation; and the priest who can deliberately impose upon the credulity of kings and queens, or of persons of any rank, by making them believe that by such means they can do good to the souls of those who are dead, must be regarded as the most depraved agents of the prince of darkness. Their's is not only a service which God has not required; but it is absolutely incompatible with that reasonable and spiritual worship which is ordained in the New Testament; and inconsistent with all that is there revealed of the way by which a sinner is saved, and by which he draws near to God with the hope of being accepted.

The grand point to which every thing in the system of Popery tends, is to get money, insomuch, that one is led to imagine that the Pope is no other than an incarnation of the ancient idol, Mammon, and that the priests are his tax-gatherers. The following abstract of a sermon on purgatory shows how little account is made by the priests of what, even by their own statement, should appear the most important branches of the doctrine, and how naturally they run on to expatiate upon that branch that brings in the money.

"I went once to hear an old friar, who had the name of an excellent preacher, upon the subject of the souls in purgatory, and he took his text out of the 21st chapter of the Apocalypse, 27th verse; "And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth," &c.; by which he settled the belief of purgatory, proving by some romantic authority, that such a passage ought to be understood of purgatory, and his chief authority was, because a famous interpreter renders the text thus: There shall not enter into it (meaning heaven) any thing which is not proved by the fire, as silver is purified by it. When he had proved his text, he came to divide it, which he did in these three heads. First, That the souls suffer in purgatory three sorts of torments, of which the first was fire, and that greater than that of hell. Secondly, To be deprived of the face of God. And thirdly, Which was the greatest of all the torments, to see their relations and friends here on earth diverting themselves, and taking so little care to relieve them out of these terrible pains. The preacher spoke very little of the two first points, but he insisted upon the third a long hour, taxing the people of ingratitude and inhumanity; and that if it was possible for any of the living to experience only for a moment that devouring flame of purgatory, certainly he would come again, and sell whatever he had in the world, and give it for masses: and what pity it is, said he, to know that there are the souls of many of my hearers' relations there, and none of them endeavour to relieve them out of that place. He went on, and said, I have a catalogue of the souls, which by revelation and apparition we are sure are in purgatory; for in the first place, the soul of such a one (meaning a rich merchant's father), did

appear the other night to a godly person, in a figure of a pig, and the devout person knowing that the door of his chamber was locked up, began to sprinkle the pig with holy water, and conjuring him, bade him speak, and tell what he wanted? And the pig said, I am the soul of such a one, and I have been in purgatory these ten years for want of help. When I left the world, I forgot to tell my confessor where I left 1000 pistoles, which I had reserved for masses. My son found them out, and he is such an unnatural child that he doth not remember my pitiful condition; and now, by the permission of heaven, I come to you, and command you to discover this case to the first preacher you meet, that he may publish it, and tell my son, that if he doth not give that money for masses for my relief, I shall be for ever in purgatory, and his soul shall certainly go to hell.

"The sottish merchant, terrified with this story, got up before all the people and went into the vestry, and when the friar had finished, he begged of him to go with him to his house, where he should receive the money, which he did accordingly, for fear of second thought; and the merchant freely gave the 1000 pistoles, for fear that his father should be kept in purgatory, and he himself go to hell."—*Master Key*, vol. i. pp. 173—175. Mr Gavin does not tell us how the friar came to know the fact that the young man had found a sum of money which had been secreted by his father; but there will appear to have been no need of a supernatural revelation, when it is recollected that every father confessor has access to know all the secrets of all his spiritual children; and these fathers can easily make known to one another, any secret which they think will serve the common cause.

It is a common thing, at this very day, for Papists in Ireland to leave large sums of money, to be applied after their death, for the relief of their souls. It had been found that great abuses existed with regard to the management of charitable bequests in general, in that kingdom. On which account an act was passed in the third year, and another in the fortieth year of his present Majesty, by which "every executor of a will is bound under a penalty of £50 to give notice in the Dublin Gazette, within three months after obtaining probate, of every charitable bequest contained in the will of the deceased, whether he was of the Protestant or Roman Catholic religion, in order that money left for charitable purposes may not be concealed and embezzled." The Commissioners, under this Act, are the highest dignitaries of both Church and State in Ireland; and in their records the following items appear:—

"1801.—The Rev. Matt. Lennon, Titular Bishop of Dromore, bequeathed £500, to purchase six Government Debentures, for the purpose of establishing a daily mass for his soul, in the chapel of Newry, in perpetuance." "1803.—The Rev. Edanus Murphy, a parish priest, in the county of Wexford, bequeathed all his books and household furniture, and what stock he might have at the time of his decease, to his nephew, the Rev. William Stafford, *to be laid out for suffraces for his soul.*" Same year, "Patrick Darcy, of Bishop-street, Dublin, left an annuity of £3 : 8 : 3, per annum, to the clergymen of Francis-street chapel, for saying *soul masses*, for the space of thirty-five years." —"In the same year, Mrs French left a sum of money to say masses for her soul, and the souls of her two husbands." 1805.—"The Rev. W. Lonergan, parish priest of Carrickbeg, county of Wexford, left in this year, £10 to the chapel of Carrickbeg, and £5 to Ballindesart chapel, and £100 to his burial, *months mind*, and *masses*, the masses at one shilling and sevenpence per mass."—*See a Refutation of the Statement of the Penal Laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland, Dublin*, 1812. This work contains many other such instances of superstition; but the above, I think, are enough for a sample.

This author informs us, that "although, since the days of lord Coke, money left to say masses for a soul, has been declared to be an unlawful and superstitious bequest, yet the Commissioners have never molested the Rev. Matthew Lennon's executors, nor even prosecuted them for not advertising his bequests." The fact is, that the utmost tenderness, and the most liberal indulgence is shown to Papists in all these matters; so that they have no reason whatever to complain of any hardship being imposed upon them; and yet, if we were to take the word of their political writers, they are suffering more cruel persecution than the children of Israel did in Egypt.

The editor of the Antijacobin Review, and Protestant Advocate, has done me the honour of inserting in his Number for last month my tenth Number entire, that is, the sixteenth of the Dublin edition. He introduces it with a paragraph, in which he says, "Whilst Glasgow has produced a layman to vindicate Christianity from its worst foes, and Ireland can boast of many, even martyrs, as well as defenders of her church, *not a single publication against Popery from the Lancashire press is known to the world.*" The editor has not seen the excellent volume of the Rev. Mr Fletcher of Blackburn, which was printed in Manchester, in 1817, and is, I am informed, now reprinting in London. It is entitled "Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion." I take this opportunity of respectfully recommending it to the "Protestant Advocate," and to all my readers. The worst fault of it is, that it is too good for the persons the author has to deal with. He concedes too much in the way of liberality and politeness; these being qualities which Papists can neither

appreciate nor imitate, when engaged in controversy about their religion.

No. LXXIX.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 15TH, 1820.

IT is now time to discuss the subject of purgatory more seriously than I have yet done. The thing, indeed, is connected with so many ludicrous associations, that it is not easy to treat it seriously; but when we consider that it is one of the chief instruments by which the people are deceived, and by which the Church of Rome has her wealth, it will appear proper and necessary that the imposition be exposed, and the truth of the gospel maintained.

There is nothing declared more plainly in the Bible, than that Christ came into the world to save sinners. It is declared with equal plainness,—"He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, and shall never come into condemnation; but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," John iii. 36. He that believes in Christ is a justified person, and when he dies he is received immediately into heaven. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," Rom. viii. 1. The apostle speaks in language of strong defiance: "Who shall lay *any thing* to the charge of God's elect?" ver. 33. This is as much as to say, that nothing whatever stands against them. The salvation which they have in Christ, is a complete salvation: it is a forgiveness of all trespasses, absolutely and for ever. The Bible does not contain the slightest hint, that there are some trespasses not forgiven to a genuine Christian, and for which he must make satisfaction in his own person, in this world, or in the world to come, or in a state between the one and the other.

Besides, we learn from the word of God, that it is in this life only that men become interested in the salvation of Christ. The state in which death finds a man, will be his state for ever. If he be in a state of peace with God at the moment of his death, he enters into peace; he rests from his labours and from his sufferings. Dying in the Lord, as every believer does, is to die in a state of acceptance and favour, which is quite inconsistent with the idea of undergoing ages, or even years of punishment. The greatest sinners, believing in Christ, are declared to be washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. vi. 11. This renders all other purification unnecessary; and the idea of a purgatorian fire for purifying the souls of Christians, cannot be entertained, without contemning, as insufficient, the blood of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. This contempt is, indeed, inseparable from the doctrine of purgatory. He that teaches that a man must make satisfaction for his own sins, in whole or in part, declares the insufficiency of the satisfaction which Christ has made; and he who expects to be purified in the fire of purgatory, is guilty of despising the sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost.

The Council of Trent do not profess to adduce any higher authority than their own for this doctrine. They had not the presumption, great as their presumption was, to father such an absurdity upon the Bible. With Papists, indeed, their authority will be held as good as that of the word of God; but with Protestants it has no more weight than the reveries of Mahomet,—I might satisfy myself with merely asserting, that there is no such place. As, however, some Popish writers of great name have attempted to prove the doctrine from Scripture, I shall now proceed to examine more particularly their Scripture proofs.

In "the grounds of the Catholic doctrine, contained in the profession of faith, published by Pope Pius IV.," we have what is meant for an argument from Scripture, on behalf of purgatory, as follows:—"The Scripture in many places assures us, that 'God will render to every man according to his works,' Ps. xii. 12; Mat. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6; Rev. xxii. 12. Now this would not be true, if there were no such thing as purgatory; for how could God render to every one according to his works, if such as die in the guilt of any, even the least sin, which they have not taken care to blot out by repentance, would nevertheless go straight to heaven?" It is undoubtedly true, that "God will render to every man according to his works;" and the Church of Rome gives a pretty fair specimen of her impudence, by saying, "this would not be true, but for her purgatory." Such declarations of Scripture have, in reality, nothing to do with purgatory. If men "die in the guilt of any, even the least sin," the Bible tells us plainly, they must perish, and that for ever. "God will render unto them according to their works;" that is, he will render indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil. Such go away into everlasting punishment. This is called the blackness of darkness for ever. But we have not the slightest hint, in the whole Bible, that such persons go into a place of temporary punishment, out of which they shall be released, sooner or later, as their friends on earth shall be pleased to pay money for their relief.

Those who die in Christ, do not "die in the guilt of any, even the least sin;" because in virtue of his atoning sacrifice, all their sins, without the exception of the very least, are taken away. "God made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us," says one apostle, "that

we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. v. 21. Christ's righteousness imputed to the believer of the gospel, constitutes him righteous before God. Thus "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe in him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; "who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification," Rom. iv. 3, 23—25. We learn from such declarations as these, that every real Christian is a justified person; that he has received a full acquittal and remission of all his sins; and the same apostle cites the Psalmist, as describing the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. It is not said, the man who hath not committed sin, for there is no such man in the world, or ever shall be; but the man to whom sin shall not be imputed; who has it not charged against him for future reckoning; who shall not be punished as his sins deserve. The standing of such a man before God, is not in himself, but in Christ his Saviour; hence his blessedness and security. If his standing were in himself, he would most certainly fall, and incur not the temporary punishment of purgatory, but the pains of hell for ever.

Now, it is true also of such a man, that God will render to him according to his works. When the earth and the sea shall give up the dead which are in them, every man shall be judged according to his works. The judgment of the great day, like that of every well constituted human tribunal, will proceed according to evidence. A man's works are the evidence of his state before God. Those who have done nothing but evil, will have their evil deeds produced as evidence against them; shall be judged according to their works, and receive the condemnation which they deserve. Those who believe in Christ, are created anew to good works. They, and they only, really serve God in this world; their services, as well as their persons, are accepted for Christ's sake, not for any value in them; and according to these the judgment shall proceed. Not that there is such merit in their works as to deserve a reward; but because they evince a relation to Christ, who alone has merited eternal life, and who is the author of it to all them that obey him. There is a broad and intelligible distinction between the expressions *according* to works, and *on account of* works, just as there is between the evidence of a witness and the fact which it is brought to establish. The just sentence of any court will be according to evidence, but the evidence is not that on account of which, or for the sake of which, a man is rewarded or condemned. The wicked shall indeed be condemned and punished on account of their works; but not as viewed in the character of evidence, but as acts of rebellion against God. The reward of the righteous will be according to their works, but solely on account of Christ's perfect righteousness, in which they become interested by faith; and, but for which, they would never have had any good works to exhibit.

But, here I ask again, what have we to do with purgatory? The passages of Scripture under consideration, speak of God rendering to men *according to their works;* but it is plainly avowed by Papists themselves, that the rendering to men in purgatory, is not according to their works, but *according to their wealth;* or, according to the wealth of their surviving friends. They speak with great solemnity, when they choose to be serious, of God requiring punishment for the guilt of the least sin; and yet they do most blasphemously represent Him as relaxing such punishment, or remitting it altogether, on condition of certain sums of money being paid to the priests for masses. By the more grave and sensible of their doctors, the punishment of purgatory is represented to be salutary and necessary, in order to qualify persons for heaven; and yet they may be exempted from that salutary and purifying process, on payment of money by their friends. It is declared by all the Romish doctors who write on the subject, that without the purgatorian fire, men cannot go to heaven; yet money can purchase exemption from this fire, or mitigate its pains. What is this, but to teach that money can open the gate of heaven? or, that money can procure admittance for persons who have not undergone the necessary purgation? Now, suppose for a moment, that this has taken place. Suppose that a man who had led a most wicked life, had died without repentance; or, to use the words of my Popish author, had "not taken care to blot out by repentance," the guilt of any, even the least sin,—suppose, I say, such a person to go to purgatory, in order to be purified, and made meet for heaven, would it not be a most cruel thing to interrupt the process of purification, and to force his passage through the fire, before it had produced its full effect upon him? This would be in reality to force the man into heaven before he was fit for it, and to such a man it would be no heaven, but a place of punishment, equal to all that Papists have fancied of their purgatory.

I know it will be answered, that God is pleased, in consideration of a certain number of masses, for which a sum of money must be paid, to mitigate the rigour of the punishment of souls in purgatory, and remit so much of the debt that is due. But what then becomes of his justice, which is declared to be so inflexible as not to remit the punishment of the least sin without satisfaction? It comes inevitably to this, that Papists consider God to be such a one as themselves, who will consent to any

thing for money. The idea is so horribly impious, that I scarcely know how to write it; and yet it is inseparable from the doctrine of purgatory, and the remission of its pains, in consideration of money paid to the priests for masses, which masses are declared to have so much virtue, as to procure a remission or mitigation of those pains which the justice of God had imposed on account of sin.

His Holiness, Pope Pius IV., adduces the following words, (Mat. v. 25, 26.) to prove his doctrine of purgatory: "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him: lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.—Which text, St Cyprian, one of the ancient fathers, understands of the prison of purgatory, *Epist.* 52, *ad Antonianum.*" But what if St Cyprian was mistaken in his application of this passage? Why, then, this proof must fall to the ground, for there is no other authority produced in support of this view of its meaning. Suppose St Cyprian to be right in his application of the words, they will be found most effectually to destroy the whole traffic of our purgatory priests. To a person who is in danger of being thrust into the prison, it is said expressly; "Verily, I say unto THEE, thou shalt BY NO MEANS come out thence, till THOU hast paid the uttermost farthing." This admits of no commutation of punishment. The sinner must pay the whole debt in his own person. The priests promise deliverance by *means* of masses and money; but, No, says the text, he shall come out by no means, but by himself paying the uttermost farthing; that is, suffering the full measure of punishment in his own person. The Douay doctors were too wise to introduce this passage of Scripture to prove the doctrine of purgatory, seeing no doubt that it would spoil their trade; and yet the infallible head of the Church of Rome had not the sagacity to perceive, that if a soul would be delivered from purgatory by *no means*, all the means of his appointment were vain.

It does not properly belong to my plan to give the true meaning of every passage of Scripture which Papists pervert. It is enough for my purpose to show that a passage does not contain what they affect to find in it; but lest they should think themselves entitled to claim this passage as an unanswerable argument on their side, I shall endeavour, in as few words as possible, to show its real meaning; which, indeed, any reader of ordinary understanding may find out, if he will read with attention the whole passage from the 21st verse: and a person can scarcely be sure of the meaning of any passage, unless he read it entire, without regard to the breaks which are made by verses, and sometimes even by chapters. Christ was speaking of unjust anger, provoking speeches and quarrels, among brethren. He declares that for one rash expression (thou fool) a man should be in danger of hell fire. He says, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." A man conscious of having given his brother cause of offence was not in a state of mind to offer an acceptable sacrifice. He is therefore commanded to take immediate steps for reconciliation; and it is in this connection that our Lord adds, "agree with thine adversary quickly whilst thou art in the way with him," &c.; meaning that if this is not done, he may expect that his adversary will take summary and severe vengeance when he shall have it in his power. But I doubt not, the words are chiefly intended to convey spiritual instruction. An irreconcileable state of mind towards a brother whom one has offended, indicates a mind at enmity against God. Unless such a one shall become reconciled, and make this evident by becoming reconciled to his brother, he is in danger of eternal punishment, from which he shall not be delivered, but which he must suffer to the uttermost.

The same Pope Pius IV. the infallible head of what is improperly called the Catholic Church, introduces his pretended ancestor, the apostle Peter, as a believer in purgatory, and a teacher of the doctrine. He refers to his first epistle, iii. 18—20, "Where Christ is said by his Spirit to have gone and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, &c. Which prison," says he, "could be no other than purgatory: for as to the spirits that were in the prison of hell, Christ certainly did not go to preach to them." What his Holiness thus declares, "certainly," is not very consistent with the explanation which other Popish writers give of a clause in what they call the "Apostles' Creed;" namely, "He descended into hell;" for they suppose that Christ literally went into hell for the purpose of delivering souls out of it, or for some other purpose which they could not well define, but upon the supposition that he went to preach to the spirits which were there in prison.

But I request my readers to attend to the statement of the inspired apostle, in connection with the narrative of the inspired historian, Genesis vi. and vii, and they will find that there is no more of purgatory in it, than in the other passages of Scripture which have been adduced. God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth, and he declared his purpose to destroy the world by a flood. But he raised up Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness. During the long period of a hundred and twenty years, while the ark was a-building, Noah was

employed in preaching the righteousness of the promised Saviour as the only ground of hope for sinners; and while he and his sons were building the ark, they were giving a visible evidence of the divine displeasure against the human race on account of sin; and at the same time preaching the evangelical truth, that there was no way of escape but that which God had appointed. It was the Spirit of Christ which spake by all the prophets (1 Pet. i. 11.) and by Enoch and Noah among the rest. It was therefore Christ who, by his Spirit, went and preached to the spirits in prison (that is, who are now in prison,) and who were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing. By the ministry of Noah, Christ, by his Spirit, preached to them the righteousness on the footing of which alone they could be saved; and he exhibited the ark then a-building, as a type of the security of all who should flee to him for refuge; but the great bulk of the people were disobedient; they did not believe the preaching; they did not flee for refuge to the hope set before them: therefore, they perished in their sins, and were, at the time when the apostle wrote, shut up in the prison of hell, where they should ever remain.

But I must not overlook one great argument which Papists profess to derive from Scripture in support of their doctrine of purgatory. It is from 2 Maccabees chap. xii, in which we are told "that money was sent to Jerusalem, that sacrifices might be offered for the slain; and it is recommended as a holy cogitation to pray for the dead." Bellarmine ranks this in the front of his Scripture proofs; and the great Mr Gother, the oracle of English Papists, also gives it the first place in his true representation of the Popish doctrine on this head, as a conclusive evidence; adding, that "these two books of Maccabees were certainly held in great veneration by all antiquity."

But in point of fact, the books called Maccabees have no more authority in religious matters than those of Bellarmine or Gother themselves. The books called Apocrypha, which are sometimes, very improperly, I think, bound up with our Bibles, were never received by the Jewish church as of divine authority. They formed no part of that volume to which Christ and his apostles so often referred, under the title of Moses and the Prophets. There is scarcely a book, or a section of a book, in the Old Testament, which is not quoted or referred to in some passage of the New Testament. Christ has thus given the sanction of his authority to Moses, and the Psalms, and the Prophets; that is, to the whole volume of Scripture which the Jews had received from Moses and the Prophets: which they most tenaciously maintained as canonical; and which is known by us under the title of the Old Testament. But there was not one of the Apocryphal books so acknowledged by the Jews, or so referred to by Christ and his apostles. It was not till the time of the council of Trent that these books were authoritatively declared to be of equal authority with the Old and New Testament; and it was not in the power of that holy, or more properly insolent assembly, to give a satisfactory reason for their investing, with divine authority, those books which had not been received as canonical by the primitive churches,—whose authors did not profess to be divinely inspired; and who, in many instances, make it evident that they were fallible men. The writer of the book from which the learned Cardinals, and the great Representer, draw their front argument for purgatory, confesses, in the following words, that he wrote merely like other authors of works merely human. He makes an apology for his imperfections as an author, which no inspired writer ever did; and he bespeaks the good opinion of his readers on the plea that he had done his best. "Here," says he, "will I make an end. And if I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired: but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto. For as it is hurtful to drink wine or water alone; and as wine mingled with water is pleasant, and delighteth the taste; even so speech finely framed delighteth the ears of them that read the story. And here shall be an end." 2 Maccab. xv. 37—39.

Besides the pedantic quaintness of this extract, it contains not a little absurdity. Who was ever hurt by drinking water alone, if he was in a temperate state of body? and what harm can result from drinking wine alone, if it be done with moderation? But the point which I wish to keep principally in view is, the explicit disavowal of divine inspiration which is clearly implied in the author's own words; and yet it is upon the words of such an author that the holy and infallible Church of Rome grounds her principal argument in support of her doctrine of purgatory, and prayers for the dead.

No. LXXX.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 22ND, 1820.

I HAVE now examined the principal Scripture authorities on which Papists profess to found their doctrine of purgatory, and I have shown that no such doctrine is contained in them. There is not a passage in the whole Bible, that gives the slightest countenance to the Church of Rome's intermediate state between this world and the next; but the whole tenor of the Bible teaches, that the state in which death finds a man, shall be his state for ever. The washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, must take place in the present

life, if it take place at all; and he who is not renewed in the spirit of his mind before his death, cannot be renewed afterwards. It is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; but such knowledge must be imparted in the present life, else it cannot be imparted:—"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave."

Had there been such a state as purgatory, it would surely have been mentioned in Scripture; and we can scarcely imagine an occasion more proper for the mention of it, than in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 22, 23; "Lazarus died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." He was neither an apostle, nor a martyr, nor a *saint*, in Popish estimation. There is no evidence of his having punished himself by stripes, or voluntary austerities of any kind. It is not said that *he* had made satisfaction to divine justice for any, even the least of his sins; but being a vessel of mercy, washed and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, he had no need of any other purgation: accordingly, he was not sent by any such circuitous route, but was instantly, on his death, received into heaven. Every real Christian is justified by the same righteousness, and sanctified by the same influence, and has no more occasion to pass through purgatory than Lazarus had.

"The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." There is no mention of a middle state, in which he might be purified and made meet for heaven; and yet upon the supposition that there was such a place as purgatory, no good reason can be given why this man should not have had the benefit of it; that is, the favour of being punished and purged there, without going to hell at all. He was not a heretic, or an excommunicated person. He was a son of Abraham. This constituted him a member of the visible church, as really as baptism can declare one to be a Christian; and there is nothing worse said of him, than what may truly be said of many baptized persons in the Church of Rome, and in Reformed Churches. Why, then, should not he have had the benefit of purgatory? Because there is no such place, —because there is no means provided in heaven, or earth, or hell, or any where else, for purifying a soul that dies under the guilt of sin. Supposing the soul of the rich man to have been in purgatory, and Abraham to have been like the Pope, or even an inferior priest, he would have said, I will send notice to thy five brethren on earth, who inherit thy wealth, that they order so many thousand masses to be said for thy relief, and pay the priests handsomely, and thy soul shall soon be with me. It is wrong to speak with levity on a subject of such awful importance; but seriously, this is in the true spirit of Popery. Our Saviour, however, teaches by the language which he ascribes to Abraham, that there was a great gulf between the place of happiness, and the place of punishment, and that it was not possible to pass from the one to the other.

There are many absurdities, as well as much impiety, connected with the doctrine of purgatory. In addition to what I have already exhibited, I present the reader with the following, for which I am indebted to a gentleman of this city, who was an eye-witness of what he describes:—

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"*Glasgow, 10th January*, 1820.

"DEAR SIR,—In discussing the subject of purgatory in your late Numbers, and the various ways in which the priests contrive to extort money from their people, under pretence of getting the souls of their departed friends released from that imaginary place of temporary punishment, I do not observe that you have noticed the custom prevalent in Ireland, (and no doubt in other Catholic countries) of making contributions for that purpose at funerals.—Previous to the procession, mass is performed for the soul of the deceased, immediately after which, the priest begins to collect money from the persons assembled. This is done very much after the manner of an auctioneer, in the act of selling a property at the hammer; and the term *canting*, by which the practice is universally designated in Ireland, bears precisely the same meaning as does that of *rouping*, in Scotland. The priest commences by saying, 'Who gives for the soul of the faithful departed?' a metal trencher being placed on the coffin. The persons nearest then throw in their offerings, and the others follow by degrees as they can get forward. To whoever gives sixpence, the priest says, 'God bless you!' To those who give a shilling, or more, he usually says, 'God *Almighty* bless you!' Those who give merely copper, pass unnoticed. As the clanging sound of the trencher becomes less frequent, the priest becomes more importunate to have it prolonged:—he vociferates often and rapidly, 'Who will give more for the soul of the faithful departed?' Some of those who had previously contributed, make an addition, and others, determined not to be outdone in this pious and public manner of testifying the respect they entertained for the deceased, follow the example; while the former, stimulated by the continued clamour of the priest, give a third time. The priest goes on vociferating, 'Will nobody give more for the soul of the faithful departed?' 'Oh, will no one give more!' until this greedy clamour wholly ceases to be of farther avail. I need hardly add, that he then completes the pious fraud by coolly pocketing the money.

"This exhibition is by no means confined to the dwelling-houses of the deceased; or at least, was not so when I was last in Ireland, about seventeen years ago. It was frequently practised on the highway leading to the churchyard, or on the burying ground itself. The purpose of this is of course to get more money, by means of the increased number of persons who are usually present out of doors. In Ireland, no funeral invitations are issued by the poorer classes, it being understood, that all who respected the deceased in his lifetime, will attend without any; and the number who join the procession as it passes along the road, is much greater than that which assembles at the house of the deceased. Hence, at the period I allude to, it was customary for the priest to stop the procession, (before which he marched singly, with a white band about his hat, and a book in his hand,) whenever he conceived the assemblage to be at its greatest. I was present at one of these public cantings, in the neighbourhood of Lurgan, in the county of Armagh, in the year 1802, when the coffin having been taken from the hearse and laid on the road, a few hundred yards before coming to the burial ground, the process which I have described took place, in presence of an immense multitude.—I am, &c."

I shall conclude the subject of purgatory, with the following hand-bill, or card of invitation to the members of the Purgatorian Society in Dublin, calling them to perform the duties, and enjoy the privileges of members; that is, of those who pay a penny a-week for the relief of suffering souls.—The date, the day, and the hour of meeting, are in writing; the rest is neatly printed.

SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN,
THE EVANGELIST,

For promoting the Exercise of the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy.

"Let us not love in Word, nor in Tongue, but in Deed and in Truth." 1 John 10 ch. 18 v. *

"As a Member of this Society, you are prayed to assist at the Quarterly Solemn Office and High Mass, which will be celebrated in St Michael's and St John's Chapel, on Wednesday next, at 11 o'Clock, for the Suffering Souls in Purgatory, and particularly for the Deceased Subscribers, and the Parents, Friends, and Relations of the Subscribers to this Society. M. BLAKE, President."

19*th day of June,* 1819.

J. Coyne, Printer, 74, Cook-st.

* The reader will look in vain for such a chapter and verse in the common English Bible.

Before proceeding to another general subject of discussion, I shall, according to custom, introduce a variety of lighter matter, to relieve the reader's mind from the gloom that may have been occasioned by dwelling so long on purgatory.

My readers, I suppose, will almost have forgotten, that there was a work printed in London, meant as a reply to THE PROTESTANT, under the title of The Catholic Vindicator. It is about six months since I had last occasion to allude to this work; and now I find it has been given up. This, I confess, is a disappointment to me; and the first disappointment of any importance that I have met with since the commencement of my labours; for the author was such a man of words, that I had made up my mind to concede to him the last word, though I should have written for seven years. Besides, I considered him a very useful auxiliary, in exposing the absurdities and impieties of the Church of Rome, which he did very effectually, by seriously maintaining them; and he exemplified, in every page, the true spirit of Popery, with a force and propriety which no Protestant could imitate, or even properly describe.

I took some notice of him once and again, in my earlier Numbers. Every such notice served him as a bone to gnaw for a week or two; but since I ceased to take any notice of him at all, he has gone on raging and foaming like a mad dog, but happily much more harmless; and in this state of rage and madness he made his exit about six weeks ago.

It was indeed, evident, long before this, that he was in a declining state. Persons even of his own communion, had become sick of the incessant repetition of his ultra Billingsgate, without a particle of reason or common sense; and though he was actually their hired champion, they wished him to have done, partly because they were ashamed of him, but chiefly because they were obliged to pay him for the full tale of every Number of his work, of which they were not able to sell much above one tenth, and lately, I have been told, not even so much.

I speak only from a current report of the trade, for I never thought it worth while to institute an inquiry into a matter of so little importance to the cause which I am pleading; but I have heard as a matter of report, which hundreds have done, that our Glasgow Papists became bound to Mr Andrews, to pay him his price for a certain number of copies of his Vindicator, and to take the risk of their sale; and that this engagement was to continue for about a year. The half of the year had not expired, when the dupes of this man of words found that they had made a bad bargain, and wished to be quit; but he kept them strictly to the terms of their agreement. They had to bear both the "skaith and the scorn."

The few who continued to read the Vindicator, were laughing at their folly; and they were compelled to pay for whole reams, nay, I may say bales, of what was no better than waste-paper.

Every effort that man could make, was made to promote the sale. No book was ever so much exposed to public view in Glasgow, as The Catholic Vindicator, of which the corners of our streets bear witness to this day. The placarding, however, ceased some weeks before the work itself expired. About three months ago, some wicked wag, going along the streets, had chalked 666, the well-known Number of the Beast, upon a number of the Vindicator's great blue hand-bills. Our Papists, it seems, were wise enough to understand the allusion, or some Protestant must have told them what the figures meant; for they did not chose to expose themselves again to such an affront. From that time they ceased their placarding; and the tattered fragments of old hand-bills remaining upon our walls, are the principal evidence that such a work ever existed.

It was very evident from these circumstances, especially from the want of sale, that the work was expiring; and it was indeed given out long ago, that the fifty-second Number was to be the last. That fifty-second did announce itself to be the last Number, but for what reason? Not because the author had disgusted all his readers, by answering his opponent with nothing but bad names, and false assertions. Not because his Numbers would not sell, and his friends were robbed of their money, by being obliged to pay for them, and would submit to the robbery no longer than they were bound by their foolish engagement. None of these causes must be assigned for the termination of the Vindicator's *important* labours. In short, the truth must not be told, as it would be disreputable to the cause of Popery; and he whose life is employed in propagating falsehood, is in great danger of expiring with a lie in his mouth. I hope the literary *defunct*, as well as his correspondents and dupes in Glasgow, will understand what I mean.

The new tax upon periodical publications, is assigned by Mr Andrews as the cause, and the only cause of his abandoning his defence of the Church of Rome, against the attacks of THE PROTESTANT. But the falsehood of this is evident, from the fact, that he actually brought his work to a close several weeks before the Act imposing such a tax was passed, and when he could not know whether it would pass or not. The Number which finishes his labours, and in which he gives his reason for their termination, is dated December 4th. The bill did not pass the House of Lords, till the 30th of that month; and it was not to take effect till ten days thereafter. If, therefore, he had not been quite exhausted,—if he had had any thing more to say in defence of his holy and infallible church,—had he been able to invent any more bad names, or any more accusations of forgery against THE PROTESTANT, he might have had at least five additional Numbers; and, perhaps, exhausted though he was, he would have found means by repeating five times more, what he had already repeated fifty times, to make up so many more pages, had he believed that any body would buy them.

Since the 10th of this month, indeed, periodical publications of a certain description, have become subject to a tax; but this would not have affected Mr Andrews' publication any more than mine, had he been pleased to continue it, and to confine himself to a defence of his religion, without abusing our Protestant government. This new tax, however, was proposed at a time most favourable for him; and he took advantage of the very proposal in order to cover his retreat, and conceal the shame of his not being able to continue the controversy any longer. He retires under the cover of a falsehood; but this is a matter of no importance with Papists. With them the question with regard to any matter, is not whether it be true, but whether it will serve any desirable purpose?

I must not be understood as yet entering upon a reply to The Catholic Vindicator. I am only honouring his demise with a passing compliment. He laboured a whole year with scarcely any other view, than to divert me from the exposure of the wickedness of Popery, on which he saw I was bent; and not being able to accomplish his object, he was not able to survive the disappointment.

The same policy has been followed by Popish writers, ever since the Reformation. Whenever an author appeared to oppose any doctrine or practice of the Church of Rome, the literati of that church set themselves not so much to defend what was attacked, as to divert the assailant to some other point; and in general they were successful in leading him entirely away from the question originally at issue. On this subject, the following remarks of Dr Campbell are strikingly just:—"When a man enters keenly into controversy on any subject, it is impossible to say, (unless he is uncommonly circumspect) how far it may carry him. It generally leads to the discussion of questions little connected with that which began the dispute. In this warfare, a man is so much at the mercy of his antagonist, that if he enter into it with more warmth than circumspection, he will follow his enemy that he may fight him, wheresoever he shall shelter himself; and in this way both combatants come to be soon off the ground on which the combat began. Exactly such a disputant was Luther. And this may be said in a great measure of all who had a leading hand in the

Reformation. To conquer the foe, wherever he was, came, ere they were aware, to be more an object to them, than to drive them off the field, and keep possession of it. In consequence of this tendency, they were often diverted from their object."—*Lect. Ecc. Hist. Lect.* xxviii.

If it were lawful to indulge in self-gratulation, I would congratulate myself on having been enabled to avoid the snare into which Luther and other Reformers fell. And certainly it was not more artfully laid for them than it was laid for me. AMICUS VERITATIS, perceiving that I was determined to expose some of the errors of his church, threw out a host of accusations against Luther, and the other Reformers, expecting, no doubt, that I would immediately enter upon their defence, and let the errors of his church alone. When the Vindicator made his appearance, he took precisely the same method; and, in addition, he began a course of scurrilous abuse against myself personally, which he continued through every page of his work. He brought such accusations as he supposed no man could bear. He asserted falsehoods, and made blunders so palpable—many of them, I believe, purposely made so, that he might tempt me to follow him into the labyrinth which he had prepared for me, knowing, that if he got me once seduced to follow him, I would not easily get back to the point from which I had started. Had I yielded to the temptation, he would have gained his point. He would not have cared how many absurdities and falsehoods I should have fastened upon him, if he had drawn me away from the exposure of the wickedness of his holy and infallible church.

The Catholic Vindicator set out at first, boasting in his might, engaging, as he said, to measure his strength with THE PROTESTANT, and to "endeavour to bring this Champion of the Philistines to the ground." The man was then only putting on his armour, and he did not know that it was not proper for such a one to boast. And though he, whom he calls the "Champion of the Philistines," that is, the advocate of the Protestant religion, is holding his head as erect, and as far from the ground as ever, the Vindicator confidently boasts, in the very last page of his work, when obliged to leave the field, that he has gained the victory. "Nothing more," says he, "I feel convinced, needs be said, to prove my superiority over Mr William M'Gavin." This, it seems, was what he proposed to himself; and this is what he professes to have gained by his work. Now, this is a point which I never disputed with him; and I hope I will never be so foolish, as to trouble the public with a controversy on the subject of superiority between myself and another man. My business has been to expose error, and maintain the truth; and I desire no victory but that of persuading my opponents to renounce error, and to embrace the truth, that they may be saved.

On looking over what I have just written, I am almost ashamed of having said so much about Mr Andrews and myself, which will naturally incur the charge of egotism. I hope, however, I shall have no occasion to revert to the subject for months to come. I would be glad, if a more gentlemanly opponent would take up the cause of the Church of Rome, and point out by fair reasoning, any mistake that I have made in my statements, or the inconclusiveness of any of my arguments; for it is a fact, that Mr Andrews, with all his boasting and bluster, never looked one of my facts or arguments fairly in the face. These personal matters are, considered in themselves, certainly of very little public importance; but they are not unimportant, when considered as illustrative of the character of Popery. Papists have not been able to meet me on the ground of fair argument; but they have denounced and cursed me from their pulpit, and they have laboured for a whole year, through the medium of their London agent, to hold me up to the world as a monster of wickedness. Now, does any man suppose, that if they had power in their hands, they would be at all this trouble? No, indeed; they would silence opposition at once, by means of the gibbet or the fire; and in doing so, they would not show greater malice than they have already done. It is true, the object of their hatred has suffered as little from their false representations, as from their curses; but this is not from want of good will on their part.

No. LXXXI.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 29TH, 1820.

I CANNOT but reflect with pleasure on the interest which my work has been honoured to excite in Ireland, of which I have received many flattering testimonies from reverend clergymen, and other gentlemen in that country, whom I never saw, and to whom I am known in no other character than that of the advocate of the Protestant religion, against the errors and superstitions of Popery. Within a few days, in the early part of this month, I received no less than five copies of the Archbishop of Tuam's charge to his clergy, which were sent to me from different parts of Ireland. The first copy which I received was in manuscript, from a reverend gentleman in the diocese of Derry; the other copies were contained in Newspapers sent me from different quarters, after the document had appeared in print.

Having communicated this document to the editors of the Glasgow Newspapers, by whom

it has been reprinted, I need not insert it here; but I intend to make such extracts from it, and such remarks, as will show that the Romish clergy in Ireland are as hostile to the Bible as ever they were; and that they heartily abhor, and wish to annihilate, the schools which have been established by the Hibernian, and other Societies, for teaching the poor to read the Holy Scriptures.

I cannot introduce this subject better, than by the following communication from a reverend gentleman of that kingdom, well known for his interesting work, the "Annals of Ireland," who has honoured me by his correspondence, and particularly by some fragments of an elegant translation of Buchanan's Franciscan, with which he has been amusing himself in his leisure hours. He has furnished me with the lines in the original Latin; but I shall content myself with giving his short introduction, and his English translation:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

"SIR, — As the Popish clergy have uniformly manifested a considerable degree of hostility to the Bible Society, I beg leave to request your insertion of the following passage from *Buchanan's Franciscan*, which may throw some light on the motives which induce these men to endeavour to keep the Holy Scriptures out of the hands of the people. Your readers will please to observe, that the satire, called the *Franciscan*, is written in the manner of Dean Swift's Advice to Servants. The satirist advises the Romish priests to do these things which he knows they do, and would expose them for doing.

'And now, my faithful brethren, once for all,
I warn all Catholics against Saint Paul;
The man of Tarsus, tho' his head lies low,
Lives in his writings, our eternal foe:—
Would he had perish'd at an early day,
Or to Damascus, when he took his way,
Had dropp'd down dead, before he was baptized,
And joined the sect he hated and despised.
Time yet will come, if Prophets tell no lie,
Who all assure us that it now draws nigh,
When men, convinc'd by Paul, shall forward stand,
To purge from Superstition all the land—
From Christian Churches, Heathen Priests expel,
No longer arbiters of heav'n and hell:—
Then truth victorious, beaming upon man,
Shall soon display the Gospel's holy plan;
And to the world expose, as clear as day,
The wiles we practise and the tricks we play.
Therefore take heed, nor grant to small or great,
The liberty these writings to translate;
And, since we can't destroy them, let them lie,
Lock'd up in Latin from the vulgar eye—
Left to be studied and commented on
By th' orthodox old doctors of Sorbonne,
Who; when their hoary heads are warmed with wine,
Can best unravel mysteries divine.

"I am, Sir, your constant Reader,
J. GRAHAM.

"*Lifford, Dec. 15th*, 1819."

Now, in the twentieth year of the nineteenth century, we find a Popish archbishop in Ireland, acting upon the very principle which the satirist ascribes to the monks of the sixteenth century:—The writings of Paul and the other apostles are, indeed, a great eye-sore to the Church of Rome, of which I furnished abundant proof in Nos. 30 to 38; but this charge of the Popish Primate suggests some new matter, which may not be uninteresting to the reader.

The first reflection excited by it is, that it seems to have been produced in obedience to a mandate issued by the Pope of Rome, addressed to the Irish prelates, on the subject of Bible Schools, for which I refer to the Glasgow Herald of the 7th, and the Glasgow Courier and Chronicle of the 11th of this month. His Holiness is pleased to say to his bishops:—"My Lords, The prediction of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the parable of the sower, that sowed good seed in his field; but while people slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, is, to the very great injury indeed of the Catholic faith, seen verified in these our days, *particularly in Ireland;* for information has reached the ears of the sacred congregation, that "Bible Schools," supported by the funds of the *Heterodox*, (that is, the wrong thinking, meaning, no doubt, the heretical Protestants) have been established in almost every part of Ireland, in which, under the pretence of charity, the inexperienced of both sexes, but particularly peasants and paupers, are deluded by the blandishments, and even gifts of the masters, and infested with the fatal poison of depraved doctrines.

"It is farther stated, that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles, translated into English by "the Bible Society," and abounding in errors, with the sole view of seducing the youth, and entirely eradicating from their minds the truths of the orthodox faith. Under these circumstances, your Lordship already perceives with what solicitude and attention pastors are bound to watch, and carefully protect their flock from the snares of wolves, who come in the clothing of sheep. If the pastors sleep, the enemy will quickly creep in by stealth, and sow the tares,—soon will the tares be seen growing among the wheat and choke it. Every possible exertion must, therefore, be made to keep the youth away from these destructive schools, to warn parents against suffering their children, on any account whatever, to be let into error. But, for the purpose of escaping the snares of the adversaries, no plan seems more appropriate than the establishing schools, wherein salutary instructions may be imparted to the paupers and illiterate country persons.

"In the name, then, of the bowels (of the mercy) of our Lord Jesus Christ, we exhort and beseech your Lordship to guard your flock

with diligence, and with all due discretion, from those persons who are in the habit of thrusting themselves into the fold of Christ, in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep away, and mindful of the forewarning of Peter, the apostle, given in these words: viz. 'There shall also be lying teachers among you, who shall bring in sects of perdition,' do you labour with all your might to keep the orthodox youth from being corrupted by them, an object which will, I hope, be easily effected by the establishment of Catholic schools throughout your diocese.

"And confidently trusting, that in a matter of such vast importance, your Lordship will, with unbounded zeal, endeavour to prevent the wheat from being choked by the tares, I pray the All good and omnipotent God, to guard and preserve you safe many years.

"Your Lordship's most obedient and humble servant,

"F. Cardinal Fontana, *Prefect.*
"C. M. Pedicine, *Secretary.*

"Rome, Court of the Sacred Congregation, for the Propagation of the Faith, 18th Sept. 1819."

The Archbishop's charge is little more than an echo and amplification of this letter from the Sacred College at Rome; but before I proceed to give extracts from this charge, I request the reader's attention to a few remarks on this *Manifesto* against the Bible, and the schools which teach the reading of it.

In the first place, we have here a direct and avowed interference of the Pope of Rome in the civil and domestic affairs of the people of Ireland; and that in opposition to the declared mind of our own Sovereign, and the active endeavours of persons of all ranks, who have avowed their conviction, that the happiness of the people in that kingdom cannot be promoted, without establishing schools for the education of the lower classes. Schools, almost without number, have been established throughout the kingdom. They are supported chiefly by the voluntary contributions of British Protestants, with the Princes of the royal family at their head. Those who have the direction of this benevolent undertaking, have introduced the word of God into the schools; and in doing so, they conceived that they were doing their duty to God and to their fellow creatures. The question, at present, is not whether the Bible be a suitable school-book? For my own part, I am persuaded there cannot be a better; but supposing, for the sake of argument, that it were otherwise,—I ask, what has the Pope of Rome to do with it? The people of Ireland are subjects of his Majesty, King George III., who, many years ago, expressed his wish, "that every child in his dominions might be able to read the Bible, and have a Bible to read." The subjects of this venerable monarch, countenanced by the princes of his family, are doing what they can in order to accomplish his benevolent desire. They have been wonderfully successful in Ireland; and because they have been so, the Pope takes the alarm; he claims the people of Ireland as *his* subjects; he calls upon his agents, the Romish priests, to obstruct, by every means in their power, what the sovereign, and the people of Britain, have considered necessary for the welfare of the inhabitants of that part of the empire. Is it possible that such insolence,—such an encroachment upon the independence of the British empire, should pass without a solemn universal protest against it?

I know our Papists will reply, that the Pope claims no more than a spiritual authority over his spiritual children; and that he calls upon his bishops only to watch over their spiritual interests. But this, like almost every Popish argument, rests on falsehood. The present interference of the Pope is with *schools for education.* The establishment of schools is a civil matter. Teaching children to read, is a civil matter. The appointment of what books shall be read in schools, is a civil matter. It is as secular men that patrons of schools prescribe the reading of the Bible. They cannot add the least influence to its doctrines, and they can add no weight to its authority; but believing it to be the word of God, they hope it will do good to some, and are sure it cannot do harm to any. But supposing they judged erroneously, the Pope has nothing to do with it. It is a matter of civil and domestic arrangement, with which no power, civil or sacred, without the kingdom, has a right to intermeddle.

It has reached the ears of the Sacred Congregation, that "Bible Schools" have been established in almost every part of Ireland: this is the evil which the Pope complains of. It is thus that tares are sown among the wheat. It is thus that the good seed is in danger of being choked; and it is thus that the people are likely to be infected with the poison of depraved doctrines. Now, it has come to the ears, I suppose, of every "congregation" in Britain, that the Pope has restored the Inquisition, and the order of Jesuits, who are going about sowing their tares, and spreading the poison of their depraved doctrines in every country in Europe. What then would his Holiness think, if any of these congregations were to address a letter to all the Englishmen, and all the Protestants in Italy and Spain, entreating and beseeching them to guard the people of these countries "with diligence and with all due discretion, from those persons who are in the habit of thrusting themselves into

the fold of Christ, in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep astray?" A simple English or Scotch congregation would be apt to think this a very just description of the Jesuits; but, if the Pope were to hear of their giving such instructions to their friends in Spain and Italy, as he has given to the priests in Ireland, he would be overwhelmed with astonishment at their impudence; he would send a Legate to complain to our government against such interference; and the persons who should dare to obey the mandate, would be swallowed up by the Inquisition.

The cases, indeed, are not exactly parallel. The congregation *de propaganda de fide*, in Rome, is composed of cardinals and other great ecclesiastics, with the Pope at their head; whereas, the British congregation, to which I have alluded, is understood to contain nothing but Christians; and it may be, of rank in the world no higher than farmers and mechanics. No matter; they have as good a right to interfere with the education of the subjects of the Pope in Italy, as he and his *sacred* congregation have to interfere with the schools established for the instruction of the people in Ireland. This letter from the Sacred Congregation, is a very important document in my controversy with the Papists. Let it be remembered, that it has not only the authority of the Pope as head of the church, but of the *sacred* congregation as his council. It has, therefore, all the infallibility that a thing of the kind can have; and nothing more infallible can possibly have issued from the Vatican, since the days of the Council of Trent. Well then this document proves, that infallibility may be mistaken; or that infallibility can tell a deliberate lie. I leave it to the humble servants of the Pope, to make their choice between the two, for it is not possible for them to escape both. It is stated, says his Holiness, "that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles *translated into English by the Bible Society*, and abounding in errors," &c. Now, though the persons called Methodists, have been honoured to do much good, in both Britain and Ireland, and are, therefore, much abhorred by the Papists, it is not true that the directors of the schools established in Ireland are, generally speaking, of that communion, or properly called by that name. They are members of the established church, and dissenters of various denominations, who have no title to the name of Methodists, farther than as it is used to denote one who loves the souls of his fellow-creatures. But the great blunder which chiefly demands our attention here, is that of representing the Bibles which are distributed, as having been translated into English by the Bible Society. Now, though a miracle should have been wrought for the purpose, his infallibility ought to have known, that the Bible Society never professed to give, and never did give a single English Bible *of their own translating*, to any man whatever. Their Reports have been annually submitted to the world; and the Pope might have known, even without a miracle, that the Bibles which they distributed in Ireland, as well as in England, were of the authorized version, which was translated into English more than two hundred years ago. If he had read a copy of the Bible which they distribute, with its dedication to King James I., he would have known this; but as it is evident that he has not read, or even seen one of them, it required not only Popish impudence, but the impudence of a Pope, to assert that it is "abounding in errors."

The infallible head of "Catholic Unity" is evidently ignorant of the fact, or he misrepresents it. But his spiritual children in this country know the fact; and they know also that their holy father misrepresents it, or mistakes it. Take it either way, I ask them what confidence they can place in such an ecclesiastical head? If he is capable of making such a mistake with regard to a matter that is published to all the world, how can they trust him with regard to his knowledge of matters which were never published to any man in the world? If he does not know who translated the English Bible which is read in the Irish schools, which is a matter of public notoriety, how can he know whose souls are still in purgatory? How can he know how much of the works of supererogation of saints deceased will serve to relieve the saints in purgatory from ages of suffering? But above all, how can he know how many of the saints departed are beatified in heaven, and therefore entitled to the worship of the faithful on earth? If our Glasgow Papists can answer these questions, I request them to do it. If they do not, I shall take it for granted that they cannot; and if, after all, they will still adhere to the Pope, I shall consider them proper children of such a father;—"Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared as with a hot iron."

But the Pope, it seems, has become friendly to education. He recommends to his Irish bishops "the establishment of schools, wherein salutary instruction may be imparted to the paupers and illiterate country persons;" and he hopes the orthodox youth will be kept back from being corrupted, "by the establishment of Catholic schools throughout your diocese." Why did not the Pope find out this before? Why did he and his predecessors suffer the orthodox youth in Ireland to grow up, and live, and die, with as little education as the cattle? It was not because he or they thought education at all necessary for the preservation of orthodoxy; for if they had, they would doubtless have thought of it before the nineteenth century. It is because the Pope finds

now, that the people will be educated by the benevolence of their Protestant fellow subjects, whether he will or not; that they will be able to read the Bible, and that they will get Bibles to read; and he has taken the alarm lest this should affect the orthodoxy of his children. He calls upon his vassals to exert themselves to the utmost to prevent the evil, by establishing schools of their own, in which, of course, the Bible will not be suffered to appear, and they will teach the children just what they please. This is not because Popery is changed; or because Papists have become more friendly to education. It is because, in the present state of things, it is necessary to assume the appearance of readiness to educate their youth, in order that they may withdraw them from the schools in which the word of God is read.

The people in Ireland, both young and old, have manifested great eagerness to enjoy the benefit of the schools lately established; and they know it is not in the power of the priests to confer such a benefit, because they have not teachers so well qualified; and they know, that though it were otherwise, the priests in general would not give them the Bible, which thousands have received, and which they are perusing with deep interest, of which there are many striking instances in the Reports of the Hibernian Society, with an extract from one of which I shall conclude the present Number; intending to take up the Archbishop's charge in my next.

"The Priest of the Parish having called at the School-house, when G—— was sitting with the Master, began to upbraid O'B—— for daring to continue teaching, after he had so frequently commanded him to give it up. O'B—— made the best defence in his power, and G—— kept silence until the Priest had finished his attack, and O'B—— his defence; then, in a firm tone, he addressed the Priest in Irish, to this purport:—"You say that the Society that supports these Free Schools, for the children of the poor, has an evil design; and allege, in proof of your assertion, that if they had not, they would have put the whole business into the hands of the Parish Priests, and have employed them to engage and pay the Masters; but do you not know, does not all the world know what would be the issue, were they to act so foolishly? Give their money, for the education of the poor, into the hands of the Priests! Yes, you are careful indeed for the poor! Do not you know, did not all your predecessors in this parish know, the miserable state of the poor, and the impossibility of having their children educated otherwise than by Free Schools? And have you, or any of them, ever cared a straw about their misery, or once bestowed a thought on the education of their children? Look at that village on the hill! You know that it abounds with orphans, and cannot be ignorant of the wretched state of the parents that survive! Did you ever help them, or care for their orphans? No; and now that God has raised them up friends, freely to educate their children, and give them the best of books, you seek to deprive them of the blessing; to shut them up, as we all have been heretofore, in ignorance and misery! You say that the Society has an evil design. You want to banish the word of God from the country, that blessed book, which we should all have remained ignorant of, had it not been for the Society and their Schools; but, be assured, that it is all in vain. The good seed has been sown, and taken root, and your united efforts will never be able to pluck it up." The Priest heard this lecture with mingled indignation and surprise; and turning away, only said, "You are an unfortunate old man."

No. LXXXII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5TH, 1820.

THE letter on which I am about to animadvert, is addressed "to the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of the Archdiocese of Tuam;" and it is subscribed "Oliver Kelly, Roman Catholic Archbishop." He holds his title, no doubt, by authority of his lord and master, the Pope of Rome, whose mandate he is bound to obey; and, as I observed in my last Number, his letter is little more than an echo and amplification of that of his Holiness. He seems, however, to have entered very heartily into the cause; and he is evidently as much afraid of schools, and the Bible, as the Pope himself.

He begins thus:—"Dearly beloved brethren and children in Jesus Christ,—To guard the sacred deposit of religion, and to promote the happiness of the flock committed to my care, are important duties imposed upon me, and the dearest object of my pastoral solicitude. To these my thoughts are at all times directed. With this view, I have frequently visited the parishes of this extensive Archdiocese, 'exhorting every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus,' Col. ch. i. v. 28."

I cannot but admire the good opinion which his Reverence has of himself, and the value which he sets upon his labours. He, it seems, has been "teaching every man *in all wisdom;*" and he expects to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." How this is to be effected is not quite so clear; for though the apostle Paul did speak in such language as this; and though he did propose to himself nothing less than the perfection of his spiritual children, he tells us how he expected to accomplish his object, which the Popish priest does not. It was

by preaching Christ, the hope of glory, who, as such, was in the believing Colossians, that the apostle both warned and taught them, and by which he expected to present them perfect. But Oliver Kelly says nothing of this. He does not so much as mention the preaching of Christ among the "important duties imposed upon" him; and it is pretty generally known, that this is one of the last things that a Popish bishop would think of.

The same apostle informs ordinary ministers how they may be instrumental in leading their people on to perfection. It is by means of the word of truth contained in the Holy Scriptures, which, he says, "are able to make men wise unto salvation." The "all wisdom" of which he speaks, is contained in the Scriptures; for he tells us again, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." But father Kelly tells us plainly, as we shall see by and by, that the Scriptures, so far from promoting the perfection which he aims at, are the principal hinderance of it. He strictly forbids the distribution of the Bible; and recommends, in preference, Reeves' History of the Bible, and two or three Catechisms; from which "abundant sources," says he, "Catholics will draw a purity of morals and doctrine, and a confirmation of their holy faith." From which it is evident, that the wisdom of his teaching, and the perfection to which he leads his people, are both different from those of the apostle, whose words he seems to have quoted for the purpose of insulting his memory, or rather the Holy Spirit, under whose inspiration he wrote.

The Archdiocese of Tuam seems, by Oliver Kelly's account, to have been a most abandoned district. Of late, however, it has been wonderfully reformed, by what means he says not; but he bears witness to the fact in the following words:—"I cannot conceal the consolation that I experience, when I reflect on your temperate, peaceful, and consistent demeanour under trials and temptations. Drunkenness, so incompatible with your temporal and eternal welfare, is not *now* so prevalent amongst you. Morning and evening prayer, that most essential duty of Christian piety, is universally enforced, and very generally observed. The Sabbath is no longer profaned by servile work, or by vain, unprofitable, or criminal amusements. Perjury, into which the ignorant in many districts have been too successfully seduced, by the machinations of wicked and interested men, is now, and I trust for ever, at an end," &c. So then, it seems, this Archdiocese was formerly notorious for drunkenness, Sabbath-profanation, and perjury; and it is not so now. If Oliver Kelly would speak the truth, he would tell us, that this happy change has taken place since the Hibernian Society's schools were established, —since the people were taught to read, and since they began to read the Bible. I am not sure that the reformation has been so great in Tuam, or any where else, as he represents it; but the Society's Reports furnish abundant evidence, that a very great change to the better, has taken place in different quarters, since the establishment of their schools, and the circulation of the Scriptures. Kelly admits, and professes to rejoice in the fact, while he reviles that which has produced it. The poor man is really and seriously alarmed by this new state of things. Since the schools and the Bible were introduced, he admits, that there is less drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, and perjury; and yet he maintains, that in no period of their existence were the people in greater danger. Let the reader hear his complaint in his own words:—

"I deem it my duty to call the attention of each pastor, to the moral and religious education of the youth committed to his care; and I will not hesitate to declare, that at no period of our existence did circumstances more unite to call forth our zeal and exertions in this particular, than the present moment; a period when, under the semblance of a Christian education, every art and insinuation is resorted to, in order to make proselytes amongst the innocent and unsuspecting youth of our communion. If the design of extirpating the Catholic religion by violence and persecution, has been, *in some degree*, abandoned, to it has succeeded one more likely to effect its purpose, because less apparent. Recourse is had to *seduction* and insinuation. An attempt is made to strip off its natural deformity and turpitude, the crime of tampering with the religious principles of the poor. The schools that are established, are embellished with a thousand specious names, but at the bottom the evil lies concealed. Proselytism is the order of the day, and the enemies of our faith, like the serpent, creep and give death under flowers."

In these words, the Reverend Oliver Kelly takes upon him to assert: first, "That every art and insinuation is resorted to in order to make proselytes among the youth of his communion." But this is nothing but a general sweeping assertion, which will be found to have no particular meaning attached to it. It is a mere figure of speech, like the *thousand* specious names by which the schools are called, while in reality they are known by only one or two, or, perhaps, three names at the most;* so the *every* art and insinuation, when reduced to sober English, will be found to mean no more, than that the teachers in the schools are very desirous to make the children acquainted

* Besides the Hibernian Society, there is the Sunday School Society for Ireland, and the Baptist Society for the support of native schools.

with the Holy Scriptures; and that they earnestly exhort them to read them by themselves and to their parents. To such men as Father Kelly, this will no doubt appear a most insidious and dangerous art. But whatever he, and such as he, may say to the contrary, it is an art which every Christian is bound to study and practise. He who has received the word of God, is bound by every tie of duty to make it known to his neighbour, though all the priests in the world should forbid it. He is not at liberty to make use of cunning, or any sort of insinuation that worldly policy may dictate; but he is warranted and commanded, in the way of even down plain dealing, to tell every man that the Bible is the word of God; that he who receives the truth which it reveals shall be saved, while he that receives not the truth shall be condemned; and whether those whom he addresses be Papists or Pagans youths or adults, it is his duty to endeavour, not by compulsion, but by persuasion, to make proselytes of them; that is, to win them to Christ, that their souls may be saved through him. The Societies which have established schools in Ireland, so far as I know, have never concealed, but openly avowed this to be their object; and, therefore, they are guilty of nothing that can properly be called *insinuation*. They see their fellow subjects living in ignorance and misery; the slaves of a cruel and gloomy superstition; and they are openly and avowedly labouring to communicate to them the word of God, with the ability to read it. This every Christian is bound to do. This every inhabitant of this free country has a right to do; and he who attempts to hinder any man, or any society from prosecuting this work of mercy, is an enemy to his fellow-creatures and to the liberty of his countrymen.

In this letter, we find, secondly, an admission by Oliver Kelly, that "the design of extirpating the Catholic religion by violence and persecution, has been, *in some degree*, abandoned;" that is, not altogether abandoned, but only in some degree. Now, I venture to affirm, that this priest never in his life witnessed,—that his father before him never witnessed,—nor his father before him, any attempt, in the slightest degree, on the part of our Protestant government, to extirpate the "Catholic religion," or any religion whatever, by means of violence and persecution. For ages, Papists have been allowed the free and unmolested exercise of their religion. Indeed this was at no time denied them, when they could keep themselves from plots and treasons. Since the commencement of the late reign, they have received one concession after another; and at this moment the worship of the established church is not more free, or more protected by law, than is that of the Popish chapel; and yet this titular Archbishop,—this man who professes to be teaching his people in all wisdom, has the effrontery to assert, that the design of extirpating his religion by violence and persecution, has been abandoned only in some degree; that is, that such a design still exists, though somewhat relaxed. Now, he knows that this is not true. Every priest in Ireland knows that the charge is false; but they seem to make it their daily business to persuade their people that there is such a design entertained against them; and thus to cherish the hatred with which the Papists generally regard their Protestant neighbours. It seems to be the sole study of these men to keep alive this hatred, and for purposes best known to themselves, at the very time when they are so clamorous for emancipation; that is, for admission into places of power and trust, when, no doubt, they would turn the hatred which they have cherished to some truly Popish purpose.

Yet, on this very subject, Oliver Kelly does not speak the sentiments of the great body of Irish Papists, as expressed by their leaders in Dublin, known by the name of the "Catholic Board." These leaders have actually gone the length of making an appeal to the Pope against their own government; and, therefore, it is no wonder that the Pope should interfere in the civil and domestic affairs of Ireland. In this appeal to the Pope, which was made about five years ago, it is not admitted that there has been any relaxation in the violence of the persecution to which they are exposed; and as there has been no change since that time, Kelly stands guilty of contradicting a public document, issued by the leading men of his own communion. I shall give an extract from this document, with some remarks, for which I am indebted to a pamphlet, entitled, "An Examination of the Address of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to Pope Pius VII. By the Rev. William Thorpe, Dublin, 1816." This will afford the reader a specimen of the manner in which the "Irish people," as the Papists call themselves, speak of their sufferings:—

"Most Holy Father.—We, the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, most humbly approach your Holiness, imploring, for five millions of faithful children, the apostolical benediction. We deem it unnecessary, Most Holy Father, to remind the Sovereign Pontiff of our church, of our peculiar claims to his protection and support; for we cannot, for a moment, imagine that your Holiness is unmindful of the constancy and devotion manifested to the Holy See, by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in despite of the *most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people*. We cannot, however, abstain from reminding our Most Holy Father, that although the persecution which we and our ancestors endured, was notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon us, on account of our adherence to, and con-

nection with the Holy See; nevertheless, the Catholics of Ireland never solicited the predecessors of your Holiness, at any period of that persecution, to alter, in the slightest degree, that connection, or make any modification of the existing discipline of our Holy Church, to obtain for the Roman Catholics of Ireland the repeal or mitigation of those cruel laws which proscribed them."

So then, if we will believe our Irish Papists, they are suffering, even at this day, a persecution the most *sanguinary* and *unrelenting* that ever aggrieved a Christian people. This reminds me of what I have read somewhere of a country minister, who had, by mistake, taken to the pulpit an old sermon which had been composed for a particular occasion. Having nothing else ready, he was obliged to go on with it, not suspecting that it contained any thing heterodox or unseasonable. He declaimed with great spirit against the vices of the age; and came unexpectedly upon the following sentence:—"Your sins are the cause of the dreadful epidemic which is at present raging in this neighbourhood." An honest justice of the peace, who had been listening with great attention, took the alarm, and starting up, loudly interrogated the speaker: "Where, Sir, where is it?" The minister, a little disconcerted, replied, "I do not know that it is any where except in this sermon." Now, let any man ask the Papists of Ireland, where is this sanguinary and unrelenting persecution carried on against them? and if there be an honest man amongst them, I am sure he will answer, no where that he knows of, except in the above libellous address and appeal of his brethren to the Pope of Rome.

I might contrast the present unmolested state of the Irish Papists, and the freedom of religious worship which they enjoy, with the state of the Lollards in this country before the Reformation, and with the state of the Waldenses and Bohemians, of whom tens of thousands were massacred in cold blood by order of the Pope of Rome, on account of their religion:—I might speak of the burning to death of hundreds of men, women, and children, during the reign of Bloody Mary, Queen of England; of the massacre of Paris; of the murder of many thousands of Protestants in France, in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, by Lewis XIV.; and of the sufferings of our own Covenanters in the west of Scotland, in the reigns of Charles II. and James II.; during which, more real suffering was inflicted on account of religion in one day, than Ireland has suffered for a hundred years: but every such appeal would be scouted at by our Papists; because in the cases referred to, the sufferers were not "Christian people;" but mere heretics, for shedding of whose blood, they tell us, no commonwealth shall be called to answer. See the Rhemish note on Rev. xvii. 6., and the Douay note on Deut. xvii. 8., in which it is boldly maintained, that God has given power to the church's guides; that is, to the priests, even under the New Testament, *to punish with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions.** The version of the Bible containing this open avowal of the power of the priests of the Church of Rome to punish all heretics with death, was lately published in Dublin, under the sanction of their highest dignitaries, in weekly Numbers, and, for any thing that I know, is publicly circulated through the country to this day. And the people who inculcate such doctrine, living unmolested, have the effrontery to complain to a foreign power, that they are the objects of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution!

I have been accused of want of liberality and politeness, because I have represented our Papists as trained to falsehood, and unable to speak the truth on any subject in which their religion is concerned. I am perfectly convinced that I have said nothing but what is strictly true; and in corroboration of what I have said on the subject of their falsifying, I quote the following passage from Mr Thorpe's pamphlet already referred to. But what need is there of any authority? When the Papists tell us that they are suffering such persecution, all the world knows that it is a lie; and they themselves know it to be a lie; but they expect by means of it to deceive the Pope, and other foreign powers, in order to embarrass the government, and, if possible, terrify them into a concession of their arrogant demands.

"They complain," says Mr Thorpe, "of persecution notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon them, on account of their adherence to, and connection with the Holy See; and this persecution they solemnly assure the world, is the most sanguinary and unrelenting that ever aggrieved a Christian people. What effect is this likely to produce on those unacquainted with the real state of the case? It must excite in them mingled emotions of pity and indignation: pity for the unfortunate sufferers, and indignation against the government which oppresses them. It would not be surprising if Roman Catholics in foreign countries, sympathizing with their afflicted brethren in Ireland,

* Since the above was in the printers' hands, I have received the following details from a correspondent;—"If we may believe historians, Pope Julius, in seven years, was the occasion of the slaughter of 200,000 Christians. The massacre in France cut off 100,000 in three months. P. Perionius avers, that in the persecution of the Albigensos and Waldenses, 1,000,000 lost their lives. From the beginning of the order of Jesuits, till 1580, that is, thirty or forty years, 900,000 perished, saith Balduinus. The duke of Alva, by the hangman, put 36,000 to death. Vergerius affirms, that the Inquisition, in thirty years, destroyed 150,000. To all this, I may add the Irish rebellion, in which 300,000 were destroyed, as lord Orrery reports in a paper printed in the reign of Charles II.; making a total of *two millions, six hundred, and eighty-six thousand.*" These horrible facts speak for themselves. Many of a like kind might be added, but I reserve this as a separate subject of discussion.

should institute an inquiry into the nature and extent of their grievances, and imitating the conduct of Protestants among us, towards the sufferers in the south of France, call on their respective governments to interpose for their relief. If the sympathies of British Protestants have been kindled by a few assassinations,—by the massacre of a few scores of people in France, surely foreign Roman Catholics cannot hear unmoved the cries of five millions of their brethren in Ireland, tortured by the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people. At this moment, perhaps, they are endeavouring to calculate how many have been slaughtered, or picturing to themselves the cruel tortures, amidst which they have been deprived of life; or perhaps they are preparing an asylum for the small remnant of the priesthood, which, after the conflagration of their sacred edifices, may have escaped the general massacre.* If such have not been the effects of this document on the mind of foreigners, we are not to thank the Catholic leaders for it; for this, like their other measures, is equally calculated to render the government odious abroad, and insecure at home. But what are we to think of the men who deliberately and unblushingly can give such falsehoods under their hand? Among the many bad signs of the times, is there a worse one than that total disregard of truth and moral character, in which those persons seem to glory, who assume to be political leaders in Ireland? Does it not appear from their public conduct, as if they had forgotten all distinction between truth and falsehood? Do we not see them daily distorting every fact, whether of a public or private nature, and, with signal effrontery, fabricating such falsehoods as may best suit their purposes of malice or revenge, or political irritation? And what is their conduct on detection, or when any attempt is made to disabuse the public mind? They bluster and bully, and make a noise about their honour; as if a calumniator were less a calumniator after he had bullied and fought, than before; or as if the stain of falsehood could be covered by the stain of blood."—P. 14, 15.

I intend to resume this subject in my next.

No. LXXXIII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12TH, 1820.

IN my last Number, I introduced Oliver Kelly, Popish archbishop of Tuam, as admitting that the design of converting Irish Papists, by means of violence and persecution, was, in some degree, abandoned; and I showed, that on this subject he was guilty of contradicting his brethren, the Popish leaders in Dublin, who, in an appeal to the Pope, assures his holiness, that they are still exposed to "the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people." In my last Number, I declared this to be a most impudent falsehood, as all the world knows it to be; but, in order to bring the matter more distinctly before the eye of the reader, I make another extract from Mr Thorpe's pamphlet:—

"Where can even a trace of such persecution be discovered? Look at the various classes of the Roman Catholics. Examine first the peasantry and working tradesmen. Are the former obstructed or oppressed, on the ground of religion, in taking or cultivating land? Are the latter shackled in the choice or exercise of their manual employments? No: there is literally no shadow of distinction between them and Protestants of the same rank. Go up higher to the departments of trade and commerce. Do the Roman Catholics labour under any disqualifications, or are they in any respect obstructed in those pursuits? No: they have precisely the same facilities, privileges, and rights, which Protestants possess. And even in the professions of law and medicine, (from the established church they are necessarily excluded,) the same rule holds good, as to every thing really important to the great mass of persons engaged in those professions. That of medicine, with all its honours and emoluments, is as free to them as to Protestants: and if, in the department of law, there are a few situations to which Protestants exclusively are eligible, those situations are so few, and, from the competition arising from Protestant numbers and talents, so few of them, even though they were open to all, would be attainable by Roman Catholics, that this profession is scarcely an exception to the general rule. But how are they situated as to opportunities of instruction? Are any obstacles thrown in the way of their advancement in learning and knowledge? The very reverse. They possess even greater facilities in this respect than Protestants. Various schools, in which there is no interference with their religious opinions, have been instituted for their instruction, and are supported by the contributions of Protestants. The only Protestant University in Ireland is open to them. Nor is this all; a college for their *exclusive advantage has been founded, and endowed by the Protestant Legislature.*

"If any where, then we may expect to find, in what concerns the exercise of their religion, some traces of the persecution of which they complain. Let us therefore examine how they are situated in this respect. Are they obstructed

* The Author may keep himself at ease on this score. There is little danger of Papists in foreign countries giving themselves the trouble of sympathizing with those in Ireland; much less of being at the expense of providing for them. They know one another too well to give much credit to such representations; besides, they have neither sympathy nor money to spare for the relief of their *living* brethren, their whole stock of both being required for the *dead* in Purgatory.

or discouraged in the exercise of their worship? No: they are secured in the full, free, and most public exercise of all the rites and ceremonies of their church. Are they limited as to the number of their clergy, or restrained from making a suitable provision for them? Their own statements on this subject furnish the best answer to this question. They have in Ireland, according to their own account, "four archbishops, twenty-four bishops, eleven hundred parish priests, eight hundred curates, and between two and three hundred regular clergy of various orders;" and as to their emoluments, an estimate may be formed from this circumstance, that the parish priest of a small village in the county of Limerick, enjoys, (as they have lately assured the public), an income of £300 per annum. There is but one inquiry more. Are they destitute of proper edifices in which to receive their congregations, and to conduct their religious services? Any one who has lately travelled through Ireland is competent to answer this question. Their chapels are as numerous as the parish churches, and, in many places, far exceed them in splendour of external ornament. This fact deserves particular notice; because those chapels have been erected, in almost every instance, on the estates of Protestants, (very frequently the ground given free of rent,) and by funds, to which Protestants have been the most liberal contributors. Such is the real condition of the Roman Catholics in Ireland, at the very moment that they have had the signal effrontery to complain to the Pope, and to state, in the face of Europe, that they are the victims of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people."—P. 16—18.

I have made this long extract, in order to let my readers know the real condition of the Papists in Ireland, with regard to religious liberty. What would our suffering forefathers in Scotland have given for the hundredth part of the liberty which Papists now enjoy in Ireland, and in every part of the British dominions? The fact is, their civil privileges are equal to those of other dissenters; and their religious worship is as free as that of the established church in any of the three kingdoms. What then is the sanguinary and unrelenting persecution of which they are the victims? It is nothing else than being deprived of the power of persecuting others; that is, the power of compelling all men to submit to the Pope of Rome, and to the other "church guides of the New Testament," who have the power of "punishing with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions."—*Douay Note on Deut.* xviii. 8. Until the Papists of Ireland have this power, concede what you will, they will not be satisfied, or cease to complain of the sanguinary persecution, of which they affect to be the victims. I know that thousands of good-natured Protestants, whose own minds are divested of such intolerant sentiments, will cry out against this assertion, as illiberal and uncharitable. No matter: it is sober truth that I write; and let any one who doubts of this, tell what Papists mean by the sanguinary persecution of which they complain to their Holy Father, against their own government. It is most certain they have nothing to complain of, but that they have not the power of the State in their own hands; and from the manner in which they have always used such power when they had it, we may judge what they will do when they shall have it again.

But to return to Father Kelly's letter:—he tells us, at the present moment, "under the semblance of a Christian education, every art and insinuation is resorted to, in order to make proselytes amongst the innocent and unsuspecting youth of our communion." And again, he says, since violence and persecution have been, in some degree, abandoned, "recourse has been had to *seduction* and insinuation." It is not denied by Dr Kelly, that the object of the Society is chiefly to teach the children to read the Bible; yet he calls this the "*semblance* of a Christian education." What are we to infer from this, but that, in his opinion, Christian education does not consist in teaching the word of Christ? This is indeed plainly avowed in the sequel of his letter, in which the Catechism of the four archbishops, Kirwan's Catechism, and Reeves' History of the Bible, are preferred before the Bible itself. Teaching these, it seems, is Christian education; teaching the Bible is only the semblance of it!

"An attempt," says the Doctor, "is made to strip of its natural deformity and turpitude, the crime of tampering with the religious principles of the poor." That is, the *crime* of instructing the poor; for this is the only thing which he has to object to the Schools, and those who conduct them. This, he calls tampering with their religious principles,—this, he says, is done with every art and insinuation; and he tells us, that recourse is even had to seduction. As these are mere assertions, without the shadow of proof; and as there is not so much as an attempt to establish a single instance of seduction on the part of the teachers, we may pass this over as unworthy of further notice, and attend a little to what is called "tampering with the religious principles of the poor," and of the "innocent and unsuspecting youth" of the Romish communion.

I observe, then, that there never was an attempt made to instruct the ignorant, or to reclaim those who were living in error, that was not liable to the same objection. The apostles of Christ did the very same thing which Dr Kelly complains of. They tampered with the religious principles of both Jews and Gentiles, whether they were young or old,

learned or illiterate. That is, they endeavoured to convince them of error, and to persuade them to embrace the truth. It is in this sense that I use the word *tamper*, for this is the very thing that grieves and alarms Dr Kelly, and which he holds up as a crime of great deformity and turpitude.

If the first Christians that came into Britain, had not tampered with the religious principles of the people, we might all have been at this day rude heathens, worshipping the works of our own hands. If the fathers of the Reformation had not tampered with the religious principles of our forefathers, we might have been as our fathers were for ages, the miserable slaves of Rome. Now, I maintain, that it is the duty of every Christian, in the sense in which I use the word *tamper*, to deal with his neighbours whom he finds living in the gross errors of idolatry and superstition. I do not say that every one should become a public preacher, for this requires qualifications which every Christian does not possess; but it is the duty of every one, as he has opportunity, by Christian conversation and Christian example, to win his erring neighbour from the worship of idols, and from every principle and practice that is inconsistent with the gospel of Christ. This is the best way in which a man can show his love to God and to his brother also.

In this way of private dealing with one who was in error, or what Dr Kelly would call tampering with the religious principles of the poor, we have the very highest example in the conduct of Christ himself. I refer to the case of the woman of Samaria whom Christ met at the well. She was descended from that mixed race whom the king of Assyria placed in the land of Israel, after the captivity of the ten tribes, of whom it is related, that "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations," 2 Kings xvii. 33. They made a profession of the true religion, so far as it served their purpose; but to the worship of the God of Israel, they added the worship of their own gods, just as Papists do; who, to the worship of God, add the worship of the Virgin Mary, and all the saints. They were acquainted with the writings of the prophets. They paid great respect to the ground which Jacob had trode, and to the well out of which he had drank. The woman, it appears, knew about as much of the promise of a Messiah to come, as Papists do of the history of his having come. The one knows the fact, and the other knew the promise, to equally little purpose; because the acknowledged truth in both cases was, and is, mixed up with so much error, as to obstruct its salutary influence upon the heart and conscience. In short, the Samaritans stood in the same relation, or rather in the same opposition, to the true church of God, as it existed among the Jews, as Papists do to the same church, as it now exists among the Protestants; for notwithstanding the errors and corruptions which prevailed among the Jews, the true church was with them; and in their controversy with the Samaritans, they had the right side of the question. Now, Christ addressed the woman who belonged to the sect of the Samaritans, in such a style as Dr Kelly will call tampering with her religious principles:—"Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship." Call it tampering, or give it what name you please, I hold it not only lawful, but laudable, nay, an imperious duty, for every well informed Christian, who has an opportunity, to address those who worship idols, whether they be Papists or pagans, in similar language, and to tell them that "salvation is of the Jews;" that is, of him who took human nature of the seed of Abraham; that salvation is of him alone, without the assistance or co-operation of any creature; and that it is only in so far as men know him, that they know what they worship, or know that their worship is acceptable, or that they will receive, from the object of their worship, the blessings which they ask of him.

If I saw a poor woman counting her beads, and saying the *Aves* to the Virgin Mary, I would not hesitate to tell her plainly, but affectionately, "Ye worship ye know not what." If I saw a company of ignorant creatures kneeling and praying before a crucifix, I would say, "Ye worship ye know not what." If I were a teacher of a school, and if a child were to bring into it one of his Catechisms, containing prayers to the Virgin Mary, I would tell him, that neither he, nor his parents, nor his priest, knew what they worshipped; and, because his Catechism would not contain the second commandment, I would show him, in the Bible, both the second and the first: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;—Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in the heavens or in the earth: Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them." I do not know that the teachers of the schools in Ireland are at all this pains, or that they would conceive this to be their duty. The object of the schools is indeed not this, but to teach the children to read the Bible; but I think a faithful Christian teacher could scarcely avoid what I have described as his duty, when circumstances afforded him an opportunity.

This would be called tampering with the children and with their parents: but it is all fair and open. Popish priests are not prevented from tampering with Protestant parents, or children, when they meet with them; their efforts in this way are well known; and if I were to use the language of Dr Kelly, I would call them *insidious* and *seductive*. But the people of Ireland are free, if they choose to enjoy their freedom. They are at liberty to listen to any one who may propose to instruct

them. But Dr Kelly and the Pope declare their purpose to deprive them of this liberty, if they can. They will not allow them to have the Bible, nor to attend the schools where the reading of it is taught. This is assuming an authority and a control over the people, which neither the sovereign, nor the legislature of the empire assumes.

That which Oliver Kelly would call tampering with the religious principles of the poor woman, was followed by the most blessed consequences both to herself and to her neighbours (see John, chap. iv.), as no doubt the knowledge communicated by those who teach the people to read the Bible, has been to many persons in Ireland, in the present day. The Samaritan priests would, no doubt, rage and storm against tampering with the religious principles of the people, just as Dr Kelly does now; but the poor woman obtained the salvation of her soul; her believing neighbours did the same; the leaven of sacred saving truth spread among the people; and after the apostles had begun to preach that Christ was exalted, Samaria was the first place from which they heard the joyful tidings that the word of God was received.

If I am not mistaken, Dr Kelly himself would not be injured, but greatly benefited by a little tampering. It will perhaps excite in his mind great indignation, to be called to account for his religious principles by a layman, and by one who is also a heretic. But there was a greater man than Dr Kelly—a man who was eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures, who afterwards became a companion, and fellow-labourer of the apostle Paul, who derived great benefit from the tampering of two lay persons, namely, a tradesman and his wife, who, perceiving that, though a zealous preacher, he was mistaken with regard to some important points, took him aside, and "explained to him the way of God more perfectly." (See Acts xviii. 2, 3, 24—28.) Apollos was, no doubt, thankful for the tampering of these plain honest persons, and he enjoyed the benefit of it all the days of his life.

If I could indulge the supposition that Dr Kelly was as humble and docile a Christian as Apollos, and as ready to take a hint from The Protestant, as Apollos was to take a lesson from Aquila, the tentmaker, and his wife Priscilla, I would ask the Doctor, who they are whom he speaks of as the *innocent youth* of his communion? By a little tampering with his Reverence; that is, by a few lessons out of the Bible, I could show him that there are no innocent youth in the world, either in his communion or any other. Does he not know that every imagination of the thought of the heart of man, is evil from his youth up;—evil and only evil continually? (Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21) That all have sinned and come short of the glory of God? (Rom. iii. 23) That, in short, the whole world is guilty before God? (v. 19.) Does a man who professes to be teaching his flock in all wisdom not know this? If he does not, he is a pretty man to make such professions: if he does know it, he must stand convicted of wilfully contradicting the word of God, and misrepresenting the state and character of his flock. In a religious sense, there is no man innocent. All stand guilty before God. Those who believe in Christ are saved from their sins, and from the punishment which they deserve; but they will not speak of themselves as innocent; nor will those who know them call them innocent. They are sinners saved by grace. I most earnestly recommend the consideration of this subject to Dr Kelly, and to every Papist who reads my pages. Let them learn and understand what they all are by nature, and by practice: let them attend to the testimony of Christ, with regard to the way, and the only way by which a sinner becomes just before God, and we shall hear no more of their own innocence or righteousness. If they believe the testimony, they will renounce all trust in the Pope, or the Virgin Mary, or in any fellow-creature, and submit to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Jesus Christ.

I think British Christians have been much to blame, because they have *tampered* so little with the religious principles of the poor in Ireland. We have long acted upon the principle avowed by the murderer Cain, who spurned the idea of being his brother's keeper; that is, he considered it none of his business to know where his brother was, or how he was. Christians on this side of the channel were not ignorant of the condition of their brethren in the sister kingdom; but it did not occur to them, at least for a long period, that they had any particular duty to perform towards them. If they be ignorant, superstitious, and idolatrous, let them remain so, seems to have been the general sentiment, for I do not know how long a period. This has now given place to sentiments more congenial to Christianity, and to corresponding exertions, which, by the divine blessing, will, in a few years, give a new character to the Irish population. The benign influence of the Bible has already begun to appear. Had the same efforts been made fifty years ago, the Pope would not, at this day, have had such a hold of the consciences of the Irish people; and it is to be hoped that fifty years hence he will have no hold of them at all.

Why should not this be distinctly avowed as the object and hope of Protestants, and the object of their benevolent exertions? Papists do not hesitate to express their hope, and to labour incessantly to bring Protestants over to their communion. For this purpose they are tampering with the poor people every day. I do not wish to deprive them of this privilege. I would not prevent them from doing what

they can, by fair argument, to gain proselytes, if there be such a thing as fair argument among them, which I confess I have never seen or heard of; but I would have our Protestants to equal them in zeal, and to excel them in honesty;—to meet them like Protestants on every point of difference; to tell them, "we believe you are in error, and that you are training up your people in error and idolatry; that we bring to you the Bible, which is the word of God, as you yourselves allow, though you wish to keep it from your people; that we are ready and willing to have our principles tried on this ground alone; that we will exercise no power or authority to compel any man to yield to us, and we require that you exercise no authority or power over the consciences of men, to prevent them from hearing us." I know that Papists will not consent to such a trial of their principles. Their absolute power over the consciences of their people is vigorously exercised to prevent them from coming to such a trial, at the very time that they are making a hue and cry against their Protestant neighbours, who exercise no power whatever, and who pretend to none, but that of persuasion, which, with truth on their side, is sufficient for all their benevolent purposes.

No. LXXXIV.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 19TH, 1820.

"PROSELYTISM," says Dr Kelly, "is the order of the day, and the enemies of our faith, like the serpent, creep and give death under *flowers*." This will, no doubt, be esteemed a pretty figure of speech; but if I may be allowed to hazard a pun on so grave a subject, I would *insinuate* that his reverence meant *leaves* rather than flowers; and it must be confessed, there do lurk under the leaves of the Bible a host of enemies of the faith of Rome.

I do not deny, but explicitly maintain, that what is life to the souls of the Irish people, is death to the cause of Popery among them; and therefore I am not surprised by the strong language of the titular Archbishop. I am, however, a little surprised by the want of discretion which his language exhibits. He is, like all his brethren, no doubt, desirous of what they call emancipation. This is a boon which the more moderate Papists profess to ask from their Protestant brethren; and it must appear to every thinking person a little strange, that those who are asking the favour, should at the same time be busy publishing letters, in which these said brethren are compared to *wolves* and *serpents*. But such is the fact; and the leading men among the Irish Papists do not hesitate to speak and publish much worse than this against their Protestant neighbours, and their Protestant government, at the very time that they are preparing their *humble* petitions for what they call emancipation. Now, I think there is a want of wisdom, or rather a want of cunning, in this, which shows that Dr Kelly and his friends have not been long enough under the tuition of the Jesuits. Our Glasgow Papists understand the subject better; for they speak of Protestants as their Christian brethren, which, however hypocritical, is language more becoming men who are asking the favour of being put upon a footing of civil equality with them. But the language of Dr Kelly, and that of the Pope whose mandate he obeys, suggests the idea of persons asking a favour, and in the same breath reviling, by every opprobrious epithet, the men of whom they ask it:—"Ye heretics, ye schismatics, ye wolves in sheep's clothing, ye serpents, creeping and giving death under flowers, we humbly pray that you will remove all the restraints which you have imposed upon us, and admit us to a free and unfettered participation of all the good things which ye enjoy!" Surely this would be reckoned an odd way of asking a favour; but it is in the true style of the Irish petitions for emancipation, when taken in connection with the representations which the petitioners are ever making of their Protestant neighbours, and even their Protestant rulers.

To show that I am not speaking without book, I refer the reader to another pamphlet by the reverend Mr Thorpe, of Dublin, entitled, "An Address to the Protestants of Great Britian and Ireland, on the subject of Catholic Emancipation.—Third edition, 1815." This author gives a number of extracts from the published speeches and other documents of the Popish orators in Dublin, full of the most scurrilous abuse of all persons connected with the government or legislature, from the king downwards, who have shown the least hesitation about granting the Papists all that they are demanding. Thus the long continued affliction of our late venerable sovereign, and the violent death of his prime minister, Mr Perceval, are both represented as judgments of God upon them for being enemies of "Catholic emancipation." This is indeed the substance of a speech made by a gentleman who passes for a Protestant, but who attends public meetings of the Papists; makes speeches for them, and is best known as their advocate. But the following is from a speech of a real Papist—a barrister, and a leading member of the "Catholic board:"—

"The principle of Mr Pitt's administration," says Mr O'Connell, "was despotism: the principle of Mr Perceval's administration was peculating bigotry—bigotted peculation! In the name of the Lord, he plundered the people. Pious and enlightened statesman! he would take their money only for the good of their

souls! The principle of the present administration is still more obvious. It has unequivocally disclosed itself in all their movements. It is simple and single—it consists in *falsehood! Falsehood* is the bond and link which connects this ministry in office. Some of them pretend to be our friends: *you know it is not true.* They are only our worse enemies for their hypocrisy." P. 7.

It is not consistent with my plan to discuss the character of the present or any former ministry; but I have made the above extract to show the inconsistency of the Popish leaders, or rather the absurdity of their conduct in professing to come from year to year to parliament, with a humble petition for emancipation, while they are doing every thing in their power to irritate the leading members of parliament against them; for let it be observed, they are not ministers of the crown alone who are objects of their abuse, nor opposers of emancipation alone who suffer their reviling. These demagogues speak of both friends and foes with equal contempt. Thus one member who stands high in the esteem of every virtuous man in the empire, and who is an advocate of "Catholic emancipation," is described by them as "the place-procuring, pray-mumbling Wilberforce." This, with a number of like things, adduced by Mr Thorpe, excites a suspicion, or rather establishes the fact, that it is not emancipation which our Irish Papists want, but the power of the state in their own hands; and they think it a most likely means to accomplish their object, to represent every man in the government or in the legislature in a most odious light, except a few who are willing to go all lengths with them; and if they, and the Pope, and Dr Kelly, can but convince the people that all the Protestants, from the highest to the lowest, are "wolves" and "serpents," ready to bite and devour them, they will not be far from having accomplished their purpose.

Our Protestant advocates of "Catholic emancipation," speak with great simplicity and good nature, of both sects living together as one family, if all distinctions were done away, and if both were alike eligible to all places of power and trust. I once entertained some such romantic notions, and therefore I cannot be surprised that some persons still entertain them. But Papists themselves have taught me better. The Pope of Rome calls us wolves, and the Popish Archbishop of Tuam compares us to serpents, for no other reason than that we are teaching the poor to read the Bible. Now, supposing the Archbishop and such as he to have power in their hands, they would find it their bounden duty, and it would be their first care, to extirpate the serpents and the wolves. It is not possible that these can live peaceably as one family with the sheep, that is, the faithful, as Papists call themselves; and therefore the shepherds must of necessity destroy them.

"*Every possible exertion,*" says his Holiness, "must be made to keep the youth away from these *destructive schools.*" But if the youth could not be kept away by any exertion while the schools exist, as in some places they cannot, would not the extirpation of the teachers come within the sphere of *possible exertions,* if Papists had the power, and if nothing else would do?

"Unless," says Dr Kelly, "we establish and support schools for the education of distressed children of our persuasion, the triumph will be eventually complete; the mystery of iniquity will have absorbed the mystery of holiness; and what the cruelty of tyrants would not have completed in this island of saints, will be speedily accomplished by softer means." The "mystery of iniquity," is nothing less than the art of reading the word of God. It is not so easy to express in half a sentence what Dr Kelly means by the "mystery of holiness;" but no doubt it is something which proceeds from him who by way of eminence is called His Holiness; and from what history records of the "man and his communications," and of those of his predecessors for a thousand years, we may guess what sort of thing the holiness is by which his children are distinguished in the "island of saints;" that is, the island of holy persons. The holiness of the children did indeed correspond with that of the father. Of this Dr Kelly bears the most ample and unequivocal testimony. He declares, in words which I gave in my last Number but one, that they were abandoned to all manner of wickedness, particularly drunkenness, sabbath-breaking, and perjury. This witness is true, as every traveller in Ireland knows; but the mystery of iniquity, that is, the reading of the Bible, has got in among them, and the mystery of holiness is in danger of being absorbed, because the people are not now so much given to the things for which they were formerly notorious. Dr Kelly will say that I pervert his meaning: but I say that he perverts the meaning of words, when he applies the term *iniquity* to the teaching of the Bible, and *holiness* to the system that opposes it; and it is not the least of the abominations of Popery that it calls good evil, and evil good.

There is such a thing mentioned in the Bible as "the mystery of iniquity;" that is, the secret working of Satan, by the means of human agents, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, in order to ruin the souls of men. (See 2 Thess. ii. 3—10.) No Protestant needs to be told that this mystery of iniquity has its seat in the Church of Rome. But I do not recollect finding in the Bible, or any where else, except in Dr Kelly's letter, such a phrase as "the mystery of holiness." If he had said the mystery of *His Holiness,* or even of his

Reverence, I might guess what he means; but I can attach no rational meaning to his expression as it stands. The word mystery signifies either something unknown, and which being made known, is a mystery no longer, that is simply a secret; or it signifies something, which, though made known as to its existence, is incomprehensible as to its nature. Take it either way, I do not see what it has to do with holiness, which is neither a secret nor an incomprehensible thing. Christ says, (John iii. 20, 21.) "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." This is "the mystery of iniquity." "But he that doeth truth cometh to the light; that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." This is holiness, but there is no mystery in it. That which is *manifest* is not mysterious in the sense of a secret; and that which every one can understand (good works for instance) is not incomprehensible.

Be "the mystery of holiness" what it may, we have an explicit admission by the archbishop, that the cause of Popery in Ireland is in danger from the schools and the Bible:— "What the cruelty of tyrants would not have completed in this island of saints, will be speedily effected by softer means." I hope all the societies and all the teachers engaged in the good work will take courage from this plain declaration of an enemy. The soft means of education and persuasion are the only means which can lawfully be used for promoting the knowledge of the true religion, and turning men from error. Dr Kelly admits that these means are likely to be effectual, and that "speedily," for absorbing, that is, I suppose, subverting, what he calls the "mystery of holiness," but which we know to be the mystery of iniquity.

It is, however, a little surprising that Father Kelly should not recommend to his clergy the *soft* means which he believes to be so effectual in the hands of Protestants. It is surprising that he should make use of such *hard* words, and recommend, or rather command, such vigorous measures, as are enjoined in the following extract, which he knows to be very different from the means which Protestants use. Why does he not recommend mere persuasion and instruction, since he finds these "softer means" likely to accomplish speedily "what the cruelty of tyrants" could never effect? "As pastors of the Roman Catholic Church," says he, "you must have viewed with *indignation* and *disgust* certain *puerile* and *ignoble* efforts that have lately been made to diminish *our influence*, and mar our *interference* in the religious and moral education and instruction of the youth of our communion; and though we deprecate, as sincerely as any other body of men, any attempt to excite dissension, or to make odious distinctions on account of religion, and have contributed most effectually to preserve the peace of the country, yet it is a duty incumbent on us, and from which we will *never shrink, to oppose, collectively and individually, every attempt*, however *insidious*, or from whatever source it may emanate, to tamper with the religious principles of the faithful committed to our care." Again, "Impressed with the sacredness and importance of this obligation, it is incumbent on us, to be vigilant and attentive to the religious and moral education of the people; the attention of the Roman Catholic clergy is to be particularly directed to the schools established in their respective parishes, and they are *to exercise their spiritual authority in its full extent*, in order to prevent Roman Catholic children from frequenting the schools where the Catholic Catechism is not taught, where Protestant Tracts are introduced, or where the moral conduct or religious principles of the master are exceptionable."

Here is the cruelty of tyrants with a witness! And does Dr Kelly expect, by such rigorous measures as he enjoins upon his clergy, to counteract what Protestants are likely to effect speedily by their softer means? If so, the cruelty of Popish tyrants must be more powerful than that of Protestant ones, as no doubt it is. The spiritual authority of the priests is directed to be exercised in its *full extent* to prevent the children of Papists from frequenting the Protestant schools. Now we know that this spiritual authority is infinitely greater than that of the most absolute monarch on the face of the earth; and in the full extent of it, it reaches to what Dr Kelly calls (from the Douay version of the New Testament) the day of eternity. We never heard of our Protestant governors inflicting corporal punishment upon those who refused to read the Bible, or who refused to learn to read; but though they had ordered every such obstinate Papist to be hanged, the tyranny of the thing would have fallen infinitely short of that of the priest who exercises the full extent of his spiritual authority to prevent children from going to school, to learn to read the Bible. It is universally admitted that civil governors can only kill the body; but the Popish priests profess to have the power of casting both body and soul into hell.

Now it is a fact that schools have been established in many parts of Ireland, and particularly in that district over which father Kelly professes to have spiritual jurisdiction. It is a fact that children have flocked to those schools with great eagerness, and that parents have encouraged their children to do so, from a conviction that education is the most likely means of promoting their happiness; and Dr Kelly calls upon his priests to prevent this by exercising their spiritual authority to its full extent; that is, by excommunicating, and, of

course, consigning to everlasting perdition, not the children only, but also the parents who suffer their children to attend the schools in which the Popish catechism is not taught, and whose teachers they do not approve. Besides, it is well known, that great as the extent of priestly spiritual authority is, by which souls are consigned to perdition, this is not all; for they exercise also a temporal authority, by which one who is excommunicated is deprived of every earthly comfort; his brethren are forbidden to have any intercourse with him; he becomes an outlaw and a vagabond on the earth; and would be left to perish, surrounded by his fellow-creatures, if there were not some of them, who, in spite of the threatenings of their hard-hearted priests, still retain so much of humanity about them as to bestow a morsel of bread to save a fellow-creature alive, even at the risk of being excommunicated for the offence, and being reduced to the state of misery which they were guilty of relieving.

In short, the spiritual authority of the Popish priests, exercised in its full extent, subjects those who fall under their displeasure to all the miseries of this life, and to the pains of hell for ever. This is what Dr Kelly commands his priests to inflict upon all who shall attend, or suffer their children to attend, the schools in which the reading of the Bible is taught. The tyranny and the cruelty are so monstrous that the reader will scarcely believe what he reads; but let any one consider the power which the priests claim over the world to come, the misery which, even in this world, their excommunication inflicts, and the authoritative command of the archbishop, requiring his clergy to exercise this power to its full extent, and he will be convinced that there is nothing of exaggeration in what I have written.

I have been speaking of the power which the priests profess to have over the world to come, and which their blind followers believe them to have. We know that they have no such power; and we know that they cannot hurt the soul of any man who reads his Bible, and who dies in the belief of what it reveals; but since they profess to have the power, and since they make the people believe them, their cruelty and tyranny is as great as if they actually possessed it, and as if they actually exercised it, by casting into hell every Bible reader, and every parent who suffers his child to go to school that he may learn to read it; and to their fiend-like cruelty they add the wickedness of imposing upon the people, by professing to have powers which they never had, and which the Almighty never intrusted to any creature.

Dr Kelly makes a parade of what he and his brethren have done in preserving the peace of the country, though it might be *insinuated* that the less they said on that subject the better. It is very well known, that the more ostensible men among them make great professions of loyalty, while their subalterns are doing every thing in their power to promote a spirit of disaffection. Besides, the language of both Dr Kelly and his master the Pope, is not such as we would expect from men who are desirous of preserving the peace of the country. Do Papists expect to maintain peace by calling their Protestant neighbours, who are labouring to instruct them, wolves and serpents, and by accusing the government of tyranny, and of a design to extirpate their religion by violence and persecution, which has been abandoned only in *some degree?* If Ireland is happy enough to enjoy peace with such men in it, it is not in consequence of their exertions, but in spite of them.

Dr Kelly claims for himself and his inferior priests, a power and influence over the people that is inconsistent with their privileges as subjects of the British empire; and he complains of efforts lately made "to diminish our influence, and mar our interference in the religious and moral education of the youth of our communion." Now I ask what right they have to such influence? Let them show from whom they received the grant of an exclusive right to interfere with the education of either young or old. It is certain that they have received no such grant from any authority that is lawfully acknowledged in this country. If they say they have it from the Pope, then I reply that the Pope has given them what was not his own, and what he had no right to give away. I do not refuse them all the influence which their priests may lawfully derive from their talents and personal character, nor the exercise of it by persuasion and fair argument. In short, I would not deny them that influence and right of interference which Protestants have a right to exercise, and which they are exercising for the benefit of the people. But that which Papists claim is avowedly exclusive and arbitrary:—"We will oppose," says Dr Kelly, "collectively and individually, every attempt, however insidious, or from whatever source it may emanate, to tamper with the religious principles of the faithful committed to our care." This tampering, as I have already shown, signifies teaching the word of God; and if Parliament were to pass an Act for establishing schools in every parish in Ireland in which the Bible was to be read, the priests tell us before-hand that they would oppose the measure both collectively and individually. So much for their subjection to the powers that be.

I remark in conclusion, that though this Manifesto against the Bible and the schools in which it is taught, is evidently a commencement of actual hostility on the part of the Papists, against the benevolent efforts of their Protestant neighbours, it has notwithstanding given me great satisfaction. It convinces me that the

labours of the teachers have begun to produce the desired effect; that the reading of the Bible has begun to tell upon the sentiments and conduct of the poor people who had formerly been kept in ignorance and bondage by their priests. In short, to use the language of the worthy Bradbury, on another occasion,—"The schools, by means of the Bible, have begun to crush the head of the old serpent in Ireland, and it is not surprising that we should hear the hissing of the generation of vipers."

No. LXXXV.

SATURDAY, February 26th, 1820.

I HAVE done, for the present, with the Pope, and the Popish archbishop of Tuam; but before I proceed to another general subject of discussion, I shall pay my respects to a more obscure son of the church, who has done me the favour of addressing me a letter, which exhibits as fine a specimen of Popish logic as any man would wish to see. This letter has the Newton-Stewart post mark; and it is the only one that I have received direct from the holy church, since I published that of W. D.

"TO THE AUTHOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

"SIR,—I have been favoured with a loan of two or three of your Numbers. In perusing No. 72, it occurred to me as rather strange, that while, with quick-sighted penetrating eye, you could discern, from the circumstance of the poor woman being obliged to pay eight shillings to the Catholic priest for the baptism of her child, &c., that "the good citizens of Glasgow, who," (with so much credit to their pious sentiments) "lately made so bold a stand against being taxed for the purpose of building parish churches, are actually, though indirectly, taxed for the building and support of a Popish chapel," the same sagacity did not discover to you, that the "good citizens of Glasgow," are also actually, though indirectly, taxed for the purpose of purchasing radical flags, Carlile's publications, &c. to those who, notwithstanding, from their own reports, and those of their abettors, are labouring under such distresses, as not to be able to support themselves except by public munificence.

"What are we to infer from this inequality of vision? Are we to conclude that while the author of the Protestant hates Popery, he loves radical reform and infidelity? This is not so very like real Christianity. When you have answered these questions, I will point out some more for your solution. I am, SIR,

"A FRIEND TO FAIR DEALING.

"N. B. It seems rather curious, that our good citizens, who are so zealous for their liberties that they will not permit government to find any of them guilty on a charge of constructive treason, can yet, notwithstanding, find the Catholics guilty of such remote and far-sought consequences of their conduct, as the taxing of the citizens of Glasgow, for the purpose of erecting places of worship by means of the priest exacting a fine from the poor widow, according to the rules of the church."

So then, it seems, it is a rule of the Church of Rome to fine poor widows who happen to be left with young children. If so, I must acquit Mr Scott of cruelty and extortion. He does not exact money from poor widowed mothers because he loves the money, but because it is a rule of the church to do so, and he is solemnly sworn to obey all her canons and rules. But what sort of a church must that be that has such a rule? It is a character of pure and undefiled religion, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction; and to do good to the fatherless and the widow. This evidently implies that we give them something, if they are poor: but no, say the Popish priests, we visit them that we may fine them, "according to the rules of the church."

It is not in my power to satisfy the curiosity which my correspondent expresses in his *nota bene*, for it never was a matter of consideration with me, or my Protestant friends, what we would, and what we would *not, permit* government to do. This language is peculiarly Popish; and if the priests had the power which they claim, it would soon be found that government could do nothing without their permission. As to the case in hand, the consequence is not far sought. If a poor widow receives five shillings from the Town's Hospital to buy meal for herself and children; and if instead of buying the meal and feeding her family, she gives the money, or a part of it, to the priest to pay his chapel debts, the citizens are actually paying a tax to the chapel; and both the widow and the priest are guilty of imposition. She must again apply to her neighbours to keep her family from starving; or if she can keep them by her own exertions, it is imposition to ask supply from the hospital.

I shall very soon despatch the queries which this "friend to fair dealing" puts to me; and I shall be happy to receive those which he promises, as soon as he pleases, for it is my great desire that my opponents would write. Well then, I wish my correspondent to understand that I was writing about Papists, and not about radical Reformers; and that it would have been as much out of my way to point out the imposition of which he accuses the latter, supposing I had known them to be guilty of it, as it would have been to censure the man in the moon for gathering sticks on the Sabbath-day, according to the vulgar opinion. I have,

on purpose, brought this simile from a distance, that it might resemble the style of my correspondent. Perhaps he will infer that I am an advocate of Sabbath-breaking, because I have not found fault with the man in the moon for his conduct; and the inference will be as fair as that which convicts me of radicalism and infidelity, because I have not attacked the Radicals, and the readers of Carlile's pamphlets. Besides, there never was certified to me a single instance of a person who was receiving the bounty of his neighbours, for the support of himself and family, applying that bounty in the way which my correspondent describes. He may, however, know of such instances, and if he does, he can prove that the Radicals are like the Papists, which is a point that I shall not dispute with him. I will even admit that the alliance between the two, is closer than some people are aware of; I could say a good deal on this subject, but I shall defer it, at least till I know the nature of the other questions which he promises to put to me.

It will perhaps appear to some readers that I have attached more importance to the foregoing letter than it deserves. It is certainly very unimportant considered in itself; but it is of use as a specimen of the Popish mode of conducting controversy. Papists will never meet an argument or a fact in a fair and candid manner; but always endeavour to draw away their readers to something else. My statement was a very plain and simple one. A fair opponent would have controverted the facts, if he had thought them doubtful; or, finding them incontrovertible, he would have admitted them, and then have endeavoured to palliate the conduct of the priest, by pleading that the rules of his church imposed upon him the hardship of doing things that were repugnant to his own feelings; or, if this would not do, he might have admitted that in this instance, the priest's conduct was cruel and unjust, and that he left him to answer for himself. But no such candour will ever be found in a Papist. The church he considers infallible; he believes her priests can never do wrong; and when they are detected in doing things that look very like crimes, and which would be called crimes, if committed by any other person, he instantly raises a hue and cry about something else, in order to cover the guilt which he cannot deny, and which he has not the grace to acknowledge. Thus the "friend to fair dealing" would cover the extortion of the ghostly father in Glasgow, by setting THE PROTESTANT and his readers a hunting after the crimes of the Radicals.

It is worth while to remark here, that not one of the instances of priestly extortion which I have given has been controverted. The story of M'Murray, though proved to be true in every material point, had yet so much obscurity about it, as to encourage our Papists, and their hired advocate, to strain every nerve to convict me of a fabrication. All the agents which they could employ in the three kingdoms were set to work for this purpose. They failed, indeed, in proving their point; but the very zeal and activity which they showed in this case, shows, that had the truth of any of my other statements been doubtful, they would have taken care to expose them. Their absolute silence, therefore, on these points, is a tacit admission that all my statements are true; and, to adopt their own mode of expression for once, I hereby inform them, that when they have replied to these, I will furnish them with more.

The following letter is from a gentleman in the north of Ireland. It has been lying past me for two months, because I had not an opening for it sooner. The writer is an entire stranger to me; but I am sure the letter will commend itself to the reader, by the plain good sense of it. Modesty would perhaps require me to suppress the complimentary passages; but I choose rather to give it verbatim as I received it.

"FOR THE PROTESTANT.

"*December* 10*th*, 1819.

"SIR,—Your exertions deserve the approbation of all who know and prize the truth. You have done, and well too, what every man, enlightened by the truth, knows he should have done, and yet must reproach himself for not having done; you have contended "for the faith once delivered to the saints." In the name of this country, I thank you for the affectionate interest you have shown, in sending your publication to Dublin. Let me urge you to extend your charitable exertions; yet when I name the place on behalf of which I ask your exertions, you may object to my word "*extend;*" I do not call on you to go beyond Dublin, as you might suppose, both from the word, and from the notorious and depraved ignorance of the southern, that is, the eminently Popish parts of Ireland. I request your attention for a part of Ireland, much nearer to you; in fact, your next neighbour; and a part, of which, I apprehend, you on your side of the water have formed very erroneous notions. B——t is the place to which I would anxiously direct your attention, and which in my opinion requires information on the nature of Popery as much as any part of Ireland. In the Popish parts your publication cannot produce much effect; because those who might profit by it, are most diligently excluded from this opportunity by the never-failing vigilance of the priests; but here every one thinks himself able to read, and qualified to judge; and of the soundness of that opinion I shall leave you to judge, when I tell you, that *liberality*, as the *cant* of the day is, flourishes abundantly; and

all professions of religion are alike in the opinion of the *Liberals*. God forbid, all Christian men should not abound in holy meekness and forbearance: they should be distinguished from the world by these virtues displaying themselves in the minutest part of their conduct. Their very thoughts should betray themselves in attractive scintillations of these duties. But to compromise the truth of scripture, and join in with the worthless cant of an ungodly world, and call indifference to the truth by the honourable and specious name of *liberality;* this a Christian dares not do, *μη γενοιτο*. Many persons, however, misled by this specious word, and perhaps possessed of holier views, heedlessly adopt the cry of the day, and unawares are deserting the standard of the gospel. These are persons who would read your publication, and to whom it might be useful. There is another class also, to whom I should wish your work known. They are persons of much worth and amiableness of disposition, who, in their political views, see in Papists nothing but suffering individuals, and are blinded by their own compassion and generosity, so that they see not what the true nature of Popery is. They think Popery is like any other profession of Christianity, not being aware that the most monstrous claims put forward, the most absurd doctrines taught, the most tyrannical attempts made by the villany of man on the rights and privileges of rational beings, have been by Popes; and that the immutability of the church, *the boast, and peculiar ground of exultation among the Papists,* on which they lay the greatest stress as proving their superiority, and from which they declare they cannot recede *without impiety,* renders it the extreme of folly to expect any mitigation. Here then there can be no compromise, and I wish for your publication here, because it sets this so strongly forward.

"I have gone on farther than I designed at first, but I should leave my subject grievously imperfect, if I did not present to your notice another description of persons, whom perhaps you would little expect to hear of among us.

"We boast, you know, of being here a kind of reformed specimen of the Scottish church. We have the same confession, the Assembly's larger and smaller catechisms, our elders, and presbyteries, and synods. In short, we preserve among us, the forms and formularies of those worthy men who hazarded their lives for the cause, who would have gone to death rather than not testify their abhorrence of the harlot church, drunk with the blood of the saints, who would have shuddered at the bare thought of holding any terms with the unscriptural doctrines of the Romish church. Would you not then, Sir, be surprised at hearing a Protestant dissenting teacher in this country, declaring in a public meeting, in a speech got up for the occasion, that the difference between us and the Church of Rome, were but on *minor points!!!* I heard this declaration myself, else I might have been tempted to suppose, that, any person reporting it to me, might have been mistaken. Let us set aside forms of discipline and church government, and must we not feel, that the man who could say, that the vital doctrines of the gospel, and the corruptions of these blessed doctrines, by the Romish church, are in themselves not materially different, is far gone from the spirit that once animated his church; and does not such a man need instruction?

"In the midst of much worldly wisdom and commercial information here, an opinion has gained ground, founded on a very illogical deduction, that wisdom in other things is a necessary accompaniment. Now, Sir, you can appreciate this mistake, but it has produced its effect. People without any pretensions to information on religious subjects, take upon them to pronounce *en maître;* and as they speak from the light of nature only, they necessarily declare against revelation, without being aware of it. In this state of mind they are soon and easily landed in infidelity, or if they are still for a religious profession, they are in most exquisite training to receive the doctrines of Popery, which, you know, are no more than the doctrines of the natural mind drest up in the garb of the gospel; the sentiments of the unrenewed man, set out in the gospel phrase. To aid on the career of these things, we have an active man, a member of the Romish church, among us, and some who call themselves Protestant dissenting ministers, who go hand in hand with him, to the betraying of the cause they should support. Do you not think such an emergency requires your interference? I would fain hope you do, and that you will make a trial of sending over some numbers of your publication hither. You may reckon on my exertions in its favour, as well as those of all to whom the truth is dear. Believe me your's truly, &c.

"A PROTESTANT."

In reply to the first part of the foregoing, I have merely to say, that I have no merit, and am entitled to no thanks, for sending my work to Dublin. Some gentlemen in that city, of their own accord, solicited, and were instantly granted, permission to reprint it, promising to bear the loss, if there was any; and to give the profits, if there were any, to charitable purposes. I request, therefore, that the friends of the Protestant religion in Ireland, will countenance and circulate the Dublin edition. In doing so, they will serve the double purpose of promoting a knowledge of the Protestant religion, as opposed to Popery, and of affording pecuniary aid to the societies established for the education of the poor. I have already distributed out of the profits of the

Glasgow edition, about a hundred and fifty pounds, chiefly for the purpose of education; and though I am quite ignorant of the extent of the Dublin circulation, I hope something will accrue from it also, to aid the societies, whose object it is to teach the poor in Ireland to read the Bible.

There is not in the whole world, a greater enemy to real Christianity than that sentimentalism of which my correspondent complains. He calls it liberality, in condescension to the phraseology of the day; but it is a liberality which consists in thinking favourably of every thing human, and lightly of every thing divine.

It is indeed surprising to hear of a Protestant dissenting teacher, speaking of the difference between Protestants and Papists, as a difference only on *minor points*. But it is one of the evils of the day, that persons take upon them both to speak and write upon subjects which they have not studied, and of which they know nothing. My correspondent is surprised that among descendants of the suffering Presbyterians of Scotland, Popery should be regarded with such a favourable, at least, with such an unsuspicious eye; but what would he think if he knew that among the Presbyterians themselves of the present day, at least by many of them, who occupy the very ground which was soaked with the blood of their fathers, Popery is looked upon as a very harmless thing? Such, however, I believe, is the fact; and I think it cannot be accounted for on any other principle, than that many of our countrymen, and even of our clergy, have lost sight of the foundation on which the Protestant religion rests, and of what their fathers suffered in maintaining it.

Another correspondent in the sister kingdom, who approves of the plan which I have taken to bring Popery into utter scorn and contempt, writes as follows. His letter does not seem to have been written with a view to publication; and therefore I shall give the extract, without the names of persons, which he has given me, without reserve. "There is," says my correspondent, "a *gentleman usher-like-way* of handling this coarse subject, which produces no manner of effect, and this is very common in Ireland: for instance, ——— lately preached a sermon, which was praised up to the skies, and ordered to be printed, in which he says, that for *our own household, God forbid that we should not teach them catechisms, &c. propounding the true Christian faith; but for others, I would have schoolmasters mild, kind, &c. but not given to proselytism.*"

I know no divine law that requires a man to seek the salvation of his own household, that does not require him also to seek that of his nearest neighbour, and of the child that may be placed under his care, if he has the honour of being a teacher; but the preacher above referred to would object to this, because it would savour of proselytism; and it is impossible that a Protestant teacher can do his duty without falling under the accusation. My correspondent proceeds as follows:

"Now giving a Bible, with an unmutilated Decalogue, is proselytism. Using a Testament in which the word μετανοια, that change of heart which is called genuine repentance, is not erroneously translated, "Do penance," would be proselytism. Teaching the children on any of the 143 Popish holy days, would be proselytism. But *this proselytism*, which we ought to attempt in season, and out of season, for the recovery of perishing sinners, is in the genteeler circles of milk-and-water Christians, utterly condemned and disclaimed. Mr ——— (a leading M. P. on the side of Catholic emancipation) once wrote to the Primate, that in the new schools (afterwards founded on this neutral plan) he would have the Christian religion, but *no particular description of it*, taught to the Irish peasantry. That is, he would give them a *whole* containing no *parts*; and taking for granted, which is false, that there is a kind of general Christianity, a broad cloak, under which, all who choose to call themselves Christians may nestle, each, out of complaisance, giving up his particular opinions, and amalgamate into one *liberal mass* of men, preferring present to future peace; and forgetting that there is but *one Lord*, there is but *one baptism*, and *one faith*."

My correspondent proceeds to express his approbation of the manner in which I have treated the subject; that is, the open and honest way of calling things by their own names; and openly avowing it as my object to proselyte men to the truth by all "practicable means;" that is, by all means that can be practised upon Christian principles; and I desire not to have recourse to any other.

In reply to the observations of those who think that I have not treated the Popish Archbishop of Tuam with the respect to which he is entitled from his high office, I remark, that I will yield to no man in respect for persons who hold high offices in virtue of the word of God, and the law of the land; but I do not look upon any Popish priest, however high his rank among Papists, as entitled to such respect. While the Israelites were commanded to respect the priesthood of Aaron, they were absolutely prohibited to respect the priests of idols. If I have succeeded in proving the Church of Rome idolatrous, as I think I have, I cannot consistently respect her priesthood. Kelly of Tuam is no more to me than M'Corry in the Saltmarket. Each is labouring in his own sphere to *uphold* the *infallible* church; and though the latter would tremble at sight of the former, as in the presence of a superior being, I consider him as the more honourable personage of the two, for he is more usefully

employed in vending old clothes, than the Archbishop in vending the old intolerant nostrums of Rome.

No. LXXXVI.

SATURDAY, March 4th, 1820.

Rome's "mystery of iniquity" appears in nothing more palpable, than in the practice of what she calls Auricular Confession. By means of this she has access to the heart of every sinner in her communion, maintains an absolute authority over his conscience, and directs his conduct as she pleases: and this prerogative does not belong to the "Church" alone, considered in her collective capacity, nor to the Pope alone, as head of the Church: it belongs in common to every pedant of a priest, who considers himself divinely appointed to receive the confession of sinners, and authorised to absolve them from all their iniquities.

I do not know that I can introduce this subject better than by inserting a communication from a correspondent, purporting to be a "Pastoral Letter" from Rome, to the Bishops and Clergy who acknowledge the Pope for their head, and who have sworn obedience to him as such. The author has professedly made the "Franciscan" of Buchanan the ground-work of his composition, and has adapted the sentiments to the state of matters in our own day. The reader is requested to connect what follows with the lines which I inserted in my 81st Number; and he will have the epistle complete. The former quotation related to the withholding the Bible from the people; what follows, relates chiefly to confession.

A PASTORAL LETTER FROM ROME.

* * * * * * * * * *

And since this world's the rough wild field we till,
Let us disseminate the seeds of ill,
Commence our labours ever in good time,
Corrupt the hearts of youth before their prime;
Keep them from Bibles, stupify their mind,
And full returns in manhood we shall find.
Teach them to lie, to flatter and deceive,
A source of gain shall rise from every knave:
For if mankind should too religious grow,
"The Church" must half her perquisites forego.
Sin swells the Bank that feeds the Pontiff's purse,
And true Religion proves his greatest curse;
Rome's ancient fabric on some pillars leans,
The props of all her glory and her gains:
Of these, Confession holds the highest place,
That ready mode of merchandizing grace;
The fairest farm may disappoint the swain
Who looks in Autumn for the promised grain;
Tho' grapes should load the branches of the vine,
Hail, rain, or wind, may blast our hopes of wine;
War may lay waste the monarch's wide domains,
And sweep the crops and cattle from the plains;
But strict Confession, to a knowing hand,
Yields fruit more certain than the fairest land;
No rain, no storms, no dire effects of war,
Its regular returns of profit mar.
Arm'd with this weapon, princes feel our weight,
When fit occasion serves in every state;
Kings from their throne indignant have we hurl'd,
And beggars raised to rule a conquer'd world;
The Corsican usurper's friends we stood,
Crown'd, bless'd, and married him to royal blood,
Leaving his lawful wife in widowhood;
Think not our influence we over-rate,
Recounting thus our power in the state;
For when the secrets of all men we know,
Prolific seeds of treason we may sow,
And with sly hints at numbers and their force,
Incite the mob to each rebellious course:
Kindle fell rancour in the people's breast,
Against the men we envy or detest;
Marking them by some execrable name,
We blast them as the sons of sin and shame;
Doom'd in their cursed carcasses to feel
The fiery faggot or th' avenging steel;
And when we lead our friends into a scrape,
Or they are charged with murder or with rape,
We often make a way for their escape,
By large collections at our altars made,
To hired witnesses and lawyers paid,
By closely questioning and shriving those
Who must give testimony for our foes,
And by that practice which the Christian loaths,
Our Absolutions, for man's broken oaths.
Hear now to whom your chief attention's due,
Still keep this wise arrangement in your view.
Let the old matron claim your prior care,
Whose wealth and weakness seem to promise fair,
Whose abject superstition may supply
The means your avarice to gratify;
Next let the usurer attract your eye,
Who loves to live in sin, a saint to die;
The merchant next, the profits of whose trade
Require that off'rings to the church be made,
Make the transgressor compromise with gold,
The oaths he falsely swore, the lies he told:
And should your friends hold offices of state,
Should they become by blood, or plunder, great,
Or dare against our views to legislate;
Mark them as sources of abundant gain,
High must the penance be when deep the stain;
When stretch'd in agony upon his bed,
A mortal fever strikes the rich man's head;
When drugs and doctors bring no more relief,
And all his family are plung'd in grief;
Be sure ye carefully that bed attend,
As if this Dives were your dearest friend;
Though vice had stain'd his life too gross to name,
For which you witness neither grief nor shame;
Give him your transubstantiated bread,
Your off'ring for the living and the dead;
Anoint his body, whisper in his ear,
That from each mortal sin you've made him clear,
That trusting in himself and in the Pope,
He needs no stronger anchor for his hope;
And as the awful hour of death draws nigh,
Leave him in fatal ignorance to die.
For his departed soul let mass be sung,
Processions walk, and blessed bells be rung;
And offer "*months minds*" till the purging fire
By floods of holy water shall expire.
But let rich souls alone at rest be laid,
Send *them* to heaven when your fees are paid.
As for the beastly beggars when they die,
Let them for ever in these torments lie;
Guide not their lifeless bodies to the grave,
Nor waste one Mass their sordid souls to save.
No time, no pains, no thought should you bestow,
On those from whom no recompense can flow;

For where's the wise man that was ever found,
To waste his labours on a barren ground,
To spend his swiftness in a vain pursuit,
Or water gardens that produce no fruit.
If there's a man who dares to keep aloof,
Who dreads to see us come beneath his roof,
Who will not often to CONFESSION come,
That mighty main spring of the Church of Rome,
Send for his servants, and of them inquire
His mode of life, their diet and their hire,
Fish for some secret floating in their mind,
Which, if you dext'rously by questions, find,
And manage well, may bring him to his knees,
To beg for secrecy, and proffer fees.
But if no chance shall throw it in your way,
An accusation to his charge to lay,
If his pure life defies the voice of fame
A single crime against him to proclaim,
Then cry out HERESY—impeach his creed,
Call him A WOLF, and then you will succeed.
Fear will compel him to pull down his pride,
And cast the veil 'twixt him and you, aside.
But let no prayers, or tears, or length of time
Avail to gain forgiveness of his crime,
Until by fees and fasting, render'd pure,
His reconciliation he secure.
When by close care and artifice refined,
You have explored the secrets of the mind;
When the fair sinner once has told you more
Than ever human ear had heard before;
When the rich rogue, to consequences blind,
Has told you what he did, and he designed;
When the pale murderer has told the tale,
Which brings him to the block if you reveal;
Then Proteus-like assume what form you please,
For all these victims may be spoil'd at ease.
Fear no refusal to your high demands,
Their character– their life is in your hands;
Nor lose your spoil by taking for your fee,
A worthless gratitude, which false must be.
For still, whoever has uncased his mind,
To dread his confidant must be inclined.
Conscious of guilt, he wishes that man dead,
Whose frown can heap confusion on his head.
When issuing edicts, dip your pens in gall,
Keep taunting nick-names ready at a call,
And when you wish to strike a Christian dead,
Pelt Latin texts of Scripture at his head.
In this we have a precedent of note,
For Lucifer himself could Moses quote.
Guard our old building, on saint Peter's rock,
With energy against each hostile shock;
And when rash men with sacrilegious eye,
Into this edifice should dare to pry,
And point out portions of the crazy wall,
Which ne'er were built by Peter or by Paul,
Blast them as heretics condemned to dwell
To all eternity in flames of hell.
Nor with less fury than the flames below,
Let purgatory's profitable furnace glow,
With this great difference, that the purging flame,
By papal bulls, and masses, we may tame.
Tell the wild Irishmen, that when they die,
Their souls must here in horrid anguish lie,
Until surviving friends their pardon buy;
And should some wag in his own vulgar way,
To your grave reverences dare to say,
I see on each of you so mild a face,
And so much feeling in your features trace,
I cannot think there can be such a place.
For if ye have the power by pray'r or spell,
Yet use it not, to quench this new found hell,
How can the fear of GOD within ye dwell?
Reply—that he with heresy is cramm'd,
And tell the clown that if he doubts he's damn'd;
And recollect, descanting on the mass,
To make our priestly dignity surpass
All competition, for no son of man,
On earth or sea's immeasurable span,
Except ourselves, can of some grains of wheat,
A living moving mass of flesh create;
Bow down to, and revere, a work so fine,
Then break in pieces, plunge it into wine,
Bruise, 'twixt the teeth, the blood, the bones, the skin,
And swallow all, a sacrifice for sin.
Thus thro' the land, your pious progress take,
At every step, some shining money make;
Rail at your king's religion—curse the fools,
Who send their children to Hibernian schools;
Absolve the ribbonman, on whom devolves
The mighty task of punishing the "WOLVES,"
Who "*in sheep's clothing*" have been found so bold,
As to affright the Propaganda fold.

Signata Romæ,
Sub Sigillo Piscatoris,
Prid. Kalend.—1820.
I. D. F. *Sec. &c.*

This subject is intimately connected with that of penance. I shall therefore give the doctrine concerning both as laid down by the Council of Trent, Sess. 4. Canon 1. *Si quis dixerit, &c.* "Let him be accursed, who shall affirm that penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted and appointed in the universal church, by our Lord Christ himself, for the reconciling those Christians to the divine Majesty, who have fallen into sin after their baptism." They teach farther (Sess. 14. cap. 2.) "That this sacrament consists of two parts, viz. the matter and the form; the matter of the sacrament is the act or acts of the penitent, namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction; the form of it is the act of the priest in these words, *absolvo te.*" I absolve thee. "That therefore it is the duty of every man, (cap. 3.) who hath fallen after baptism, as aforesaid, to confess his sins at least once a year to a priest."—"That this confession is to be secret (cap. 5.); for public confession is neither commanded nor expedient."—"That this confession of mortal sin be very exact, (cap. 5.) and particular, together with all circumstances, especially such as *speciem facti mutant,* alter the kind or degree of sin, and that it extend to the most secret sins, even of thought, or against the 9th and 10th commandment." That is the 10th, according to our division, for the church of Rome divides it into two, to make up the number, having left out the second. And lastly, "That the penitent thus doing, (cap. 6.) the absolution hereupon pronounced is not conditional or declarative only, but absolute and judicial." That is, the priest, on receiving confession, as above described, pronounces a full and everlasting pardon of all the sins so confessed, a pardon which the sinner may take and plead at the day of judgment, against all charges that may then be brought against him on account of the sins which he has confessed.

Before proceeding to expose the wickedness of the doctrines above taught, I shall give more in detail, what Papists avow, as well as what

they disavow, on the subject of confession, from Gother's "Papist Misrepresented and Represented." First, what they disavow, as in the words following:—"The Papist misrepresented believes it part of his religion to make gods of men; foolishly thinking that these have power to forgive sins. And therefore as often as he finds his conscience oppressed with the guilt of his offences, he calls for one of his priests; and having run over a catalogue of his sins, he asks of him pardon and forgiveness. And what is most absurd of all, he is so stupid as to believe that, if his ghostly father, after he has heard all his villanies in his ear, does but pronounce three or four Latin words over his head, his sins are forgiven him, although he had never any thoughts of amendment, or intention to forsake his wickedness." I hope to show before I have done, that there is no misrepresentation in the above, but let us first hear what is avowed on this subject.

"The Papist truly represented believes it damnable in any religion to make gods of men. However, he firmly holds, that when Christ, speaking to his apostles, said, John xx. 21; 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;' he gave them, and their successors, the bishops and priests of the catholic church, authority to absolve any penitent sinner from his sins. And God having thus given them the ministry of reconciliation, and made them Christ's legates, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. Christ's ministers, and the dispensers of the mystery of Christ, 1 Cor. iv. and given them power that whosoever they loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, Mat. xxviii. 18. he undoubtedly believes that whosoever comes to him making a sincere and humble confession of his sins, with a true repentance and firm purpose of amendment, and a hearty resolution of turning from his evil ways, may from them receive absolution, by the authority given them from heaven; and no doubt but God ratifies above the sentence pronounced in that tribunal; loosing in heaven whatsoever is thus loosed by them on earth. And that whosoever comes without the due preparation, without a repentance from the bottom of his heart, and real intention of forsaking his sins, receives no benefit by the absolution; but adds sin to sin, by a high contempt of God's mercy, and abuse of his sacraments."

From the above authorities it appears that the church of Rome makes it the indispensable duty of every member of her body to tell all his or her sins to a priest at least once a year. Now if this were literally obeyed, I venture to affirm that every member of the church would require to have a priest to himself, and that the whole year would be occupied by every priest in hearing the confessions of a single individual. There is not an hour of a man's life, in which he does not commit sin in thought, word, or deed. Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart of man is evil, and only evil continually. He who alone knows the human heart has declared this to be its character. What then must we think of that religion which teaches that a person may, in a few minutes, confess to a priest all the sins which he has committed in the course of a whole year? The thing is as impossible as to recal and relate all the thoughts which have passed through his mind during the same period; it is as impossible as to recal in an hour, and preserve in a bottle, all the air that has passed through his lungs in breathing during twelve months. Yet, according to the doctrine of the church of Rome, it is necessary that every man and woman effect this impossibility.

I know that the Romish casuists make an exception of sins which they call *venial;* and they require only that a man confess the *mortal* sins which he may have committed in the course of the year; but this is a distinction of their own making, and it involves an error the most pernicious and fatal, that ever was invented by the father of lies. Sin in every form, and every degree, is the object of divine abhorrence. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness, without exception. Men, thinking only of what affects their own comfort and security in this world, look upon some sins as great, and others as little. Robbery and murder, for instance, are great sins, and swearing and false worship are little ones, because the latter do us little harm, whereas the former are hurtful to society. But this is not the rule by which the Almighty judges. It is the alienation of the heart of man from himself that constitutes the guilt of the sinner in his sight; and this alienation appears to him in the most secret thoughts, and the most trivial actions of the sinner, as really as in those actions which are most condemned by his fellow creatures. If our Popish doctors were to sit down and make out a list of the sins which they call venial, I am verily persuaded they would place that of our first parents in eating the forbidden fruit at the top of the list. I defy them to find, in the whole catalogue of human transgressions, from the creation of the world, one, *considered in itself*, more venial than this. What harm could there be in eating the fruit of one tree more than another? This is the cavil of infidels at this day; and, upon the supposition that any sin is venial, it is impossible to make a satisfactory reply.

But in point of fact, we know that this sin "brought death into the world, and all our woe." By this single offence of one man, judgment came upon all men to condemnation. Sin consists in disobedience to our Cre-

ator and Lawgiver; and whether this disobedience appear in things which men call great, or things which they call little, it indicates a state of mind at enmity against God, and which deserves all the punishment which he has threatened against transgressors.

What an enemy to the souls of men, therefore, must the church of Rome be, which teaches that there are some sins so venial, that is, so trifling, that it is not worth while to confess them; that God will not mark them, at least not mark them, or remember them, so as to exact punishment for them! This, however, is so interwoven with Popery as to constitute an essential part of the system; and if there was nothing else objectionable in it, this alone would exhibit it to the world, as a religion, not of God, but a mystery of iniquity emanating from the Prince of darkness.

The revelation of divine mercy, by the gospel of Christ, proceeds upon the assumption, that all men are utterly lost and undone, on account of sin. Christ came to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself. He laid down his life as a ransom for many. Now in the whole history of this wonderful transaction, we find not the least hint that any sin was so venial, as not to require expiation. It was to put away sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, that the Saviour of the world laid down his life. It was sin, without distinction of great or little, venial or mortal, that rendered this infinite sacrifice necessary, in order that we might be saved. Those who are saved by grace cannot possibly look upon any sin as venial. They will, in secret, confess to God every sin of which they are conscious, encouraged to do so by his own word, "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity."

But Popery carnalizes every thing. It reduces this sublime view of Christian piety, and privilege, to the mere annual form of confessing to a fellow creature, and receiving his absolution. And as such fellow creature cannot hear the thousandth part of the confessing sinner's transgressions, but only a few of his enormous crimes, such as eating flesh on Friday, or in Lent, the penitent is taught to believe that his other sins are merely venial, or no sins at all. Thus the priests prophecy lies; the people love to have it so; and thousands annually go down to the grave with a lie in their mouths.

No. LXXXVII.

SATURDAY, March 11th, 1820.

It is imperiously required of every Papist that he confess his sins to a priest at least once every year. I showed in my last Number, that if this order were literally observed, every sinner would require to have a priest of his own; and that both he and the priest would have enough to do, though they minded nothing else, from the end of one year to the end of another. The man who believes it to be possible to confess at one sitting, or rather at one kneeling, the sins of twelve months, must have a very different notion of what sin is from the representations which the word of God gives of it; and in fact, he has the authority of the church, which he considers infallible, for regarding the most part of those things which the Bible calls sins, as mere peccadilloes, not worthy of being remembered, much less of being punished, either by God or man.

I need not stop to expose the error of this doctrine; the error is manifest to every man who reads his Bible, and who understands but the first principles of the word of God. My present object is to prove the fact, that the church of Rome teaches the doctrine that some sins are only venial, while others, and these but few in number, are esteemed mortal; and that, having persuaded her blinded adherents to believe this impious absurdity, she allows them to rest satisfied with having made a confession, though it should not embrace one in ten thousand of their real transgressions.

Thus the words of the Council of Trent, (Sess. 14. cap. 6.) are, "that this confession of *mortal* sin be very exact and particular;" which leaves it to be inferred, that sins, which are not considered mortal, need not be confessed at all; and as every sinner is disposed to think his own sins but venial, at least the greater part of them, he will have but few mortal ones to confess; no more in ordinary cases, in the course of a year, than he can detail to his priest, with all their aggravations, in an hour.

The Douay catechism is honourably explicit on this subject. It reduces the *deadly* or *capital* sins to seven in number. To these, of course, a penitent may restrict his confession; and if he cannot accuse himself of any of these, he has no confession to make. He has only to declare himself as innocent as on the day of his baptism, by which rite he believes he was cleansed from original sin, and to demand the body of his Creator in the sacrament of his body and blood, it being necessary, in order to the reception of this, that a man be in a state of grace, that is, free from mortal sin. The seven deadly sins are, pride, covetousness, luxury, anger, gluttony, envy and sloth. The French catechism issued by Bonaparte and the Pope, gives precisely the same number, with two slight verbal variations:—What the former calls luxury and sloth, the latter calls wantonness and idleness.

The Douay catechism has also six sins against the Holy Ghost; but as they are not described as mortal, we must consider them as only

venial. There are, despair of salvation, presumption of God's mercy, to impugn the known truth, envy at another's spiritual good, obstinacy in sin, and final impenitence. The grave authors of this catechism had already placed envy among the deadly sins, but here it appears among those which are distinguished from the deadly. This arises, I suppose, from the rule of the Council of Trent, which requires a particular regard to circumstances, especially such as *speciem facti mutant*, that is, alter the kind or degree of sin. It is envy in general that is a mortal sin; but when it is only "envy at another's spiritual good," the species is altered; and the sin becomes venial. If we take the word of God for our rule, we shall find that there is no sin so emphatically marked as deadly as that of final impenitence; but the Douay doctors class this with sins which are not deadly, for no other reason that I know of, but that they have still a remedy for it in Purgatory.

There are four sins besides, which are particularly marked by the Douay divines in their catechism, which Amicus Veritatis says is approved by the whole church of Rome. These four sins are, wilful murder, sin of Sodom, oppression of the poor, and to defraud workmen of their wages. These are entitled, "the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance." But seeing they are not placed in the list of deadly sins, it may be presumed that their *cry* is not heard, that vengeance does not follow them, and therefore we must consider them as merely venial.

In this way Papists "sport themselves with their own deceivings." They are worse than the fools that make a mock at sin; for they represent the most enormous wickedness as no sin at all, or as such a trifle that it would be unjust to punish men for it, at least with eternal punishment. Thus, in answer to the question, "What is venial sin?" the Douay catechism answers,—"It is a much more pardonable offence against God or our neighbour:" that is, more pardonable than the mortal sin which is explained immediately before. In short, the Council of Mentz professed plainly, "That they cannot understand how God should be just, if he punish any for venial sins with eternal punishment." Sonnius, one of their authors, tells us, that "venial sins are *worthy of pardon;*" that is making them *meritorious:* and Bellarmine, their great champion, declares, that they "hold with a general consent that venial sins make not a man guilty of eternal death." "That God would be unjust if he punished venial sins eternally, justice requiring a forbearance to punish that offence which deserves not punishment." Again, says the same author, "some sins are so far from deserving eternal punishment, that God *cannot* punish them eternally, without injustice." Gregory de Valentia says, that "venial sin may be remitted without any infusion of grace." Andradius and Bonaventure assert, "That for venial sins we do not so much as need repentance." The Council of Mentz teach, "That many depart this life free from mortal sins, and for lighter sins they shall never be damned." (See the quotations, and many more to the same purpose, in a Sermon by Mr Jenkyn, entitled, "No Sin Venial.")

Thus, from the published sentiments of their greatest authors, and from their approved catechisms, it will appear, that Papists need not much concern themselves about most of the sins of which they know themselves to be guilty; nay that they may easily get quit of them all by persuading themselves of some circumstance which changes a mortal sin into a venial one; or if this cannot be done, they have only to tell their deadly sins to a priest, who not only will, but who is *obliged* to grant absolution, if the sinner appear to be sorry for what he has done, and promise amendment. A little penance is enjoined as a thing of course, which the penitent may either suffer in person, or compound for by a little money, and then he is declared to be in a state of grace, as pure and innocent as when he came from the laver of regeneration, that is, from the holy water sprinkled on him at baptism.

I do not believe that the grossest heathenism is so much calculated to promote sin, and to keep men at ease under their sins, as this impious substitute for Christianity, which the church of Rome has palmed upon the world; by means of which she has deceived the nations of Europe for so many ages, and led millions of souls to everlasting perdition. For let it be observed, that in the sins of her catalogue there is no mention of that which is the root and the sum of all iniquity, namely, the want of love to God. A man may be unconscious of any of the seven deadly sins—of any of the six sins against the Holy Ghost;—or of any of the four that cry to heaven for vengeance;—it may not be in the power of man to convict him of any one of these seventeen sins; and yet he may be in the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity, because the love of God is not in him; and while his fellow-creatures are regarding him as a saint, worthy to be canonized and adored, all the benevolence of heaven is looking down upon him with pity and compassion, as an enemy to God in his mind; and as belonging to that description of men, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.

The church of Rome endeavours, by every means in her power, to keep the eyes of men shut against this view of their character and state. She is constantly diverting their minds from reflecting upon the character of true religion, as consisting in love to God and to our fellow-men, and as manifesting itself in spiritual worship, and holy practice. She has their

minds pre-occupied, by a system of false religion and will-worship; which is the more pernicious, and the more to be abhorred, because it assumes the name of Chrisitanity. In this system, the love of God, which is the essence of true religion, is declared not to be necessary; at least, not to be so necessary as that one cannot be a Christian without it.

I shall immediately prove this by quotations from distinguished writers of the church of Rome. These writers were Jesuits, and therefore their doctrines will have the greater weight with our British Papists; for I wish the reader to recollect, that after this most pestilent Society had been proscribed by all the Popish powers in Europe, they found an asylum in the heart of England; where, for thirty years past, they have been allowed to extend their influence, concentrate their powers, and mature their plans for bringing the world again in subjection to their ghostly dominion. The principal Popish writers of the present day in England, have avowed themselves on the side of the Jesuits; the Pope himself, by his recent authoritative restoration of the order, has identified with them not only himself personally, but also the church of which he is the head; and I have not a doubt, that if the Popish priests at present in Scotland and England would tell the truth, they would confess that they are Jesuits. I have not access to the original works from which the following extracts are taken; but I give them as quoted by M. Pascal, who was a devoted and zealous member of the church of Rome; but so amiable and so pious, that I cannot allow myself to call him a Papist.

In Escobar, says M. Pascal, (in his Provincial Letters, Let. X.) who has collected the various opinions of our Fathers on this subject, in the practice of the love of God by our Society, tr. 1. ex. 2. n. 21. and tr. 5. ex. 4. n. 8. you have this question: "When, or at what time, is a man obliged to have an actual love or affection for God? Suarez says, it is enough to love him a little before we die, without fixing any time. Vasquez, that it is enough to love him at the point of death. Others, at baptism; some, at the seasons of contrition; others, upon festivals. But our Father Castro Palao opposes, and justly too, every one of these opinions. Hurtado de Mendoza pretends to say, that we are obliged to love him once every year, and that we are well off, in not being obliged to love him oftener. But Father Conink believes that we are bound to do it once in three or four years. Henriquez, every five years. And Filiutius says, it is probable that we are not rigorously obliged to do it every five years."

Anthony Sirmond, another of their Fathers, discusses this doctrine in the manner following:—"St Thomas says we are obliged to love God as soon as he has given us the use of reason: but that is a little too soon. Scotus, every Sunday. What foundation has he for that? Others, in times of strong temptation. Ay, if there was no other way to avoid it. Scotus, that after some great mercy received from God, it is not amiss to thank him for it. Others, at the point of death. That is a little too late. Neither do I believe it necessary every time that the sacraments are administered. Attrition with confession, if you can come at it conveniently, will do well enough. Suarez says, he is sure we are obliged to love God some time or other. Ay, but when? Why, you are to be judge of that, for he knows nothing of the matter."

On these sentiments of Jesuit authors, expressed in their own words, Pascal remarks, "Now if such a doctor as Suarez knows nothing of the matter, I do not know who does. And he concludes at last, that in strictness, we are only obliged to keep the other commandments without having any affection for God, or our hearts the least inclined to love him; provided we do not hate him; and this he proves throughout his whole second treatise. You will see in every page, but more particularly in the 16, 19, 24, and 28, where are these words: 'God, in commanding us to love him, is satisfied if we obey him in his other commandments.' If God had said, 'Though you keep my commandments ever so well, I will damn you, if you do not moreover give me your heart and affections; do you think that this motive would have been proportioned to that end and design, which God may, and ought to have? It is therefore said that we shall love God, by doing his will, in the same manner as if we loved him affectionately, and had no other bias but that of charity itself. Should that be really the case, so much the better; but if not, we still do not fail strictly to obey the commandment of love, while we perform the works thereof: so that (observe the goodness of God) we are not so much commanded to love him as we are not to hate him."

"Thus have our Fathers (continues M. Pascal) discharged men from the *painful* obligation of loving God with all their hearts. And this doctrine is of that importance, that Fathers Annat, Pintereau, Le Moine, and even A. Sirmond, have stoutly defended it whenever it was attacked; as you may see in their answers to the Moral Theology, but particularly in that of Father Pintereau, 2. p. of Abbe de Boisic, p. 53, where you may judge of the value of this dispensation by the price which it cost, which was no less than the blood of Jesus Christ. But what crowns this doctrine is, that it sets you free from the troublesome duty of loving God, which is the great privilege which the Christians have above the Jews. 'It was reasonable,' says he, 'that by the law of grace in the New Testament, God should take off the troublesome and difficult duties of the law of

rigour, which obliged men to acts of perfect contrition, before they could be justified; and that he should institute certain sacraments, to supply all our defects, by the help of means more easy to be performed: otherwise Christians, who are the children, could not more easily recover the good graces of their Father, than the Jews who were the slaves, could obtain mercy from their God.'"

In short, the sum of the Jesuits' doctrine on this subject is thus shortly given by Pascal: "That this exemption from loving God is the great benefit, or advantage, which Jesus Christ has brought down upon the earth;" and then he expresses his indignation against the doctrine thus inculcated by the leading men of his own church, in the following language, which would do honour to any Protestant:—"What! will the blood of Jesus Christ procure us an exemption from loving him? Before the incarnation, mankind were obliged to love God, but since God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son; shall the world, thus mercifully redeemed by him, be discharged from loving him? Strange divinity of our times! To dare to take off the curse that St Paul pronounces against those who love not the Lord Jesus! To destroy what St John says, That he that loveth not, remaineth in death. Nay, what Jesus Christ himself affirms, 'He that loveth me not, keepeth not my commandments.' Thus you make those worthy to enjoy God through all eternity, who never once loved him in the whole course of their lives. This is the mystery of iniquity complete! Open your eyes at last, my good Father, and if the former errors of your casuists are not discernible enough to strike you, may these last withdraw you, by their glaring impieties."—Vol. I. p. 227. ed. 1744.

Here I shall indulge myself in a short digression, to show the reader in what manner the Jesuits of that day treated this faithful exposure of their impieties, and the then unknown author, who published his Letters one by one, at intervals. They found it impossible to defend themselves by fair argument; and they had recourse to a weapon which their society, in every stage of its existence, has been found to handle more dexterously than any other body of men in the world; that is, lying, downright impudent lying, and calumny. Thus the author of the Provincial Letters, who was a man really concerned for the honour of his church, was asssailed by the Jesuits with every opprobrious epithet; and, to express in one word all the crimes of which they accused him, they called him a HERETIC; and, supposing him to belong to the Society of Port Royal, they accused the whole body, nuns and all, with heresy, particularly of "disbelieving the mystery of transubstantiation, and the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist." This had no connection with the subjects in dispute; for the author of the Letters was a firm believer in that absurdity; but it seems to have been intended, and it had the effect of diverting his mind, at least for a time, from exposing the impiety of their doctrines; for we find he entered immediately on his own defence, which occupies a considerable part of his second volume. In this defence, however, he makes a most pointed exposure of the wickedness of these fathers.

"I shall not only prove," says he, "that your writings are full of scandal, but I shall go farther. It is possible to say a thing that is false, believing it to be true; but the real liar is he that lies with an intention to lie. Now I shall make it appear that you, Fathers, lie with that intention; and that you load your enemies, knowingly and designedly, with crimes of which you positively know that they are innocent."—"For this doctrine of evil speaking is so notorious in your schools, that you have not only maintained it in your books, but, with the most consummate impudence, in your public disputations; as, amongst others, in those at Louvain, in the year 1645, in these terms. It is but a venial sin to ruin the credit of a false accuser, by charging him with false crimes: and this doctrine is so much in vogue with you, that whoever dares to attack it, you treat him as an ignorant fool-hardy fellow."

A capuchin friar who had been accused by the Jesuits in the same manner, is introduced as making the following defence:—"I have stopped their impudence once before, and I will do it again, in the same manner. I declare therefore to all the world that they (the Jesuits) are MOST IMPUDENT LIARS: *Mentiris impudentissime.* If the things they accuse me of be true, let them be proved, or let my accusers from henceforth and for ever stand convicted of a most IMPUDENT LIE. After this challenge, all men will see who is in the right, they or I."—"This honest capuchin, Fathers, has cut off from your reverences all possibility of making a retreat. You are now convicted of being professed detractors, and must defend yourselves by your maxim, that this kind of calumny is no crime at all. This father has found out the way of stopping your mouths; and indeed it is the only way, whenever your accusations want proof. The best answer to every one of you, is that of the Capuchin father, MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME." Such is the character of the Jesuits, drawn, not by a heretical Protestant, but by a brother of their own communion, who knew them well.

The reader will be apt to think that I have lost sight of the subject of Auricular Confession; but this is not the case. I wish to expose, as plainly as I can, the notions which Papists entertain with regard to sin, in order to a better understanding of what they call their sacramental confession. If they knew sin in its true character, as it is described in the

word of God, they would see that it is impossible for a fellow-creature to hear a true confession of it, or to grant absolution; and if by any means they should acquire this knowledge, it would ruin the trade of their father confessors, who are, therefore, directly interested in maintaining false notions of sin, and distracting the minds of the people with distinctions of sins venial and mortal; which they do in such an equivocal and quibbling manner, that they can make any sin belong to the one class, or to the other, according to the disposition of the sinner's mind, or according to the weight of his purse, and his willingness to part with its contents for the good of the church.

The above extracts confirm the truth of some of my remarks in the early part of my work, in which I convicted Popery of representing the Father of mercies as a cruel tyrant. It is only because Papists look upon him in this light, that they can entertain the question for a moment, as a subject of discussion, whether, and how often, they are bound to love him? If they did not regard him with aversion, they could never think of the benefit of being exempted from loving him; and they would never speak of the love of God as a *painful* obligation.

Their doctrine, however, is deeply rooted in human nature. "The carnal mind is enmity against God;" and it is one of the radical vices of Popery, that she professes to save men in their natural state of depravity, by means of her sacraments, which are declared to produce the miraculous effect of reconciling men to God, while yet there is no real change produced in the state of their minds towards God. This accounts for all the nonsense and blasphemy of the Popish writers on the subjects of sin, confession, and absolution, which I have given in this, and intend to give in my future Numbers.

No. LXXXVIII.

SATURDAY, March 18th, 1820.

To love God with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves, is the sum of true religion; but Popery teaches that it is not necessary to love God, except on some extraordinary occasions; and that if we were under obligation to love him at all times, Christians, who are the children of God, would be no better of than the Jews, who were his slaves. It will scarcely be credited, that a doctrine so horribly impious can be held by men even in the lowest state of depravity; but for the truth of what I assert, I refer the reader to the words of their own great divines and casuists which I gave in my last Number, upon the authority of Pascal, one of the greatest, and, I suppose, one of the best men that the church of Rome ever produced.

I proceed now to show, that, by the authority of the same casuists, Papists are also relieved from the obligation of loving their neighbour; and thus being made free from the *painful obligation* of obeying the two commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets, the reader will perceive that the confession of sin, which they have to make to their priests once a year, must be a very light and trivial matter. I am aware that the authority of Escobar, and Suarez, and Filiutius, and Bauny, and Emanuel Sa, and Bellarmine, and all the rest, jointly and severally, is not so great as that of a General Council; but I know at the same time, that the authority of any one of them is great enough to direct the conscience and the conduct of a Papist, if the opinion which he gives on any point of morals be a probable one; and any man may consider as probable whatever he pleases, or whatever may serve his present purpose.

The duty of love to our neighbour is detailed and enjoined in the second table of the law, which commences with the duty of love to parents and superiors. Let us see now how the Jesuits dispense with this troublesome duty. "For what concerns love, Dicastillus saith, that it is not altogether certain, that a child can lawfully desire the death of his father, or rejoice in it, because of the inheritance that may come to him thereby; but he believes that he *sins not mortally* in rejoicing, not in his death considered as an evil to his father, but as a lawful means appointed of God, for him to obtain the succession; not because some evil befel the father, but some good to the son." Tambourin, who wrote after Dicastillus, delivers the doctrine with more confidence. "If you desire the death of your father upon some condition, the answer is easy, that *you may lawfully*. For if one say in himself, if my father should die, I should enjoy his estate; in this case he should not rejoice in his father's death, but in his inheritance." Again, "I desire the death of my father, not because it is an evil to him, but because it is good for me, or because it is the cause of good unto me; and because by this his death, I enter into the possession of my paternal inheritance." I suppose it did not occur to this grave and reverend father, that, according to this *holy* doctrine, a younger brother might lawfully desire his death; and that what it is lawful to desire, it is also lawful to effect, if one be able, and have an opportunity.

Hear again this sad Tambourin, in reply to the following question:—"May an inferior desire the death of his superior, in the church or commonwealth, that he may succeed to his office, or that he may be delivered from him, because he favours him not?" Answer:—"If

you desire only to receive with joy the effect of this death, to wit, the inheritance of a father, the charge of a prelate, the deliverance from some trouble he procured you, the answer is easy, that you may desire all these things lawfully, and that because you rejoice not in the evil of another, but in your own proper good." Here again, I take it for granted, that what it is lawful to desire, it is lawful to do; and by this casuistry of the Jesuits, it is lawful for any person to dispatch his superior in church or state, if he favours him not.

I have before me a folio volume of such morality, which was collected and arranged by a grave doctor of the church of Rome, not with approbation indeed, but with the most decided disapprobation. The work is entitled "*The Jesuits' Morals*, collected by a doctor of the College of Sorbonne in Paris; who hath faithfully extracted them out of the Jesuits' own books, which are printed by the permission and approbation of the superiors of their society." This doctor of the Sorbonne was evidently a Jansenist, a sect, in comparison with the Jesuits, of little account in the church of Rome; for with all her boasted unity, the church of Rome has been as fruitful in sects directly opposed to each other, as Protestants have been at any period. He gives the very words of his authors, in the original Latin, with the most particular references, so that there can be no doubt, with regard to his authorities. The passages above quoted will be found in pages 298, 299, of his work.

He shows, from a great number of passages, that the Fathers of the Jesuits hold it lawful to commit murder in a variety of cases. "It is lawful," says Lessius, "for an honourable person to kill an assailant, who would strike him with a cudgel, or give him a box on the ear to affront him, if he cannot otherwise avoid the disgrace. This may be proved; first, because if one attempt to damnify me in my honour and reputation, by smiting me with a cudgel, or giving me a box on the ear, I may betake me to my arms to keep him off; and by consequence, I have the very same right, if he endeavour to do me some wrong by reproaching me: for it is of small consideration, what means are made use of to do me an injury, if I be hurt as much the one way as the other. In the second place, recourse may be had to arms to hinder an affront; and so also to silence reproaches. In the third place, the danger of losing honour is equal to that of losing life. But it is lawful to kill, to avoid the peril of losing life; and by consequence also for avoiding the danger of losing honour." Again, "if one may kill for fear of losing his money, he may also for fear of taking an affront." Page 305. Our modern men of honour, the fighters of duels, must all have been trained in the school of the Jesuits.

Another grave author pleads for the privilege of the clergy, in the following words:— "That we cannot at least deny that clergymen and friars may, and even are obliged, to defend their honour and reputation, which proceeds from virtue and prudence; because this honour doth appertain to their profession, and that if they lose it, they lose a very great benefit and advantage." "It follows, that it will be lawful for a clergyman, or a monk, to kill a slanderer, who threatens to publish some great crimes against him, or his order, if he have no other means to defend himself therefrom." "You have read," says this author, "the doctrine of Amicus, and you demand whether a monk, that hath sinned through frailty of the flesh, with a woman of base condition, who takes it for an honour to be prostitute to so great a personage, boasts herself of it, and defames him, may kill this woman? I know not what to answer. It is true, I have heard an excellent Father, a doctor in divinity, of great wit and learning, say, that Amicus might well have forborne to propound this proposition; but it being once published in print, he was obliged to maintain it, and we to defend him. This doctrine indeed is probable, and *a monk may kill a woman with whom he hath sinned, for fear she should defame him.*" Page 313. I could fill half-a-dozen of Numbers with extracts from Escobar, and other Fathers, all to the same purpose. I cannot, however, pollute my pages with what these Fathers have written upon the seventh, that is, what they call the sixth, commandment. By their casuistry, they allow persons to be as wicked as they please, provided they do not take pleasure in actions *as wicked.* By what they call directing the intention, a man may commit the greatest crimes, and be guilty of no more than venial sin, or not even so much.

According to the same authors, theft is a harmless thing. Thus Emanuel Sa teaches: "He who in taking what is another's, doth him no prejudice, because he made no use of it, and was not like to use it, is not obliged to restitution." Escobar asks, "If a man, after many small thefts, hath taken the last halfpenny which makes up a great theft, whereof he thereby becomes guilty, be obliged to restore all the sum, which was composed of these petty thefts?" to which he replies, "He is not obliged, under mortal sin, to make restitution of all the sum, but only part, which being taken off, the theft would be no more criminal." Page 341.

The Jesuits have applied all their skill to evade the force of the ninth commandment. Lying is as necessary for the support of Popery, as meat and drink are for the support of our bodies. It is therefore indispensable, that it be considered only a venial sin, or in most cases, no sin at all. Dicastillus demands,

"Whether he be obliged to retract, who hath affirmed some falsity which will cost the loss of life, or member, to another, when the witness by his retraction will incur the same penalty?" and answers; "That he believes that if the false witness have not sinned mortally by bearing this false testimony, he is not obliged, after understanding the truth, to retract what he had said, so exposing himself to great evils." Hurtado teaches, and Tambourin approves it, that "a scholar, having need to prove that he had gone through his course, and having need of two witnesses hereof, may employ therein two of his friends who have not seen him go to the lectures, but are sufficiently persuaded that he did attend them: but they may not *swear* for all that, that they have seen him go." Page 346. That is, they may not swear, but they may *affirm* what they do not know to be true; and we shall see presently that these doctors do not look upon a false oath as a mortal sin.

Filiutius instances, in the case of promises and oaths, speaking of one who promised something outwardly, without intention of performing, "For if one ask him if he have promised, he may say no, intending that he had not promised, by any promise that obliged him; and by consequence he may also swear, for otherwise he should be constrained to pay what he owes not." Sanchez, speaking of the same thing, says, "All the difficulty is reduced to this, to know if he that hath sworn had an intent to swear, but not be obliged in swearing, if he be truly obliged?" After reporting the opinions and the reasons of those who hold that the oath obliges, he adds; "The second opinion which I hold more probable, holds, that in this case the oath obliges not at all." Page. 47. By this rule a man may swear to any thing, and yet not be bound; for it was only his intention to take the oath, but not to be bound by it. "If you be assured," says Tambourin, "that you have made a vow, or an oath, and you doubt whether you had an intent to oblige yourself, or if the words which you used in your oath contained an invocation of God, at least a tacit one, I believe it is probable that you are not obliged to keep it."

Considering all these things, the reader must be convinced, that confession in the church of Rome must be a very easy matter; and that most persons will have very few sins to confess. There is not one of the divine commandments, by which a person can be convicted of mortal sin, though he had transgressed them all a thousand times in the course of the year, if he be but ingenious enough to apply the doctrine of intention to all his actions. He may have desired the death of his father or of his civil superior; he may have killed the man who had affronted, or designed to affront him, and the woman who had it in her power to divulge his wickedness; he may have embezzled the property of another; and he may have invented a thousand lies in order to ruin his neighbour, if he had but a suspicion that his neighbour had an ill will towards him: in short, he may have been a habitual blasphemer, and murderer, and adulterer, and thief, and liar, and yet be held not guilty of any mortal sin, because he did not these things, taking pleasure in them *as sins*, but for some desirable and necessary purpose. When he goes to confession, he may tell his priest why and wherefore he did such things; and if his confessor be a Jesuit, he will admit the force of every extenuating circumstance, and, according to the morality of his order, exact no more in the way of penance than what he may consider agreeable to the penitent himself.

Besides, persons in meaner circumstances, who do not stand so high in the esteem of the Jesuits as the rich and the great, may get over the painful duty of confession very easily, if they will go to the priest at the season of the year when he has most work on his hands, or if they will only be at the pains to concert matters with their poor neighbours, so as to go to the priest in forties or fifties at a time; for he must hear them all separately; and the Jesuits have a rule, that when they have many penitents to attend to, they need not be very particular in rummaging the conscience of any one of them. Thus Bauny teaches: "That if any one of ignorance or simplicity confess his faults only in gross, without determinately expressing any one of them in particular, there is no need to draw from his mouth the repetition of those faults, if it cannot conveniently be done; because the confessor is pressed with penitents that give him not leisure for it."

The priest, however, is empowered to grant absolution of the penitent's sins, though he should not have heard of what nature they are, and this absolûtion is as effectual as if he had heard a confession of them all, with every symptom of deep sorrow on the part of the penitent. It is not, however, necessary, in ordinary cases, that a penitent should be very sorrowful on account of his sins. Some of the above cited fathers teach that contrition is indeed a desirable thing, if one can come at it; but if not, they say that attrition is enough. Now this word attrition does not signify sorrow for sin as displeasing to God; but only such sorrow as arises from the fear of punishment. It is quite consistent with a state of mind at enmity against God; and yet with this hatred of God in their hearts, the priest grants them the pardon of all their sins, and sends them away with the belief that God has pardoned them too; and that if they were to die immediately, they would certainly go to heaven, either directly, or by way of purgatory. Every intelligent Christian must be convinced that this doctrine could proceed

only from the father of lies, and the enemy of men's souls.

In order to absolution, it is indeed required in ordinary cases, that the penitent should *resolve* to forsake his sins and lead a new life; but it is not in all cases necessary that this resolution be sincere, or that there be a probability of his fulfilling it. Father Bauny confesses that "oftentimes it be supposed that such resolutions come but from the teeth outwards." Emanuel Sa says the same thing, and adds, "we may absolve him who resolves to abstain from sin, though he himself believe that he shall not hold his resolution." Again, says the same father, "that he may be absolved, who from just and reasonable cause will not quit the occasion of sin, provided he make a firm resolution that he will not sin any more; though he have already relapsed thereinto many times." *Just* and *reasonable* cause for not quitting occasion of sin, is elsewhere explained to be, going into bad company for the sake of doing them good, though the person doing so have reason from former experience to suspect that they will lead him to sin, rather than that he shall lead them to forsake it. Again, Father Bauny teaches, "If, notwithstanding all that they have said and promised to their confessor in times past, they cannot forbear to break out into excess and greater liberty in the very same faults as before, they ought to be admitted to the sacrament, and may be absolved."—"That the penitent purposing with true affection, and resorting to the feet of the priest to put an end to his sins, deserves to receive pardon though he amend not." Dicastillus speaks without hesitation on this subject:—"that after it is experimented that he amends not at all, and after it is known that the penitent hath no will to quit the occasions, absolution may be given him. And when there is some reasonable cause why the penitent should not separate himself from the occasion of sin, though the penitent have relapsed into it very frequently, he is not to be obliged to avoid it, nor to be deprived of absolution, though his relapses be very frequent; he ought on the contrary to be exhorted to come frequently to confession." See *Jesuits' Morals*, p. 211—213.

Thus it appears that sin is the staple commodity of traffic in the church of Rome. It is by this that she has her wealth; and if persons were not perpetually sinning, and professing to repent at least once a-year, the priests might shut shop. The greatest sinner is in fact the best customer; and, as in the case last cited, one who relapses very frequently, must not be obliged to avoid sin, or the occasion of it; he must rather be exhorted to come more frequently to confession; and as he must not come empty handed, the greater sinner he is, he is so much the better member of the holy church.

I expect to hear that our British Papists reject the authority of the great Fathers from whose writings I have made such liberal extracts. They will plead that the Jesuit casuists were not the "Catholic Church," and that therefore what they teach is not necessarily catholic doctrine. I might, perhaps, admit the plea, if it were urged by any other church than that of Rome; but as she firmly maintains, that all her priests are, in virtue of their ordination, successors of the apostles, and endowed with the authority of apostles to declare the word of God and the true meaning of the scriptures with infallible certainty, she has no right to object to any doctrine which her priests may inculcate. Every lay person is in fact bound, under pain of anathema, to receive and hold fast whatever his priest may tell him on matters of faith. This is not the case in Protestant churches. In them every member is exhorted to read the Bible, and judge for himself; and to receive nothing from the mouth of any man except what he finds supported by the word of God. It is quite otherwise in the church of Rome, in which it is declared unlawful to exercise private judgment; and that every man must, under pain of damnation, receive implicitly what is taught by his priest. Besides, the works from which the above extracts are made contain not the sentiments of mere individual priests; they have the sanction of the superiors of the order of Jesuits, which is virtually the sanction of the whole body, not of the Jesuits only, but of the whole church, of which they are the most active agents and defenders.

I will show farther, that whatever the more consistent Papists of Spain and Portugal may plead on this subject, those in Britain are fairly committed as identifying themselves with the Jesuits. The Orthodox Journal, which is declared by itself to be now the only "Catholic Journal" in Britain, in the Number which has just reached me, speaks of the Jesuits as the most meritorious order with which the church was ever blessed; and ascribes all the evils which have befallen Europe, during the last thirty years, to the suppression of the order; for such was their *pure morality*, and other good qualities, that had they not been suppressed, the French Revolution would probably not have taken place, and all its bitter consequences would have been prevented. This is the avowed opinion of the public organ of the English Papists, who is known to write under the patronage of a right reverend Vicar Apostolic, and who may be presumed to have the concurrence of the great body of his brethren. Let us hear, then, his account of the Society of Jesuits:—

"The admirable constitution by which this renowned order was governed, showed the knowledge which its sainted founder had of human nature. By its rules, ambition, jeal-

ousy, and vain glory, were unknown among the disciples of Loyola, because there was no chance whatever left them to gratify these inordinate passions of the heart." It seems to be a rule with all Popish writers, to disavow most peremptorily those vices of which they are most notoriously guilty; and thus, it seems, the Jesuits could not be accused of *ambition*, though their object was no less than to have the direction of all the governments in Christendom, and ultimately of the whole world.

I have not room for one half of what this writer says in praise of the Jesuits; but it may come in my way again.

I beg leave to recommend to the reader a small pamphlet just published, entitled, "God's revenge against Rebellion; an historical Poem: with copious notes, illustrative of the present state of Ireland: Occasioned by a late edict from Rome, and a circular letter of a titular bishop in the west of Ireland, against Bibles and Protestant Schoolmasters. By the Rev. John Graham, M. A." This Poem was addressed to THE PROTESTANT, but being too large for insertion in his work, he recommended its separate publication. It contains a great deal of information with regard to the present state of Ireland, and the mischiefs occasioned by Popery in that unhappy country. It may be had of all the Booksellers, price sixpence. I am indebted to the Author for many other valuable communications, particularly the Poem inserted in my 81st and 86th Numbers.

No. LXXXIX.

SATURDAY, MARCH 25TH, 1820.

THE following letter contains only one paragraph on auricular confession, which is my present subject of discussion; but that paragraph, which contains the testimony of a living credible witness, is worth fifty arguments in order to demonstrate the wickedness of Popery in this matter alone. Indeed, the whole letter is so very interesting, that I am sure the reader will thank me for interrupting the course of my argument in order to give place to it.

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"*Lillieslief*, 12*th February*, 1820.

"MY DEAR SIR,—While the facts I am now going to state, will form my apology for troubling you with this long letter, they will show you that I must feel a more than ordinary interest in the admirable work which you are carrying on, under title of "THE PROTESTANT."

"I am a native of Ireland; and was brought up in the profession of Christianity, as taught by the ministers of the church of Rome, until about the beginning of the 18th year of my age. In my early years, I was favonred with a better education than Papists generally give their children in that ill-fated, but admirable country. Protestants forming a large portion of the community, the Bible was among us a common school-book: this is a circumstance for which I can never be sufficiently grateful; for although I did not then understand the will of God as revealed in the Bible, the repeated perusal of it rendered its language and sentiments familiar to my mind; and the knowledge which I thus acquired was afterwards of great use to me.

"In my 16th year, I was, by the advice of my parents and the priest, admitted to the communion of the church. I had then, and once afterwards, a specimen of 'auricular confession:' to these two events in my life, I look back with horror! If auricular confession be at all times conducted as it was when I engaged in it, I have no hesitation in saying, that I consider it one of the most abominable and corrupting institutions of Popery. If the person confessing hesitates for a moment, through defect of memory, or through the feelings of shame, the father confessor proposes a leading question on the various kinds and degrees of iniquity, and thus stimulates the reluctant devotee, and drags from him or her the inmost secrets of the heart. To say a single word in explanation of the questions which a father confessor will thus propose to a young man or a young woman, to a husband or a wife, would be to imitate his vile example. You will perceive, at a single glance, that they tend to increase the knowledge of the young and simple in the ways of transgression, and to render vices, of the most injurious and disgusting kind, familiar to all.

"About the time I have already mentioned, a Protestant friend lent me three sermons, which he had bought from some person selling tracts. These sermons are by three men whose praise is deservedly great in the churches of Christ—Thomas Boston, E. and R. Erskine. The sermon by Mr Boston is called 'The Everlasting Espousals,' on these words, (Hosea ii. 19.) 'I will betroth thee unto me for ever;' the one by Mr Ebenezer Erskine, is called 'The Plant of Renown,' on Ezekiel xxxiv. 29; and the one by Ralph Erskine, is on Isaiah xlv. 11. In the sermon by E. Erskine, the person and work of Jesus Christ as Mediator, are exhibited with great force and accuracy; in the sermon by Mr Boston, the way in which the people of God are brought into his family, and made partakers of its blessings, are delineated in the peculiar manner of that able and evangelical writer; and in the sermon by R. Erskine, there is a full account of the high privilege of believers, in being allowed at all times to approach into

the presence of their God and Father, through Jesus the only Mediator, to supplicate those things which are promised to them, and of which they have need.

"The perusal of these sermons produced a deep and painful impression upon my mind. All my former views of religion were distracted and confounded; and new views of sin and duty were forcibly pressed upon my attention. In these sermons, the Scriptures seemed to me to speak a new language, and to present to my mind an entirely new scene of contemplation; they certainly set before me the ground of a sinner's hope of pardon and acceptance with God, in a light directly opposite to that in which I was formerly taught to view them. But although I was by the perusal of these sermons surprised and confounded, I was not convinced. I determined to read them again with my Bible in my hand; and I did so, comparing every opinion of the writer, and every passage which they quoted in support of their opinions, with the oracles of God. This second perusal increased the pain I felt in a very high degree. From the Scriptures I found I could not refute the doctrines taught in these sermons; and to admit these doctrines to be true, was, according to the lessons I had been taught from my infancy, to expose myself to all the horrors of eternal damnation. In this state of mind I knew not what to do, I dared not consult my parents; for to do so, I certainly knew was to bring upon me their high displeasure, and perhaps all the sarcasm and censures of my ghostly father; and to apply to any Protestant, I felt was in some measure to commit myself, without being fully persuaded in my own mind. Thus matters proceeded with me for some time. I read the Scriptures, and some Protestant books which I procured from the same friend, most attentively; offered up frequent and fervent prayers to Almighty God for light to perceive, and courage to persevere, in the way of duty; and often went to hear the sermons of some Presbyterian ministers in the neighbourhood. While proceeding in this tenor of conduct, I found light gradually shed on my mind, and I thought I began in some measure to perceive the way in which I ought to go.

"By the manner in which I had for some time conducted myself, I had attracted the attention of my mother. Observing my absence from mass, and hearing of my attendance at Protestant places of worship, she began to dread the very worst of me that a Popish parent can dread of a child—heresy. It was on a Sabbath morning that she first spoke to me on the subject. She began by asking me, 'if I was going that day with the rest of the family to prayers?' At that moment my whole frame shook; and, through fear and anxiety, I found myself wholly unable to speak. I had long wished for such an opportunity as this, to speak to my tender-hearted and affectionate mother, on a subject that engrossed my whole attention; and yet, when it presented itself to me unexpectedly, I found myself quite unable. She saw my confusion, and was grieved to the heart. The sorrow I saw in her face was the first thing that roused me from the stupor into which I had sunk; and I said to her, 'No—I am not going with the rest of the family to prayers to-day.' She said, 'Why?' I had been reading in the New Testament when this conversation commenced, and holding it out to her, I said—'Because I find no authority for mass in this book.' She quickly asked what book it was, I was reading? and I told her. She then felt all that a tender-hearted affectionate Roman Catholic mother could feel in such circumstances; and I find, Sir, nineteen years after this interview, that I have not nerves to proceed with the story of it.

"Of the part I had now acted, the priest was soon informed; and, with the mild and merciful spirit of his order, he passed sentence upon me, without ever condescending to converse with me, and without ever making a single effort to enlighten my mind, and reclaim me from my supposed heresy. The sentence which he passed, as I was informed, was, 'That I was a heretic, and must be banished from the family;' sagely adding, 'That the clean must be kept from the unclean.' This sentence, though communicated to me, my parents, influenced by strong affection, hesitated to carry into execution. But a Popish priest knows nothing about parental affection, and cares far less about it, in such a case as this. He therefore repeated the sentence, and accompanied the repetition with considerations fitted to command an immediate compliance. A Popish priest in Ireland is never at a loss for considerations to influence the conduct of his flock, in matters connected with their religion. In obedience, therefore, to the repeated commands of a man who called himself a minister of the gospel of peace, and who professed himself a disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, I was banished from my father's house, for no crime—but the crime of desiring to worship the God that made me, according to the dictates of my conscience!

"I believe my parents thought that the very attempt to banish me from the family, would bring me to an immediate submission; and that they, on that account, yielded the more easily to the commands of the priest. In the affair my father took no direct hand: the painful task devolved upon my mother; and I believe was devolved upon her, in the hope that her tenderness and affection would so work upon my feelings, that I would not be able to part with her. On the day fixed for this banishment, she rolled up a small parcel of linens, and desired me, with an aching heart, to accompany her on a short journey. I did so;

and when about a mile from the village, she stopped suddenly, and made the last appeal to my feelings. She did every thing which reasoning, and prayers, and tears could do, to induce me to return to the bosom of that church out of which she believed, and declared, there is no salvation. I felt deeply and wept bitterly; but God enabled me to remain faithful. After some minutes of great suffering on both sides, we parted; and I was not permitted for about two years to enter my father's house, although I had often occasion to pass very near to it. At the time I have now mentioned, a man who had more sagacity, and more of the milk of human kindness in his constitution, than many of his brethren, and who had stood sponsor for me when I was baptized, interfered, as he had a right to do, according to the principles of his church, in my behalf. He called on my parents, and, I believe, on the priest, and reasoned with him very seriously about the manner in which they had dealt with me. He charged them with harshness and cruelty; and declared that the treatment I had received, was more fitted to harden, than reclaim any human being. Through this interference I was again permitted to visit my father's family. Of this permission I immediately availed myself; and though I have not since resided with my parents, we have still been on a very friendly footing, and carry on a friendly correspondence. After an absence of nine years, I paid them a visit last harvest, and met with a reception full of parental kindness and affection.

"After my banishment from my father's house the Lord provided for my temporal support in a manner wonderfully gracious. 'When my father and my mother forsook me, then the Lord took me up.' Indeed, Sir, when I look back, which I frequently do, upon the way by which God has led me, I must consider myself, in a peculiar manner, a child of Providence. He has often brought me, while blind, by a way which I knew not, and led me in paths that I had not known: he has often made darkness light before me, and crooked things straight. But how pleasing soever to my own mind, I must quit this part of my story, as in some measure foreign to the design of this letter.

"My chief difficulty at this time arose from an inquiry very natural in my circumstances. This inquiry was, 'With whom shall I now join in worshipping God?' A Papist I could no longer be. The harsh and cruel manner in which I had been treated, made an indelible impression upon my heart; and convinced me, that persons capable of acting as Papists had acted towards me, were destitute of the spirit and the faith of Christ. But the treatment I had received was not the thing which chiefly influenced me against Popery and Papists; the thing which chiefly influenced me against them was, their direct opposition, in almost all the great matters of faith and practice, to the Scriptures of truth. This direct opposition appeared to me most striking, on the atonement and intercession of Christ, on the doctrines of justification and sanctification, on faith and repentance, and on the respect due to the Virgin Mary, and other reputed saints. On these, and on many other things, I was then, and I am still, of opinion, that Papists are directly opposed to the unerring oracles of God.

"But although I had renounced Popery, there was much of Popery in my views and feelings. I was, to a certain extent, a Protestant; but having emerged from a region of thick darkness, I was not able to form an accurate notion of many things connected with Protestantism. I well remember that nothing perplexed me more, than to form a just notion of what is meant in the New Testament, by the word 'church.' From my infancy I had been taught to consider the 'church' a mysterious something—made up of I knew not, and never was told, what—possessing the attributes of holiness, unity, and infallibility. But when I viewed Protestantism as set before me in Ireland, broken down into so many opposing fragments, I could see no such 'church' as the one to which my mind had been familiar from my youth. This circumstance embarrassed me much; and to increase my embarrassment, those Papists with whom I had occasion to converse, dwelt with unrelenting severity on the subject. It did not then occur to me, that the 'church' of Christ is composed of believers in his person and work, of different ages and countries—and sometimes different from each other, in the peculiar features of their character, and in many of their opinions; but all agreeing about the great articles of our holy religion, all united to the same Saviour, partakers of the same grace, and expectants of the same glorious immortality. The thing for which I looked, and which I always expected, was a visible organized body, which was exclusively the church of Christ, and concerning which all that is said in Scripture might be fulfilled.—I have dwelt the more fully on this matter, because I know it is one of the great stumbling-blocks of Papists, and one of the means most successfully employed to keep them in the darkness of Popery; and because it tended, for many months, to embitter my own existence. Having a firm hold of my mind (as indeed all the dogmas of Popery have on the minds of those who believe them,) I was not able, for about two years, to get wholly rid of it, and so become a member of some Protestant community. During this period, I continued to worship sometimes with one class of Protestants, and sometimes with another, until my views of divine truth became clearer, and I found a body of Christians with whom I could join in religious fellowship. This I did with one, with which I am still connected.

"I have just now mentioned, that all the dogmas of Popery have a firm hold of the minds of those who believe them. As I deem facts of far more use to you than reasonings, I will here give you my own experience; and I presume what I am now going to state, will lead you to conclude, that there may be many Papists convinced of the falsehood and absurdity of many of the doctrines which they are taught, but who dare not give way to their convictions. Long after I had renounced Popery, and was perfectly convinced of the falsehood and absurdity of its peculiar tenets, I have, on a moment's reflection on what I had done, felt my whole frame shudder. At such a moment, I have involuntarily trembled from head to foot, as if I had leaped a tremendous precipice, into which I was in danger of falling backward. Such horror of mind, and such convulsion of my whole frame, were most frequently excited, by a very trifling and absurd doctrine of the Popish church. This doctrine is, 'that it is sinful to eat flesh on certain days of the week.' But trifling and absurd as is this doctrine, and although I was convinced from reason and from Scripture, 'that every creature of God is good, and ought to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth; yet while eating flesh on a Friday, or Saturday, a sudden thought of the possible criminality of my conduct has darted on my mind, and convulsed my whole body, so that the knife and fork have fallen from my powerless hands on the table. This circumstance sometimes excited the laughter, but always awakened the pity, of the amiable Protestant family in which I resided.

"I have given you this, only as a specimen of the hold which their peculiar opinions have of the minds of Papists. Nor is it wonderful that these peculiar opinions should have such a hold of their minds. From the day on which they are first capable of forming a notion on any subject, they are impressed with the most awful ideas of their church, and all her doctrines and institutions. Their parents have been taught before them, and they are taught in their turn—that out of their church there is absolutely no salvation; and that to doubt or dispute any thing which she teaches, on any ground whatever, is most certainly to expose them to all the horrors of eternal perdition. In connection with these lessons, they are taught to hate and abhor all Protestants, of every class and description, and to hate and abhor every thing that is peculiar to them; but while they are taught these things, they are also taught to use every means in their power, without scruple (for the end sanctifies the means), to convert and bring them to the profession of their holy and infallible religion; and to induce them to engage in this work of conversion, they are assured that it is very acceptable to God, and very conducive to their own salvation.

"Such is the way in which I was taught from my infancy, and such is the way in which all the Papists with whom I was acquainted, taught their children. Of the influence which such a mode of teaching is fitted to have on the minds of youthful persons, you can be at no loss to judge. The impressions made on the mind in the nursery, are at no time, and in no circumstances, easily effaced; and I know that Popish parents make it their peculiar business, in every period of life, to strengthen and confirm the impressions which they have made on the minds of their children in religious matters.—It is to this mode of teaching that I ascribe several circumstances peculiarly characteristic of Papists. You are here, and indeed in the whole of this letter, to consider me as referring to Irish Papists, for it is with them that I am best acquainted; yet I presume the facts which I state are applicable to Papists in every country.

"It is, I think, owing to the peculiar mode in which he is taught from his infancy, that a good staunch Papist is one of the most credulous, and one of the most incredulous of human beings. Such a Papist firmly believes, that the apostle Peter is the very rock on which Christ hath built his church; he firmly believes that an ignorant and guilty creature, whom he calls a priest, can, by a few words, convert a piece of bread into the very God that made him—into the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; that every human being on the face of the earth, might each of them eat this God whole and entire, at the same instant of time, and that this might be done every day; and he believes that the Virgin Mary, or any other saint in heaven, may hear a thousand millions of prayers, offered up at the same moment, from a thousand millions of different parts of the earth. A person capable of believing such things as these, one would think capable of believing any thing which human language could be employed to express. But no such thing: the very person who will firmly believe all these monstrously absurd positions, will not believe a single word that is said against them. You may set before him the most clear and convincing arguments on these subjects from Scripture, from the dictates of reason, and from the testimony of his own senses; but you will set them before him in vain. Nay, the more clear and convincing these arguments are, he will be the more averse to them, and the more unwilling to listen to you. Thus, while he is on the one side credulous to the last degree, he is on the other most incredulous. Is such a person one of those 'who receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, and to whom God sends strong delusion that they should believe a lie?'"

As there is not room for another paragraph, I shall break off the narrative here, and resume

it in my next Number. The writer is an entire stranger to me; but he is well known to several gentlemen of this city, to whom he has given me a reference; and such of them as I have had an opportunity of seeing, bear the most ample testimony to his character as a Christian, and his talents and usefulness as a minister of the gospel. He has kindly allowed me to give his name, which will appear in its proper place.

No. XC.

SATURDAY, April 1st, 1820.

(*Continued from No.* LXXXIX.)

"The last word in the preceding paragraph recalls my attention to another circumstance peculiarly characteristic of Papists, and which, in my view of the matter, springs from the manner in which they are taught. This circumstance is their proneness to dissimulation and falsehood, when they think they will promote the cause of their holy and infallible church. To do justice to this subject would require more time than I can at present spare; and the light which you have already thrown on it, renders any thing like a full discussion of it by me, quite unnecessary. There are, however, two ways in which Papists manifest a proneness to dissimulation and falsehood, in favour of their church, on which, as far as I remember, you have not yet touched.—One of these ways is, by denying or maintaining certain doctrines, when they think that either the one or the other will best serve their cause. There are two subjects on which they are, in this respect, dreadfully guilty. These are, 'the power of the priest to forgive sins,' and 'the kind of worship which they pay, and ought to pay, to saints and images.' On these subjects, I have met Papists, who maintained directly opposite opinions; and who maintained them at different times, with equal vigour and virulence. But take which side they please, they are at all times ready to quote scripture, and abuse Protestants for misrepresenting them. The other way in which Papists are guilty of dissimulation and falsehood, in favour of their holy and infallible church, is, by denying that they are Papists, and publicly professing themselves Protestants. This is a thing very often done. But I do not rest my charge, so much on the numbers who actually do this, as on those who approve of it where it is done. There is nothing among Papists more common, than to represent a large portion of the great, even the greatest, in our land, as like king Charles the Second, Catholics in heart, though Protestants by public profession; and, instead of considering this a disgrace, they consider it one of the great glories of their church. Nothing they think can confer higher honour on their cause, than for persons who have lived Protestants to die in their communion; and rather than lose such honours as these, they will invent and publish a thousand falsehoods. From what I have read of your work, Sir, I presume you are too good a 'Protestant' to envy Papists the honour of such persons dying in their communion. Persons whose last act on earth, is to proclaim their infamy, by publishing their hypocrisy, are surely such as 'shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt;' such as 'shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation.' 'How can these hypocrites—how can this generation of vipers, escape the damnation of hell?'

"Persons educated, and capable of acting in the manner now described, could not be uninterested spectators of the change I had made. Their conduct in reference to this change, is worthy of notice, as it strikingly indicates the spirit of Popery. As soon as the fact got abroad, the hue and cry was raised against me; and every effort was made to hunt me down. Motives, at once the most abominable and the most inconsistent with each other, were ascribed to me, and were employed to account for the atrocious and damnable part I had acted. Truth and decency, and every thing else, fitted to do honour to a religious profession, were readily sacrificed to render me odious, and to excite suspicion against me among Protestants. Nor did they in some cases labour in vain. There were among my acquaintances some Protestants, not unlike one to whom you have given some portion of celebrity, not very enviable. They were indeed Protestants; but this was owing to a mere circumstance; and that circumstance is, that their parents happened to be Protestants before them. This was all the reason they could give for their religious profession; and they did not hesitate to say 'that no man ought to be trusted, who could change his religion.' The number of such ignorant and inconsistent Protestants was but small; and instead of injuring, their conduct ultimately did me much good. It excited the sympathy and the kindness of many who might otherwise have taken little interest in my affairs. The friends whom God then raised up for me, have not since for a single moment forsaken me. I found them in August last, the same kind, warm-hearted, generous friends, I had found them nineteen years before.

"But the efforts of Papists were not in my case, more than in the case of others, who had gone in the same way before me, to be confined to words. A John Huss and a Jerome of Prague could be reasoned with and abused; but if reasoning and abuse would not reclaim them from heresy, Papists could wield other weapons, and they did wield them. In suffering some personal violence for daring to think

for myself, on the things that belong to my peace, "no new thing happened to me." When arguments and calumny failed to bring me back to the mother church, some of her worthy sons endeavoured on two occasions, by blood and battery to convince me of the errors into which I had fallen. On both these occasions I had recourse to the law of the land for protection and punishment; and had no little reason to rejoice, that the laws were administered by Protestants. On one of these occasions, a severe fine was exacted, and considerable bail demanded and given, for the future good behaviour of the culprit, or I should rather say, "of the zealous, pious, and peaceable missionary of the holy and infallible church of Rome."

"Soon after this event, I came to Scotland; and must say that I found in it Papists as bigotted and as intolerant as I met with in Ireland. Of their bigotry and intolerance I could mention some facts; but they are unnecessary. They would at any rate be but as drops added to the ocean.

"When I reflect, Sir, on 'the great things which God hath done for me, I should indeed be glad. My mouth should be filled with laughter, and my tongue with singing.' I have been delivered from great darkness, and, I must add, from great danger. I will not say, That none within the pale of the church of Rome are saved, I would fondly hope that there are many within the pale of that church, who do not believe all, and trust in all, that is taught them, by their priests; but who chiefly take the oracles of God for their guide, and firmly trust in that atonement which is revealed in them, as the foundation of pardon and acceptance with God. Being Papists, however, much of the abominations of Popery must adhere to their opinions and practices; and before they can become partakers of eternal salvation, they must be purified from all these—and themselves 'saved yet so as by fire.' But, while charity leads me to hope this, I must declare that I could not hope it of one whose views of religion are similar to those I was taught, and which I entertained, when a Papist. Such views are most certainly subversive of the mediation of Christ; and render it of none effect to them who are under their influence. In such a state of things, then, I must have been lost! and lost for ever! How grateful ought I to be for the mighty and merciful deliverance I have experienced from such darkness and danger! O that I were enabled to walk worthy of it! 'Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul; and forget not all his benefits: who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies.'

"With what is contained in the preceding pages, Sir, you are at liberty to do as you think proper; and if you think proper to publish any part of them, you are at liberty to give or withhold my name as you please.—Of the truth of the facts contained in these pages, you need have no doubt. Many of them must, from their nature, depend upon my own authority; but for all those of a public kind, I can, if necessary, produce hundreds of witnesses, Popish and Protestant. 'These things were not done in a corner.' Of my own character I forbear to say any thing, but, as I presume I am entirely unknown to you, I refer you to the following gentlemen in Glasgow; gentlemen with whom I have had the honour of being more or less intimate, for many years.—[Then follow the names of five clergymen, and several other gentlemen, of this city.]

"I am, Sir, yours truly,

"PATRICK BRADLEY."

I return now to the subject of auricular confession, which will yet occupy severa Numbers of my work.

According to the casuistry of the Jesuits, as given in their own words, in my 87th and 88th Numbers, it appears that the disciples of Loyola, and of course our English Papists, who approve the principles of that order, may break at pleasure any or all the divine commandments, and yet not be guilty of mortal sin. I inferred from this that confession of sin once a year to a priest must be a very trifling matter; and no more than a mere form, at least so far as regards transgressions of the law of God; for I admit that sins against any commandment of the church are not so easily passed over, or explained away, but must be atoned for by the most rigorous penance. He who shall commit the great sin of eating flesh on a Friday, or of going into a Protestant place of worship, or who shall fall short of paying any of his church dues, and who shall confess any of these faults to his priest, will be dealt with more severely, than the man who has only blasphemed his Maker, or murdered his neighbour.

But though confession is thus made easy to the Jesuits, and all the truly initiated, it is a very dreadful thing to the simple faithful, who retain any traces of reverence for the law of God, and who are not instructed in the quibbling casuistry which makes it void. To come before a priest in order to make confession, is such a solemn and important step, that in order to do it properly, the penitent is recommended to spend several days in humiliation before God. Thus the priest is the principal object of reverence, for the sinner must not approach him without preparation and humiliation, whereas he may come to his Maker at once.

In order to prove this, I shall insert here a whole chapter of instructions from Challoner's

"Garden of the Soul," one of their most popular books of devotion; a book that contains a great deal of matter which has the appearance of piety, but all directed to a wrong object. It is very much like what I should imagine to have been the devotions of the Babylonians to Bell and Nebo, expressed in the language of Sion:—

"INSTRUCTIONS AND DEVOTIONS FOR CONFESSION.—In order to prepare yourself to make a good confession, endeavour, in the first place, to recommend the matter earnestly to God; and for some days before, and frequently and fervently, beg his divine grace and assistance: and this more especially, if you have for a long time lived in the habit of sin: in which case it is most proper to prepare yourself by a spiritual retreat of some days, during which time you may seriously enter into yourself, and perform the ten meditations (which we have transcribed above from *St Francis de Sales*) or such like devotions, by which you may be sufficiently disposed for so great a work; which otherwise 'tis to be feared might be ill done by being done too hastily.

"Examine your conscience with care and diligence, yet without too much anxiety and scrupulosity. Consult the table of sins to help your memory; and reflect in particular on the evil inclinations you are most subject to, on the places and companies you have been in, on your usual employments, on the duties of your calling, and how you have discharged them, &c. And in every sin, whether of commission or omission, strive to call to your remembrance the number of times you have been guilty.

"When you have duly examined your conscience, don't think this is all you have to do in order to be rightly prepared for confession; the greatest part of the work remains still to be done; and that is, to take proper time and care to procure a hearty sorrow and detestation of all your sins, by which you have offended so good a God, with a full determination, with the grace of God, to avoid the like sins for the future, and to fly the occasions which usually bring you to sin; and to take proper measures to begin a new life.

"In order to obtain this hearty sorrow for your sins, and this firm purpose of amendment, you must earnestly beg it of God, whose gift it is; and you must make use of such prayers, considerations and meditations as be most proper to move you to it. Particularly reflect on the four last things, on the enormity of sin, on the goodness of God, and his benefits to you, on the death and passion of Christ, &c. And when you have obtained this hearty sorrow and resolution, then you may hope that you are sufficiently prepared for confession, and not till then.

"If you have any thing upon your conscience, which you have a particular difficulty of confessing, cease not with prayers and tears to importune your heavenly Father to assist you in that regard till he gives you grace to overcome that difficulty: and be sure never to go to confession with a design of telling a lie to the Holy Ghost. Ah! what a comfort it will be to you to ease your conscience of its load! and what a rack and torture sacrilegiously to conceal it!

"Let your confession be humble, without seeking excuses for your sins, or flinging the fault on others; let it be entire as to the kind and number of your sins, and such circumstances as quite change the nature of the sin, or notoriously aggravate it. Be modest in your expressions, and take care not to name any third person."

Then follows "a prayer to implore the divine assistance, in order to make a good confession." The prayer is a pretty long one, and the language is very like that of devotion. The following are extracts from it:—"I desire now to comply with thy holy institution of the sacrament of penance; I desire to confess my sins with all sincerity to thee and to thy minister: and therefore I desire to know myself, and to call myself to an account, by a diligent examination of my conscience. But, O my God, how miserably shall I deceive myself, if thou assist me not in this great work by thy heavenly light." That is the *great work* of telling to a fellow creature the sins which he has committed against God; and although God alone be the party offended by his sins, he is taught to speak as if he were certain that God would take his part, and help him to make a proper appearance before his priest. This prayer concludes as follows:—"O blessed Virgin, mother of my Redeemer, mirror of innocence and sanctity, and refuge of penitent sinners, intercede for me through the passion of thy Son, that I may have the grace to make a good confession. All you blessed angels and saints of God, pray for me, a poor miserable sinner, that I may now, for good and all, turn from my evil ways, that so henceforth my heart may be for ever united with yours in eternal love, and never go astray from the sovereign good. *Amen.*" The following note is appended:—"This, or the like prayer, may be frequently repeated for some days before confession, in order to obtain of God the grace of making a good confession."

What is meant by *a good confession* is not so explicitly stated as I think it should be; but the phrase is a scriptural one; and perhaps it was chosen by the priests, and is by them so often repeated to make the thing go down more easily. They can tell us that Christ Jesus, before Pontius Pilate, witnessed *a good confession* (1 Tim. vi. 13.), and therefore every Christian ought to make a good confession to his priest. There is no connection or correspondence between the things.

Christ confessed what was both good and true; and thus he made a good confession; but the church of Rome has been pleased, in her infallible wisdom, to apply the expression to the confession of her penitents, though it should contain nothing but that which is evil; and the greater the evil confessed, so much the better is the confession.

I shall now give a specimen of the manner in which a penitent is taught to catechise himself, with a view to his being catechised by the priest, when he goes to confess. The "Garden of the Soul" furnishes "An examination of conscience upon the ten commandments." I shall give only a few extracts as a sample. Some of the questions are not fit to meet the eye of a modest man or woman, and yet they have a conspicuous place in this favourite book of Popish devotion.

On the first commandment:—"Have you been guilty of heresy, or disbelief of any article of faith, or of voluntary doubting of any article of faith? How often? And for how long a time? Or have you rashly exposed yourself to the danger of infidelity, by reading bad books, or keeping wicked company? How often? Have you by word or deed denied your religion, or gone to the churches or meetings of heretics, so as to join with them any way in their worship? Or to give scandal? How often?" On the third commandment, (or what they call the second, for they omit in their catechisms what is properly the second,) such questions as these are asked:—"Have you sworn falsely, or what you did not certainly know, whether it was true or false? Or have you sworn to do any thing that was wicked or unlawful? Or broken your lawful oaths? How often? Have you had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by your soul, or by the way of imprecation upon yourself? How long have you had this custom? How many times a day have you sworn after this manner? Have you sworn by the blood or wounds of God, or any other blasphemous oath? How often? Have you cursed yourself or others, and if so, was it from your heart? How often?" &c. &c.

"Have you neglected to hear mass upon Sundays and holydays of obligation? Or have you heard it with wilful distraction? Or not taken care that your children or servants should hear it? How often? Have you spent those days in idleness, or sin? Or been the occasion of others spending them so? How often? Have you done any servile work without necessity on those days? Or set others on doing so? How often? Have you broke the days of abstinence commanded by the church? or eaten more than one meal on fasting days? or been accessary to others so doing? How often? Have you neglected to confess your sins once a year? or to receive the blessed sacrament at Easter? Have you made a sacrilegious confession or communion, by concealing some mortal sin in confession, or what you doubted might be mortal? Or for want of a hearty sorrow for your sins and a firm purpose of amendment? Or by being grossly negligent in the examination of your conscience? How often? Have you received any other sacrament, for example, confirmation or matrimony in mortal sin? Have you neglected to perform the penance enjoined in confession? Or said it with wilful distractions? How often? Have you presumed to receive the blessed sacrament after having broken your fast? Have you, after falling into mortal sin, neglected for a long time to return to God by repentance? And for how long a time?" I have here given the whole of what is to be inquired into relating to the divine command, "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy;" and the reader will see, that there is scarcely a word that relates to the spirit and meaning of the divine precept. The holy day of spiritual rest is quite forgotten; the fasts and feasts of the church are put in its place; and the sinner professing penitence, is taught to purge his conscience only with regard to the latter.

I shall not disgust my readers by taking them over the catechetical exercise upon the other commandments. The above is sufficient to show what sort of a thing auricular confession is, so far as regards the things confessed upon the commandments of the first table. And here there is one thing which must, I think, deeply affect the reader's mind. The interrogatories are all formed upon the supposition that the penitent may be a great and habitual transgressor. He may be one who has had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by his soul, and by way of imprecation upon himself; and who has been in the habit of doing so many times in a day. Now in order to make "a good confession," it is not necessary that he have actually forsaken this wicked habit. It is enough that he confess his fault, and promise or *resolve* to forsake it; or make a *firm resolution* of forsaking it; and the priest, upon this *confession* and *resolution*, and *promise*, grants him absolution.

Now in this, as in every thing else, Popery appears directly opposed to the religion of the Bible. True Christianity knows nothing of good resolutions distinct from good practice There is not in the whole Bible a promise of pardon to him who only resolves to forsake his sins. This, however, in ordinary cases, is as much as the priest expects from his kneeling suppliant.

No. XCI.

SATURDAY, April 8th, 1820.

My last Number broke off in the middle of what I had written on the subject of good resolutions, with which, therefore, I commence the present.

In answer to the question, "What is required to a good confession?" the Douay catechism answers:—"1. That we seriously examine our consciences; 2. Be heartily sorry for our sins, with a *firm purpose to amend*, taking time and care to make an act of contrition," &c. And, "What is a firm purpose of amendment? Ans. It is a *resolution*, by the grace of God, not only to avoid sin, but also the occasion of it." And the "Papist truly Represented" teaches, that whosoever comes to the priests, "making a sincere and humble confession of his sins, with a true repentance, and a *firm purpose of amendment*, and a hearty *resolution of turning from his evil ways*, may from them receive absolution," &c. This is the current language of all their catechisms and books of devotion which I have seen. All their promises of pardon are given to hearty repentance and good resolutions. If it were the repentance which springs from faith in Jesus Christ, I would not object to connecting with it a promise of pardon; but such repentance is inseparably connected with actually forsaking sin, not with a mere *resolution* to forsake it. The hearty repentance of the Papist is that into which he works himself by fasting and flagellation; and while suffering or expecting to suffer such things, it is very natural to *resolve* to forsake sin, and even to make a *firm purpose* to forsake it some time or other. Now, when a man comes to a priest, and makes such professions, the priest must grant him absolution, and declare him reconciled to God, having all his sins forgiven, though both priest and penitent be unpersuaded of any change in the character of the latter, and though both expect he will immediately return to the practice of all manner of wickedness, trusting to the efficacy of a new confession, and a new absolution.

The "Garden of the Soul" furnishes a preparatory exercise for confession, in which actual amendment is not required as necessary to a good confession. The penitent is instructed, not to forsake his sins, or amend his life, but only to think of the measures which he must take for an entire amendment; and to be fully determined, for the time to come, to amend his life. These instructions relate to confession every time that a man makes it; and though he should have confessed annually fifty times, his exercise in his fiftieth year of confession embraces only a purpose of amendment,—a purpose that will never be carried into effect, unless the sinner shall renounce Popery, and embrace the gospel of Christ. Without this, he will but "resolve, and re-resolve, and die the same."

When a penitent has spent several days in deep humiliation before God, he may then venture, but very cautiously, to approach, and confess his sins to a priest. The following is part of the preparatory exercise recommended in the above-mentioned work, in order that a penitent may, in a proper spirit, prostrate himself in the awful presence of his ghostly father.

"N. B. Here it is proper that the penitent should think upon the measures he must take for an entire amendment of life for the time to come; considering well what have been the occasions of his sins; what circumstances are apt to be dangerous to him; what precautions he must take against those dangers for the future; what pious exhortations he must daily make use of; such as prayer, meditation, spiritual reading, &c. When, and how often, frequent the sacrament, &c. When the penitent finds himself heartily sorry for having offended God, and fully determined for the time to come to amend his life, and avoid all *mortal* sins, and the immediate occasions of them: he may then go to confession, in which he may follow this method.

"The method of confession. The penitent, kneeling down at the side of his ghostly father, makes the sign of the cross, and asks his blessing; Pray father, give me your blessing, for I have sinned. Then he says the Confiteor in Latin, or in English, as far as *mea culpa*, &c. through my fault, &c.—2. After this he accuses himself of his sins, either according to the order of God's commandments, or such other order as he finds most helpful to his memory; adding, after each sin, the number of times he has been guilty of it, and such circumstances as may very considerably aggravate the guilt; but carefully abstaining from such as are impertinent or unnecessary, and from excuses and long narrations. —3. After he has confessed all that he can remember, he may conclude with this or the like form: 'For these, and all my other sins, which I cannot at present call to my remembrance, I am heartily sorry; purpose amendment for the future; most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution from you my ghostly father:' and so he may finish the Confiteor (or confession), and then give attentive ear to the instructions and advices of his confessor, and humbly accept of the penance enjoined by him. 4. Whilst the priest gives him absolution, let him bow down his head, and with great humility call upon God for mercy; and beg of him that he would be pleased to pronounce the sentence of absolution in heaven, whilst his minister absolves him on earth. —5. After confession, let the penitent return to his prayers; and after having heartily given God thanks for having admitted him, by the

means of this sacrament, to the grace of reconciliation, and received him like the prodigal child, returning home, let him make an offering of his confession to Jesus Christ, begging pardon for whatever defects he may have been guilty of in it, offering up his *resolutions* to his Saviour, and begging grace that he may put them in execution.—6. Let him be careful to perform his penance in due time, and in a penitential spirit."

Then follows a prayer to be said after confession, in which the penitent gives thanks for being admitted to this "sacrament of reconciliation." He speaks as if he were perfectly certain that all his sins are forgiven. He *resolves* henceforward to flee occasions of sin. He *resolves* to perform such good devotions as are necessary for obtaining this grace; and he *resolves* to fly idleness, and to set himself a regular order and method of life, for the time he has yet to come. Thus the poor devotee of a false religion is taught to deceive himself, and to say to his soul peace, peace, when there is no peace. He is taught to believe that, in virtue of his confession and the priest's absolution, he is perfectly reconciled to God, while all the affections of his heart are as much estranged from God as ever. He is, therefore, in a worse, and more dangerous condition, than the transgressor who never professed to repent of his sins; for while the latter may be open to conviction, and accessible to the remedy which the gospel reveals, the former has his heart shut against every application. He who is whole, or who thinks himself whole, will not apply to the physician.

There is no truth more certain, and none more important to the human race than this—there is forgiveness with God. This is a matter of pure revelation; for unless God himself had made it known, no sinner would ever have found it out; and without the knowledge of this truth, no sinner would ever have repented or returned to God. We see what is the natural tendency of sin in the conduct of our first parents, who, when they became sinners, instead of seeking, or returning to God, made a silly attempt to flee from him. Adam confessed plainly that he was afraid to meet his Creator; that was because he considered him as now his enemy. He had indeed become an enemy of God; he very naturally concluded that God was his enemy; and from all that he knew at the time, he could not possibly think otherwise. He had incurred the dreadful sentence of condemnation; and as yet there was no revelation of mercy.

But looking with infinite compassion upon a ruined world, God did that very day make himself known in that gracious character in which he has been acknowledged and worshipped by his church in all ages. This character is expressed by himself in one short sentence —"A just God and a Saviour;"—just, in inflicting the punishment of transgression upon a willing substitute; and a Saviour, as, by this medium, he extends pardon and salvation to the guilty. This was revealed to our first parents, as recorded in the third chapter of Genesis, in language which would appear extremely obscure to us, if we had never been told any more about it; but it is made perfectly plain by subsequent revelations contained in the Bible; and there can be no doubt that it was also made plain to Adam and Eve by the institution of sacrifice, which directed them to the promised seed of the woman, who should, at the appointed time, reconcile sinners to God by the sacrifice of himself. Those who believed the promise, came directly to God, confessing their sins over the head of the slain sacrifice, and they received pardon in virtue of the atonement of Christ, which such sacrifice represented.

We have nothing distinctly recorded of the faith of the two first transgressors; but we have a very explicit statement with regard to that of their second son, Gen. iv. 4; and Heb. xi. 4. He understood and embraced the promise for his own salvation; and offered to God an acceptable sacrifice. In slaying the victim, he acknowledged that he deserved to die for his sins. He came to God as a sinner deserving to perish; but imploring mercy in the name, and for the sake of the promised Saviour, he was pardoned, and saved. There never was a sin pardoned, or a sinner saved, in any other way; and never did a sinner perish who came to God as Abel did.

Thus to the first sinners of mankind God made himself known in his holy and gracious character, as the God of mercy, forgiving the greatest transgressors, upon the footing of a propitiatory sacrifice. Now it was God in this very character that men did not like to retain in their knowledge; Rom. i. 28. The object of their aversion was, "that which may be known of God," which was "manifest to them; for God had showed (or revealed) it unto them," verse 19. It was therefore not so much God as Creator of all things, as God in his revealed character, whom, when men knew, "they glorified not as God, neither were thankful." It is true that from the very creation of the world, God made known his eternal power and Godhead, not only by direct revelation, but also by visible exhibitions of that power in the things which were made, so as to leave men "without excuse," when they disbelieved his promise of a Saviour to come. When sinners questioned his power or his wisdom to effect their salvation, by the means which he had been pleased to reveal, he referred them to the earth and the heavens which his hands had made, as a standing evidence of what he was able to do, so that men had no "excuse" for their unbelief. This at least was the manner in which he

expostulated with the desponding Jews, Isa. l. 2, 3, "Is my hand shortened at all that it cannot redeem? Or have I no power to deliver? Behold, at my rebuke I dry up the sea, and make the rivers a wilderness. I clothe the heavens with blackness, and make sackcloth their covering."

Far be it from God to make a display of his power for the mere sake of display; when, therefore, he did, by the things which are made, make men understand his eternal power and Godhead, it was to encourage them to confide in his promise of an Almighty Saviour who should put away sin. Why are such magnificent descriptions of the power of God given in the fortieth chapter of Isaiah? Why, for instance, these bold interrogations, implying a declaration that all the things mentioned belong to God, and to him alone? "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?"—"Have ye not known? have ye not heard? *hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth?* It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." All this seems to be for the gracious purpose of confirming the faith of his people in the Saviour, whose coming is announced in the beginning of the chapter, and to encourage sinners to confide in him, seeing he whose power is thus described cannot fail in the accomplishment of his promise. Why faint or be discouraged? Why be afraid that the promise will fail? "The Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary."

From the words of the apostle, taken in connection with those of the prophet, it appears, I think, pretty plainly, that from the beginning or from the creation of the world, or from the foundations of the earth, which are all expressions of the same import, God revealed to men the things that might be known of him; that is, "the invisible things of him," things that could not be seen with the bodily eye; namely, his grace reigning through righteousness unto the eternal salvation of sinners through Jesus Christ; and at the very beginning of the world, when the fulfilment of his promise was very remote, he gave such a discovery or understanding of his power and Godhead, as exhibited in his works, as to render inexcusable every man who would not believe his promise, and accept the salvation thus provided.

But this manifestation of the divine character was what men did not like; they did not like to retain it in their knowledge, and therefore they soon lost sight of it. So far as external revelation could go, the thing was as manifest to Cain as to Abel; but Cain did not like it. His quarrel was not with the divine perfection of power, or of wisdom, or any thing that could be known of God by his works. It was with his revealed character—it was with his spotless holiness and inflexible justice, that would not admit *him* into his presence, or accept an offering at his hands without a sacrifice of atonement. God had provided a Saviour for the guilty; but in order to be saved, men must come to him *as guilty*, confessing their sins, and crying for mercy. This is what Cain and his wicked descendants and imitators did not like. Therefore God gave them over to a reprobate mind, and to vile affections: they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. This was the origin of all the idolatry and superstition that have been in the world.

There is, however, something in the hearts and consciences of men that will not let them rest without a religion. There is a consciousness of guilt, and an apprehension of punishment. The conscience must be pacified. God's way of doing so was very plainly revealed; but they did not like it, because it humbled their pride, and required them to forsake their sins. It then became the business of the more cunning of the descendants of Adam to invent something that should be in some respects like God's way of giving peace to the conscience; but yet so different from it as to allow men to continue in their sins. This was effected by idolatrous priests in various ways; but the system was never so completely organized, nor the plan of deceiving sinners so deplorably successful, as it has been in the church of Rome, under the name of Christianity.

The divinely appointed way of obtaining peace to the conscience, and the pardon of sin, is that of believing in the Lord Jesus Christ. On this subject, the testimony of Christ and of his apostles is as plain as language can make it. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" John iii. 16. "What shall I do to be saved?" said the alarmed, and almost despairing jailor of Philippi.—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," was the apostle's reply, Acts xvi. 31. The truth concerning Christ, when believed, establishes its residence in the heart; and by the power of the Holy Spirit, it effectually turns sinners from their evil ways. It is by the incorruptible seed of the word; that is, the Gospel,—the word of truth, which liveth and abideth for ever, that men are born again. The believer is born of water and of the Spirit; he is made a new creature. He now sees sin in such a light as he never did before. He is taught to hate it with a perfect hatred. He perceives its impurity and horrible malignity in the

evangelical testimony of what Christ suffered on account of it; and for his own sins he humbles himself before God, in deep and unfeigned repentance. His repentance is not the effect of abstinence, or bodily mortification of any kind; but the effect of the operation of the Holy Spirit, by means of the word of truth; and where it exists there is not a mere purpose of amendment, or resolution to lead a new life. The heart is actually turned from sin unto holiness. The new life has begun; and the love of Christ effectually produces in the repenting sinner a life of holy obedience.

But such a one will never forget that he is a sinner. Therefore he is in the daily practice of confessing his sins to God, and of begging forgiveness in the name of Jesus Christ. He knows that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin. He knows that he has continual access to this; and having recourse to it every day by faith and prayer, he lives in the comfortable persuasion that his sins are forgiven. He has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a peace, however, which is inseparably connected with continuing in the faith, and persevering in holy practice. It is absolutely inconsistent with indulgence in the least known sin; and it knows nothing of the distinction of sins mortal and sins only venial.

One who is thus taught of God, confesses his sins to God alone, because he knows that he only is able to forgive. To think of another who could pardon or absolve him from his sins, would be the same thing as to think of another God. This was the feeling of the prophet Micah on this subject, chap. vii. 28. "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity,"—and who "delighteth in mercy?" The interrogative form of the expression is well understood to be a strong asseveration that there is no other God that can do this.

Attend now to the manner in which Popery affects to impart the same benefits of pardon of sin and peace with God.

This she professes to effect by means of certain things which she calls sacraments, some of which are confessedly founded on divine institution, and others are of mere human invention. Of the former sort is baptism. This, though a divine ordinance, is divested of every thing that is divine in the hands of a Popish priest. It was meant as a sign of regeneration, as a representation of the work of the Holy Spirit, in renewing and sanctifying the soul; but the church of Rome ascribes to baptism itself the power of regenerating. This is putting it out of its place, and putting it in the place of the Holy Ghost; just as the sacrifice of the mass is put in the place of the atonement of Christ. The church of Rome admits the doctrine of original sin; but then she asserts that baptism takes it all away, and he who has just been baptized is as free from sin as an angel of God. In this way she gives peace to the consciences of her children; but it is a peace that is founded on a falsehood, and which must issue in the ruin of all that believe it. Independently of its opposition to the divinely-appointed way of giving peace to the conscience, the Popish method contains in itself that which must ever render it insecure. The whole virtue of the sacrament depends upon the good intention of the priest. No man can be sure that the priest had such intention when he baptized him; and, therefore, upon their own principles, Papists can never be sure that they are regenerated. Mr Gavin relates a story of a priest whom he knew, who, when dying, made this *good confession* that a great many people in his parish were not baptized, because he had performed the rite to them, when children, without the intention; and moreover, he told his confessor, that all those stood in this predicament whose names were marked with a cross in the parish register. After his death the circumstance was mentioned to the bishop, who ordered the book into his presence, and he found a number of names crossed. Such as were alive he sent for, and baptized privately; but many were dead. These of course had perished for want of a good intention in their priest: and every Papist now alive may be in danger of the same thing, for any thing that he knows: for how can he be sure of the intention of the priest who baptized him?

It cannot be shown that the external rite of baptism ever made a man more holy than he was before. If the thing signified accompany the sign, a holy character is undoubtedly imparted; but the experience of many centuries has proved that this is not always the case; for we find that persons who have been baptized are, on growing up, just as unholy as those who have not. This, however, is a matter which does not give the church of Rome any concern, for she has in reserve the sacrament of confession and penance, by which she can take away all the sins which a man has committed after baptism. In the preceding pages, I think, I have clearly proved that this is the doctrine of the church of Rome. Persons may live in the practice of every vice; yet by confessing to a priest as often as they please, they can get all their sins forgiven; and it is required that they do this at least once a-year; and once a-year they receive absolution, which absolution by a priest is understood to be as effectual, and it satisfies the sinner as completely, as if he were favoured by a voice from heaven assuring him that he was absolved in the court above.

No. XCII.

SATURDAY, April 15th, 1820.

WHILE auricular confession is, to say the least of it, useless to him that makes it, it must be extremely pernicious to him who hears it. The mind of a Popish priest must be the common receptacle of all the filth in his parish. There is, as the word of God assures us, a desperate wickedness in the heart of man. The Almighty challenges for himself, exclusively, the knowledge of its deep depravity; and to him alone is it lawful for a sinner to lay open, in the way of confession, or contrite acknowledgment, all the wickedness which he feels within him. This can be done with safety only to him who, being infinitely holy, is incapable of pollution. To tell all the evil that is in one's heart to a fellow-creature would corrupt the most innocent, and increase the wickedness of the most wicked. This, however, is what every Popish priest exacts of all his flock, without exception; and thus, by becoming familiar with the depravity of others, his own depravity must be fearfully augmented. Nay, he becomes so hardened in wickedness as to be the corrupter of the young and comparatively innocent. He insinuates the poison of his own filthy imagination into the hearts of the inexperienced, and effects their seduction under the pretext of promoting their salvation.

That this is not an exaggerated statement, I could easily prove, with disgusting minuteness, from a variety of authorities, which all confirm the testimony of Mr Bradley, in my 89th Number, Page 377. In particular, I have before me the narrative of John Gordon, a native of Aberdeenshire, who, against his will, was sent to a Popish seminary in the Highlands, and afterwards to the Scotch College in Paris, in order to be educated for the priesthood. Having no means of escape, for a long time, he was obliged to conform to all the rules of the College. At last, however, he happily effected his escape, and returning to Scotland, he renounced Popery, and embraced the Protestant religion, before the Presbytery of Edinburgh, on the 7th of June, 1731. A certificate to that effect is prefixed to his work, signed by Jo. Guthrie, Moderator. Soon after his arrival in Paris, he was obliged to go to confession, and to go through all the preparatory exercises, which he relates very minutely.

Then, speaking of the confession itself, which he was instructed to make, he says,—"But all this was to be understood of *mortal* sins, or those that kill the soul, at one blow; but as for venial sins, we could obtain remission of them without confession, by saying a *Paternoster*, an *Ave Maria*, or the like. However, as for young people, such as we, who had but just come out of the contagious sea of the world, it was our safest way, he told us, to declare or confess all, because we could not, so well as our confessors, discern between mortal and venial sins.

"After this we were sent to our chambers, to begin an examination of our consciences. Paper, pen, and ink, were given us, that we might write down all the sins we could think of. When they had given us sufficient time for examination, then they gave us some prayers to say, for obtaining contrition, or sorrow, for our sins; after which Mr Smith was placed in the confessional, to hear our several accounts. I must confess these proceedings did not well digest with me; but I was too well secured either to make off, or disobey; so to the confessional I went, where, I must own, there was not a corner of my conscience but what was pretty well sifted by the *impertinent interrogations* he made, by which *I learned more sins than ever I had heard of, when conversant in the world.* However, I came pretty well off; for the only penance I had imposed on me was to repeat, every day, for the space of two weeks, the seven psalms which are called penitential psalms; and because I had apostatized from them, as he said, he ordered me for that to sleep in my clothes, for the above-mentioned time. That was the *peccatum contra Spiritum Sanctum* (sin against the Holy Ghost), against which he spake for a considerable time. However, out of compassion, he lifted up his hands, and gave me absolution."

After a variety of interesting matter, Mr Gordon proceeds:—"But to return to the rest of my adventures in France—Having finished my course of divinity, I was obliged to take the order of a sub-deacon, and a year after, I was made a deacon. I was then most of all shocked; for now I was obliged to do what I detested to see others perform. There was a breviary put in my hands, which every day I must say under pain of mortal sin, in which there was such an account of saints, and offices to their honour, that it was nauseous to rehearse them. Every Saturday we were obliged to say the office of the Virgin Mary, and litanies to her honour, where there were such bombast titles as *Stella Maris*, Star of the Sea; *Rosea Mystica*, Mystical Rose; *Turris Davidica*, Tower of David; *Turris Eburnea*, Tower of Ivory, and the like; and *Ora pro nobis* (Pray for us), at the end of each of these titles. It was also incumbent on me to exercise the functions of the orders I received, viz. to carry crosses at their processions, and the holy water, and to offer incense to their sacrament, altars, and pictures; to carry their sacrament about the churches, and from their tabernacles to their altar; during which time every person prostrated himself on the ground, and adored it. These, and such like practices, made me very uneasy; but I did not know how to avoid them.

O

"Being now thus advanced, I was obliged to be more conversant in the world than formerly, and very soon became acquainted with several confessors, in particular with one Mr Holdar, *alias* Jonathan Holdforth, in the English seminary of Paris, who was confessor to most of the English nuns, in the monastery of Sion, by St Victor's. All our conversation ran upon the different stories he heard in confesion, and of the nuns' scruples of conscience," &c. &c. "that I am ashamed to rehearse them. So that I would advise these ladies either to forbear frequenting confession, or at least to make choice of a discrect person. But he is not the only person who is free in revealing what he has heard; for it is the ordinary discourse of the priests, when they meet, to inform one another of what they have heard in confession, and how dexterously they behaved on these occasions. This I can assert, because I was often present at such conferences, where the conversation was so indecent that even an honest Pagan would have blushed." Pages 61, 62. This work is dedicated to the celebrated Duncan Forbes, of Culloden, with whom the author seems to have been acquainted; and I see no reason to question the truth of any of his statements. Indeed, independently of such facts as are narrated, it must be evident to every person acquainted with human nature, that confession, as practised in the church of Rome, must have a direct tendency to deprave the morals of the priests themselves, as well as of their miserable dupes.

Mr Gavin, in his "Master Key," gives a most minute illustration of this subject, with several examples of the mischievous effect of auricular confession, in debauching the minds of young persons. "To the discovery of mortal sins," says he, "the father confessor doth very much help the penitent; for he sometimes out of pure zeal, but most commonly out of curiosity, asks them many questions to know whether they do remember all their sins, or not? By these, and the like questions, the confessors do more harm than good, especially to the ignorant people and young women." "And when they come to that tribunal, with a sincere, ignorant heart, to receive advice and instruction, they go home with light knowledge, and an idea of sins unknown to them before." Vol. I. p. 5.

After a variety of preparatory ceremonies, which are particularly described, the penitent "riseth and goes to the confessionary; that is, the confessing place, where the confessor sits in a chair like our hackney chairs, which is most commonly placed in some of the chapels, and in the darkest place of the church. The chairs, generally speaking, have an iron grate at each side, but none at all before; and some days of devotion, or on a great festival, there is such a crowd of people, that you may see three penitents at once about the chair, one at each grate, and the other at the door, though only one confessing at a time, whispering in the confessor's ear, that the others should not hear what he says; and when he has done, another begins, and so on. But most commonly they confess at the door of the chair one after another; for thus the confessor has opportunity of knowing the penitent: and though many gentlewomen, either out of bashfulness, or shame, or modesty, do endeavour to hide their faces with a fan or veil, notwithstanding all this, they are known by the confessor, who, if curious, by crafty questions, brings them to tell their names and houses, and this in the very act of confession; or else he examines their faces when the confession is over, whilst the penitents are kissing his hand or sleeve; and if he cannot know them this way, he goes himself to give the sacrament, and then every one being obliged to show his face, is known by the curious confessor, who doth this not without a private view and design, as will appear at the end of some private confessions."

Then comes the *Confiteor*, which is, in English, as follows:—"I do confess to God Almighty, to the blessed Mary, always a virgin, to the blessed Archangel Michael, to the blessed John Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to thee O father, that I have too much sinned by thought, word, and deed, by my fault, *by my fault*, by my greatest fault: Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, always a virgin, the blessed Archangel, Michael, the blessed John Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, and thee, O father—to pray God our Lord for me, *Amen*." "This done, the penitent raises himself from his prostration to his knees, and touching with his lips either the ear or the cheek of the spiritual father, begins to discover his sins by the ten commandments."

Surely it is not necessary to make any comment on this compound of idolatry and absurdity. The whole process is so horribly revolting to every feeling of decency and common sense, that it is with difficulty I have brought myself to write it. One can scarcely think of the labial application to the ear or the cheek of the priest as above enjoined, without remembering the injunction of the idolatrous priests to the children of Israel, "Let the men that sacrifice *kiss the calves*," Hosea xiii. 2.

Mr Gavin gives about half a dozen examples of confession made by nuns and others, which I must be excused from inserting in my work; and then he proceeds to show how the priests accommodate themselves to persons and circumstances, so as to be very lenient to some, and rigorous to others, just as they think lenity or rigour will best serve their purpose.

"If a poor countryman," says he, "goes to confess, the father confessor takes little pains with him; for, as he expects little or nothing from him, he heareth him, and, with bitter words, corrects the poor man, and, most commonly without any correction, imposing upon him a hard penance, sends him away with the same ignorance he went with to confess.

"If a soldier happens to go to make his peace with God (so they express themselves, when they go to confession,) then the confessor showeth the power of a spiritual guide. He questions him about three sins only; *to wit,* thefts, drunkenness, and uncleanness. Perhaps the poor soldier is free from the two first; but if he is guilty of the last, the confessor draws the consequence that he is guilty of all the three, and terrifying him with hell, and all the devils, and the fire of it, he chargeth him with restitution, and that he is obliged to pay so much money for the relief of the souls in purgatory, or else he cannot get absolution. So the poor man, out of better conscience than his confessor, offers a month's pay, which must be given upon the spot (for, in the shop of confessors there is neither trust nor credit) to appease the rough, bitter confessor, and to get absolution; and I believe this hard way of using the poor soldiers, is the reason that they do not care at all for that act of devotion; and as they are so bad customers to the confessors' shop, the confessors use their endeavours, when they come to buy absolution, to sell it as dear as they can; so, at one time, they pay for two, three, or more years.

"I have heard a soldier, cursing the confessors, say—'If I continue in the king's service twenty years, I will not go to confess; for it is easier and cheaper to lift up my finger and be absolved by our chaplain, than to go to a friar who doth nothing but rail and grumble at me, and yet I must give him money for masses, or else he will not absolve me.'"

Lifting up the finger is thus explained in a note:—"The custom of the Spanish army, in the field, and the day before the battle or before the engagement, is, that the chaplain goes through all the companies, to ask the officers whether they have a mind to confess, and if one has any thing to say, he whispers in the chaplain's ear, and so through all the officers. As for the private men;—crying out, he says, 'he that has a sin, let him lift up one finger,' and then he gives a general absolution to all at once."

"If a collegian goes to confess, he finds a mild and sweet confessor; and, without being questioned, and with a small penance, he generally gets absolution. The reason the confessors have to use the collegians with great civility and mildness is, first, because, if a collegian is ill used by his confessor, he goes to a deaf friar, who absolves *ad dextram et ad sinistram* all sorts of penitents, for a rial of plate; and after he (the collegian) inquireth and examineth into all the other confessor's actions, visits, and intrigues; and when he has got matter enough, he will write a lampoon on him, which has happened very often in my time. So the confessor dares not meddle with the collegians, for fear that his tricks should be brought to light; and another reason is, because the collegians, for the generality, are like the *filles de joye,* in Lent; that is, without money, and so the confessor cannot expect any profit by them.

"I say, if absolution be denied to a collegian, he goes to a deaf confessor; for some confessors are called deaf, not because they are really deaf, but because they give small penance, without correction; and never deny absolution, though the sins be referred to the Pope. I knew two Dominican friars, who were known by the name of deaf confessors, because they never used to question the penitent.

"One of such confessors has more business in Lent, than twenty of the others."—"All the great and habitual sinners go to the deaf confessor, who gives upon the bargain a certificate, in which he says, that such a one has fulfilled the commandment of the church; for every body is obliged to produce a certificate of confession to the minister of the parish, before Easter, or else he must be exposed in the church. So, as it is a hard thing for an old sinner to get absolution, and a certificate from other covetous confessors, without a great deal of money, they generally go to the deaf confessors. I had a friend in the same convent, who told me that such confessors were obliged to give two-thirds of their profit to the community; and there being only two deaf confessors in that convent, he assured me that, in one Lent, they gave to the Father Prior six hundred pistoles apiece."

"If a modest, serious, religious lady comes to confession, he uses her in another way; for he knows that such ladies never come to confess, without giving a good charity for masses; so all the confessor's care is, to get himself into the lady's favour, which he doth by hypocritical professions of goodness and devotion, of humility and strictness of life. He speaks gravely and conscientiously, and, if the lady has a family, he gives her excellent advices, as, to keep her children within the limits of sobriety and virtue, for the world is so deceitful, that we ought always to be upon our guard; and to watch continually over our souls, &c. And by that means, and the like (the good lady believing him to be a sincere and devout man), he becomes the guide of her soul, of her house and family; and most commonly the ruin of her children, and sometimes her own ruin too. I will give the following instance, to confirm this truth; and as the thing was public, I heed not scruple to men-

tion it, with the real names:—In the year 1706, F. Antonia Gallardo, Augustin friar, murdered Donna Isabella Mendez, and a child three weeks old, sucking at her breast. The lady was but twenty-four years of age, and had been married eight years to Don Francisco Mendez. The friar had been her spiritual guide for all that while, and all the family had so great a respect and esteem for him, that he was the absolute master of the house. The lady was brought to bed, and Don Francisco being obliged to go into the country, for four days, desired the father to come and be in his house, and take care of it, in his absence. The father's room was always ready; so he went there the same day Don Francisco went into the country. At eight, at night, both the father and the lady went to supper, and after he had sent away all the maids and servants into the hall to sup, the lady took the child to give him suck; and the friar told her, in plain and short reasons, his love, and that without any delay or reply, she must comply with his request. The lady said to him,—'Father, if you propose such a thing to try my faithfulness and virtue, you know my conscience these eight years past: and if you have any ill design, I will call my family, to prevent your further assurance.' The friar then, in fury, taking a knife, killed the child, and wounded so deeply the mother, that she died two hours after. The friar made his escape; but whether he went to his convent or not, we did not hear. I myself saw the lady dead, and went to her burial, in the church of the old St John."

I come now to show that notwithstanding the solemnity and importance of auricular confession in the Church of Rome, it is sometimes reduced to a mere farce, for the amusement of a parish. "The preacher of the parish pitcheth upon one day of the week, most commonly in the middle of Lent, to hear the children's confessions; and gives notice to the congregation, the Sunday before, that every father of a family may send his children, both boys and girls, to church, on the day appointed, in the afternoon. The mothers dress their children the best way they can, that day, and give them the offering money, for the expiation of their sins. That afternoon is a holiday in the parish, not by precept but by custom; for no parishioner, either old or young, man or woman, misseth to go and hear the children's confessions. For it is reckoned among them a greater diversion than a comedy, as you may judge by the following account:—

"The day appointed, the children repair to church, at three of the clock, where the preacher is waiting for them, with a long reed in his hand; and when all are together, the reverend father placeth them in a circle round himself, and then kneeling down, the children also doing the same, makes the sign of the cross, and says a short prayer. This done, he exhorteth the children to hide no sin from him, but to tell him all they have committed. Then he strikes with the reed the child whom he designs to confess the first, and asks him the following questions. *Confessor.* How long is it since you last confessed? *Boy.* Father, a whole year, or the last Lent. *Conf.* And how many sins have you committed, from that time till now? *Boy.* Two dozen. Now the Confessor asks round:—And you? *Boy.* A thousand and ten. Another will say, a bagful of small lies, and ten big sins; and so one after another answers, and tells many childish things. *Conf.* But pray, you say you have committed ten big sins, tell me, how big? *Boy.* As big as a tree. *Conf.* But tell me the sins. *Boy.* There is one sin I committed, which I dare not tell your reverence before all the people; for somebody here present will kill me, if he heareth it. *Conf.* Well, come out of the circle and tell it me. Then both go out, and with a loud voice, he tells him, that such a day he stole a nest of sparrows from a tree, of another boy's, and that if he knew it, he would kill him. Then both come again into the circle, and the father asks other boys and girls so many ridiculous questions, and the children answer him so many pleasant, innocent things, that the congregation laughs all the while. One will say that his sins are red; another, that one of his sins is white, one black, and one green; and in these trifling questions they spend two hours. When the congregation is weary of laughing, the confessor gives the children a correction, and bids them not to sin any more, for a black boy takes along with him the wicked children. Then he asks the offering, and after he has got all from them, he gives them the penance for their sins. To one he says, I give you for penance to eat a sweet cake; to another, to go to school the day following; to another, to desire his mother to buy him a new hat; and such things as these: and pronouncing the words of absolution, he dismisseth the congregation with *Amen*, So be it, every year.

"From seven to fifteen, there is no extraordinary thing to say to young people, only that from seven years of age they begin to confess in private, and receive the sacrament in public. The confessors have very little trouble with such young people, and likewise little profit, except with a *puella*, who sometimes begins, at twelve years, the course of a lewd life, and then the confessor finds business and profit enough, when she comes to confess."—*Master Key to Popery*, vol. 1st, part 1st

No. XCIII.

SATURDAY, April 22nd, 1820.

THE sacrament of confession, as it is called, as administered by a parcel of idle and luxurious ecclesiastics, must be productive of the most enormous wickedness. This might be inferred from the nature of the sacrament, and the well-known character of those who administer it; but there are abundance of facts adduced by various authors, which completely prove that the lewdness of heathen idolatry is outdone by that of Popery, under this single rite. It is difficult to write with decency on such a subject; but it is necessary to tell at least part of the truth, in justice to the cause in which I am engaged, that is, to expose the church of Rome as the very Antichrist that is opposed to all that is holy, and just, and good.

Da Costa, a Portuguese gentleman, a member of the church of Rome, in his relation of what he suffered in the Inquisition, in consequence of being accused of free masonry, after describing, at considerable length, the vices of the priests, proceeds as follows:—

"Another admirable instance of their continence in this respect, presents itself in Gonsalvius, during his relation of what happened in Spain, when the Bull of Pope Paul IV. enjoining to the holy office the cognizance of the crime of *solicitant*, was published. (A solicitant is a priest, who, in the act of confession, solicits the penitent confessing to indecent acts.) Before I advert to the fact, I shall state those words of the Bull that are applicable to the subject: 'Whereas certain ecclesiastics, in the kingdom of Spain, and in the cities and dioceses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity, as to abuse the sacrament of penance in the very act of hearing the confessions, not fearing to injure the same sacrament, and him who instituted it, our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke, females to lewd actions, at the very time when they were making their confessions.'

"When this Bull was first introduced into Spain, the Inquisitors published a solemn edict in all the churches belonging to the archbishopric of Seville, that any person knowing, or having heard of any friar or clergyman's having committed the crime of abusing the sacrament of confession, or in any manner having improperly conducted himself during the confession of a female penitent, should make a discovery of what he knew, within thirty days to the holy tribunal; and very heavy censures were attached to those who should neglect or despise this injunction. When this edict was first published, such a considerable number of females went to the palace of the Inquisitor, only in the city of Seville, to reveal the conduct of their infamous confessors, that twenty notaries, and as many Inquisitors, were appointed to minute down their several informations against them: but these being found insufficient to receive the depositions of so many witnesses; and the inquisitors being thus overwhelmed, as it were, with the pressure of such affairs, thirty days more were allowed for taking the accusations, and this lapse of time also proving inadequate to the intended purpose, a similar period was granted not only for a third but a fourth time. The ladies of rank, character, and noble families, had a difficult part to act on this occasion, as their discoveries could not be made of any particular time and place. On one side, a religious fear of incurring the threatened censures, goaded their consciences so much as to compel them to make the required accusation; on the other side, a regard to their husbands, to whom they justly feared to give offence, by affording them any motives for suspecting their private conduct, induced them to keep at home. To obviate these difficulties they had recourse to the measure of covering their faces with a veil, according to the fashion of Spain, and thus went to the inquisitors in the most secret manner they could adopt. Very few, however, escaped the vigilance of their husbands, who, on being informed of the discoveries and accusations made by their wives, were filled with suspicions; and yet, notwithstanding this accumulation of proofs against the confessors, produced to the inquisitors, this holy tribunal, contrary to the expectations of every one, put an end to the business, by ordering, that all crimes of this nature, proved by lawful evidence, should from thenceforth be consigned to perpetual silence and oblivion." —*Narrative, &c. by Hippolyto Joseph Da Costa Pereira Furtado de Mendonca,* vol. I. Pages 117—119.

This was not like an instance of an individual priest or two, in a nation, in the course of a century, being detected in the practice of wickedness. It shows that the disease was universal, the whole mass was corrupted; and the fact that both husbands and wives continued in the same communion, and submitted their consciences, and trusted their salvation, in the hands of the same ghostly guides, shows the influence of a judicial infatuation and hardness of heart to which they must have been abandoned, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved.

Mr Gavin gives an account of a priest who made his dying confession to himself, in which he acknowledged that for twelve years he belonged to a club of priests, six in number, residing in contiguous parishes. Every one, he said, had a list of the handsomest women in his parish, and when any one had a fancy to

see any one of them, the priest of the parish sent for her to his own house, under some religious pretext, and had her introduced to his brother priest. In this way, said he, we have served one another for twelve years past. "Our manner was to persuade their husbands and fathers, not to hinder them any spiritual comfort; and to the ladies, to persuade them to be subject to our advice and will; and that in doing so they should have liberty at any time to go out on pretence of communicating some spiritual business to the priest: And if they refused to do it, then we would speak to their husbands and fathers not to let them go out at all; or, which would be worse for them, we should inform against them to the holy tribunal of the Inquisition."—*Master Key*, vol. I. Page 29. Thus, under the cloak of letting them go to confession, Papists become accessary to the prostitution of their wives and daughters.

It is now time that I should think of drawing the subject of auricular confession to a close; but it would not be fair to do so without examining what the church of Rome adduces as scripture authority for the practice. Know then, gentle reader, that the front argument from scripture is contained in these words of our Saviour to his apostles, John xx. 21, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." From this the "Papist truly represented," argues, that Christ gave the apostles "and their successors, the bishops and priests of the catholic church, authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins."

This I say is the front argument of the church of Rome for auricular confession; and I request the reader to look at it again, and to take his Bible, and read the passage in its connection, and he will find that there is not a word of confession in it. The remitting, or retaining of sins here, is connected with the gift of the Holy Ghost, under whose divine influence the apostles, as ambassadors of Christ, were authorized to proclaim the forgiveness or remission of sins, to all who should receive the testimony concerning Christ; and in the same authoritative manner, to declare the everlasting perdition of those who received not their testimony. The sins of the former were remitted, and the sins of the latter retained, according to their inspired declaration; and thus what they bound on earth was bound in heaven, and what they loosed on earth was loosed in heaven. But the question recurs, what have we here to do with auricular confession? And the answer must be, nothing at all.

But we shall see how the late bishop Hay of Edinburgh extracts the duty of confession out of these words:—"What is sacramental confession? *Ans.* It is the laying open the state of our souls to a priest, by humbly accusing ourselves to him of all our sins, in order to obtain the grace of absolution. *Q.* Is this confession of our sins necessary for obtaining absolution? *A.* It is ordained by Jesus Christ as a condition absolutely necessary for this purpose; insomuch, that without it, the grace of the sacrament of penance, by which our sins are pardoned, and we restored to the friendship of God, will not be bestowed upon us. *Q.* How does this necessity appear from Scripture? *A.* It is included in the very power which Jesus Christ gave to the pastors of the church, of binding and loosing, of remitting and retaining sins. For by giving them this power, he constituted them judges of our souls in his own stead, the ministers of reconciliation between God and the sinner; consequently, it is his will that they should exercise this power with justice and discretion, according to the merits of the case, and the dispositions of the penitent; for we cannot suppose he intended that they should exercise it at random; it would be impiety to suppose that. Besides, as this tribunal is not a tribunal of strict vindictive justice, for punishing the offender to the extent of what he deserves, seeing nothing less than hell fire is the proper punishment of mortal sin, but it is a tribunal of mercy, where, by the sentence of absolution, the sinner is delivered both from the guilt of his sins, and from the eternal punishment due to them; and this eternal punishment is exchanged for a temporal punishment, which, through the merits of Christ applied to our souls in this sacrament, both contributes to satisfy the divine justice, and is most wholesome and salutary to the penitent; it is doubtless the will of Jesus Christ that the priest, when he exercises the power of binding, and lays this penance on the penitent, should do it with a just proportion to his guilt and dispositions. Now, it is self-evident that the priest can neither act with justice and prudence, in forgiving and retaining sins, nor observe the just proportion in imposing the proper punishment suitable to the guilt and dispositions of the sinner, unless he knows the real state of his soul, both as to his guilt and dispositions; and, as none can possibly discover this to him but the sinner himself, hence it manifestly follows, that the very power of binding and loosing, of forgiving and retaining sins, given by Jesus Christ to the priests of his church, necessarily includes a strict obligation on sinners to lay open the state of their souls, by a humble confession of all their sins, to a priest, in order to receive the effect of that power, and to be absolved from their sins by him." —*Sincere Christian Instructed*, vol. II. Pages 77, 78.

Perhaps the reader will expect an apology from me for giving such an enormous quantity of nonsense, in one quotation. I have done it for the double purpose of showing the manner

in which the greatest Popish writers overwhelm with words a subject that cannot bear to be openly exposed; and the circuitous process by which they derive the duty of auricular confession of sin to a priest. When drawn from under its overwhelming verbiage, the argument is simply this:—The priest cannot remit sins till he know them; he cannot possibly know them but by the confession of the sinner, ergo, it is the duty of every man to confess his sins to a priest. Thus the very imperfection and ignorance of the priest is given as a reason for trusting in him. It is declared that he has the power of remitting sin and granting absolution; and at same time, it is admitted that he cannot possibly know what sins a man has committed, or whether he be a sinner at all, until he shall learn the fact from the person himself who applies to him for absolution. I wish all who go to confess their sins to a priest had but the sense which a heathen king displayed in addressing the wise men of his court, which by a little accommodation may be applied to the case in hand, Dan. ii. 9. Tell me my sins, and then I shall know that you can grant me absolution.

There is a sense, indeed, in which the pastors of the church may be said to grant absolution; that is, when persons having been separated from communion in consequence of some public sin, or some sin publicly known, are, upon evidence of repentance, restored to fellowship. This is not forgiving sin, but receiving back a sinner, believing that God has forgiven him; and we believe this only when we have evidence of genuine repentance. A free and open confession is one evidence of repentance; but it is not a confession of secret sin that is required. It is enough that confession of this be made to God, who knows it already. In the case of the church, the confession must also relate to some sin that is known already, and that has been an occasion of scandal. Confession is not required for the purpose of discovering secret sins against God; but for ascertaining the state of mind of the sinner, with regard to what has given public offence; and if there be reason to believe that he really repents, he is absolved; that is, restored to his place in the church which he had forfeited. But this, in every point, is very different from confession and absolution in the church of Rome.

Bishop Hay finds another authority for auricular confession in these words, 1 John i. 8. "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity." Plain common sense could find nothing of auricular confession to a priest in these words: for there is no mention, and not the most distant allusion to a priest in the whole chapter, unless we shall suppose the inspired writer speaking of himself and the other apostles under that character, when he says, the things which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, &c. Yet this *wordy* prelate speaks of his proof from this passage in the following confident style: "This testimony is so strong and clear, for the necessity of confessing our sins, that our adversaries have no other way to escape the force of it, but by vainly pretending that the apostle means only the confessing our sins privately to God alone." We do not only pretend, but firmly maintain, that the apostle in this passage, speaks of confessing sins to God, and to no other; though the grave bishop should reckon this so small a matter that he calls it *only* confessing to God, whereas confessing to a priest, is, in his opinion, the great and indispensable thing. The structure of the language will bear no other meaning than that the confession must be made to him who is faithful and just to forgive; that is, God, as in the version from which the bishop quotes. It is the pronoun *he* in our version; but it evidently relates to the substantive, God, in the 5th verse. But let us see how bishop Hay extorts the doctrine of confession to a priest out of this passage:—

"But that this (*i. e.* confession to God alone) cannot be the apostle's meaning, is evident from two strong reasons; first, because *the confessing our sins* is here put in opposition to the *saying we have no sin;* these two are opposite to one another, and therefore must certainly relate to the same object. Now who is there in his senses that would seriously dare to say to God in private *that he has no sin?* In this part of the sentence, then, the apostle certainly means saying, *we have no sin before men;* and, consequently, in the opposite part of it, when he says, "if we confess our sins," he necessarily means the doing so *before men also.*" This is doubtless a most precious piece of Popish logic. The whole weight of the argument, if argument it can be called, rests upon the words, if we *say* we have no sin; and even these conclude nothing in the bishop's favour, unless they necessarily mean, saying *aloud before men.* Now so far from necessarily meaning this, they do not mean this at all. They refer to what a man *thinks* or *says in his heart.* If we say we have no sin we deceive *ourselves.* It is by what a man thinks, or says to himself, that he deceives himself; but by what he says aloud before men, he deceives not himself, but others. Besides, bishop Hay ought to have known that some men are guilty of doing every day what he says no man in his senses will do; that is, saying to God that they have no sin. Christ described a class of men under the character of the Pharisee, who not only said to God he had no sin, at least such as other men had, but boasted of a great deal of merit. And this

must be the case with every Papist when he has received the absolution of his priest, and performed his penance.

"Again," proceeds bishop Hay, "St James says, 'confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved.' Here we see, in express terms, the confessing our sins to man laid down as a condition of our salvation. His reverence admits that there is a difficulty in the words *one another*, which he attempts to remove, but he only smothers it with a great heap of words. So far as the words of the apostle go, they make it as much the duty of the priests to confess to their people, as of the people to confess to the priests.

In the following, the reader will see how the meaning of the plainest passages of scripture is perverted by such writers as bishop Hay, and indeed by all Popish writers.—"St Paul," says he, "speaking of the reconciliation of sinners to God, says, 'God hath reconciled us to himself by Christ; and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God, indeed, was in Christ reconciling the world to himself—and he hath placed in us the word of reconciliation; we are therefore ambassadors for Christ,' 2 Cor. v. 18. In these words, the apostle declares, that whereas God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, reconciled the world to himself, he was pleased to appoint the apostles, and their successors in office, to be the ministers of this reconciliation; that is, to be his substitutes on earth for applying to the souls of the people the means obtained by him for communicating the grace of reconciliation; and for this purpose, says the apostle, he placed in us the word of reconciliation, by which means we are made the ambassadors of Christ. Hence, then, it manifestly follows, that if the pastors of the church be the ministers of our reconciliation with God, if the *word of reconciliation*, the power of pronouncing sentence of absolution upon us, *be placed in them*, it is, of course, by their ministry alone, that we can obtain this reconciliation. Christ instituted no other way; therefore, it is our strict obligation to have recourse to them for this benefit, by laying open before them the state of our souls in the sacrament of confession, that they may apply to us the means of our reconciliation, in the way that Christ requires of them to do."—*Sincere Christian Instructed*, &c. vol. II. Page 82.

The apostle's doctrine in the above-cited passage, is, that when Christ died upon the cross, "God was in him reconciling the world to himself;" that is, taking away the grounds of difference which stood between him and sinners of the human race, "not imputing to them their trespasses;" but imputing them to Christ, who voluntarily took them upon himself, that he might make atonement for them; thus it is said, "he bore our sins in his own body on the tree." "For God made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in him." It was thus that God reconciled us to himself; and we are said to be reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Now, says the apostle, "he hath given to us the word of reconciliation." This was not to effect the reconciliation; for Christ himself effected it. It was not even to apply the means of reconciliation, as bishop Hay calls it, for it is the Holy Ghost alone that can apply the benefits of Christ's death to the souls of men. It was, as the apostle himself plainly declares, the gospel with which he was put in trust, and which he calls the word of reconciliation, because it shows the way by which we become reconciled to God. The apostles received a commission from Christ himself to preach this gospel to all the world. Thus they became his ambassadors; and as such they beseeched men, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God: that is, to believe in Christ, and acquiesce in the divine plan of salvation, which is called submitting to the righteousness of God.

The apostles never professed, like this arrogant priest, to put themselves forward as Christ's *substitutes*. They did not even call themselves ministers of reconciliation, as the Popish priests do. They were only ministers of the *word* of reconciliation, which is an expression of precisely the same import as the modern phrase, preachers of the gospel. They were indeed ambassadors of Christ. They received their commission directly from himself. They were endowed with extraordinary and miraculous powers for the exercise of their functions; and so guided by the Holy Spirit in all their ministrations, as to declare the mind of their master with infallible certainty. In these respects they had no successors; and there is no need of any; for they are to us in their writings as much the ambassadors of Christ as they were to those who were subjects of their personal preaching. By their word they are still beseeching men in the name of Christ to be reconciled to God.

Let no one imagine that by these remarks I mean to undervalue a standing ministry in the churches of Christ; I know this to be as really of divine appointment as the apostolic office itself. I know that he who gave apostles and prophets, for laying the foundation of the church, gave also pastors and teachers for its edifying, or building up. But the latter have no right to put themselves in the place of the former, much less to exalt themselves above them, as the silliest Popish priest does, when he requires persons to confess their secret sins to him, and when he gives himself out as a minister of reconciliation, as one who is able to grant pardon of sin by means of his sacraments, and to restore sinners to the favour and friendship of their offended Creator.

No. XCIV.

SATURDAY, April 29th, 1820.

The subject of satisfaction for sin is intimately connected with that of confession. The one, indeed, is incomplete without the other; for let a sinner make ever so good a confession, and let him even have received full absolution, it is necessary that he perform his penance; that is, make satisfaction to divine justice for his sins, in his own person. That I may do the church of Rome all manner of justice, I shall, as usual, lay down the doctrine in the very words of their own standard authors. The following is Gother's statement of what the church of Rome disavows, and of what she avows; which was published and approved "by the late venerable and reverend Dr Richard Challoner, Bishop of Debra, and Vicar Apostolic of the London district. The twentieth edition."

"Of Satisfaction. The Papist misrepresented, believes very injuriously of Christ's passion, being persuaded that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our sins, but that it is necessary for every one to make satisfaction for themselves. And for this end, after he has been at confession, the priest enjoins him a penance; by the performance of which, he is to satisfy for his offences: and thus confidently relying on his own penitential works, he utterly evacuates Christ's passion; and though he professes himself a Christian, and that Christ is his Saviour, yet by his little trusting to him, he seems to think him to be no better than what his crucifix informs him, that is, a mere wooden one.

"The Papist truly represented, believes it damnable to think injuriously of Christ's passion. Nevertheless he believes, that though condign satisfaction for the guilt of sin, and the pain eternally due to it, be proper only to Christ our Saviour; yet penitent sinners being redeemed by Christ, and made his members, may in some measure satisfy by prayers, fasting, alms, &c. for the temporal pain, which, by order of God's justice, sometimes remains due after the guilt and the eternal pains are remitted. So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's sufferings every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings, but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St Paul did, who, by many tribulations, and by suffering in his own flesh, filled up that which was behind of the passions of Christ; and this not only for himself, but for the whole church, Coloss. i. 24; and this he finds everywhere in Scripture, viz. people admonished of the greatness of their sins, doing penance in fasting, sackcloth, and ashes, and by voluntary austerities, endeavouring to satisfy divine justice. And these personal satisfactions God has sufficiently also reminded him of in the punishments inflicted on Moses, Aaron, David, and infinite others; and even in the afflictions sent by God upon our own age, in plagues, wars, fires, persecutions, rebellions, and such like: which few are so atheistical but they confess to be sent from heaven, for the just chastisement of our sins; and which we are to undergo, notwithstanding the infinite satisfaction made by Christ, and without any undervaluing it. Now, being thus convinced of some temporal punishment being due to his sins, he accepts of all tribulations, whether in body, name, or estate, from whencesoever they come, and with others of his own choosing, offers them up to God, for the discharging his debt; still confessing that his offence deserves yet more. But these penitential works he is taught to be no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to the satisfaction Jesus made upon the cross; in virtue of which alone, all our good works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight."

The above is the entire chapter on satisfaction. I request the reader to study it closely, and then to say if he does not find that what is called the misrepresentation, is substantially the same as the representation: and this is the case with most of the articles in the work. The author gives what Protestants allege against the church of Rome, in such language as he chooses to put in their mouths: he usually begins his answer with a sentence of damnation; and then, with a "nevertheless," he comes round to admit and defend the very same doctrines, though in different words, and generally in words which are less explicit, and therefore more susceptible of a double meaning.

Take for instance the first sentence of what is called the misrepresentation in the above extract:—The Papist "believes very injuriously of Christ's passion, being persuaded that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our sins; but that it is necessary for every one to make satisfaction for themselves," or "for himself," as it should be; for Papists do not write very grammatically. Compare this with the following words of the Papist truly represented, and say where is the difference? "Penitent sinners being redeemed by Christ, and made his members, may in some measure satisfy by prayers, fasting, alms, &c. for the temporal pain, which, by order of God's justice, sometimes remains due after the guilt and eternal pains are remitted." And "by voluntary austerities endeavouring to satisfy divine justice." Here it is plainly admitted, that persons may in some measure satisfy divine justice for themselves, which is the very thing alleged against them, in what they call a misrepresentation of them; and that this is a disparagement of the passion of Christ, and a declaration that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory,

must be evident to all who understand the terms.

The following sentence alone contains the substance of what Protestants allege against the church of Rome; and there cannot be a plainer avowal that Papists consider the sufferings of Christ as not sufficient. "So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's sufferings every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings, but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St Paul did," &c. We shall see by and by, that St Paul did no such thing; but maintained the very opposite doctrine, namely, that he would trust, or glory in nothing but the cross of Christ, that is, in Christ's suffering to the death as an atoning sacrifice—a sacrifice by which divine justice was fully satisfied.

If a man were to speak ever so truly of the light of the sun at noon, and to say that he trusted in it as very useful to enable him to follow his lawful calling; but if "nevertheless" he would insist on setting up a farthing candle as a necessary or profitable addition, and above all, if he paid much more attention to the trimming and admiring his farthing candle, than to using the light of the sun for its proper purposes, all the world would say that he considered the sun's light as insufficient; nay, that he despised it, and thought very injuriously of it, seeing he found himself so deficient in point of light, as to be under the necessity of making an addition of his own.

My simile falls short of what I mean to represent by it; for there is light in a burning farthing candle; and when it is held up in the face of the sun there is more light than there was before. There is an actual addition of light, however imperceptible; but with regard to the point in hand, it is absolutely impossible for all the creatures in the universe to make an addition to the satisfaction which Christ made to divine justice by his sufferings; and, therefore, the man who attempts to make such an addition, believes more "injuriously of Christ's passion," than the man does of the light of the sun who attempts to help it by means of a farthing candle.

This is not a subject to be treated with levity. It requires to be considered with the utmost seriousness; though when Papists speak of *their* satisfying divine justice in some measure, we cannot think that they are serious, but upon the supposition that they consider God as such a one as themselves, as one who thinks lightly of sin, and whose justice is easily satisfied.

God, as our creator and lawgiver, is entitled to the constant and entire obedience of our hearts, and of our whole lives. But we have failed in this duty of obedience; and by our disobedience have become enemies to God in our minds, and by wicked works. As enemies we deserve to suffer the wrath of God to the uttermost. There can be nothing meritorious in the sufferings of persons who deserve to suffer. The sufferings of sinners, therefore, can never satisfy divine justice, or effect their reconciliation with God. The law by which transgressors are condemned, makes no provision for their reconciliation, but hands them over to the executioner of divine vengeance. To satisfy divine justice, it is necessary to suffer to the full extent of what one's sins deserve; and no man in the world can do this, for the wages of sin is death;—the penalty of transgression is everlasting destruction.

To satisfy divine justice for the sins of men, nothing less would be accepted than the sufferings of one who had no sin. Thus the perfect holiness of Jesus Christ is declared to have been essentially necessary, in order to his making satisfaction for the sins of his people. Had he had any sin of his own, all that he suffered would have been due to divine justice on his own account, and he could not have effected the reconciliation of himself, much less that of others. "Such an High Priest became us (was necessary for us), who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests (under the law), to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's," Heb. vii. 26, 27. He offered sacrifice for the sins of the people when he offered up himself; but in order to his doing this acceptably and availably, it was necessary that he should have no sin of his own. His sacrifice satisfied divine justice, because it was a sacrifice "without spot;" and because it was presented by him, who, "though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and who, being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation to all them who obey him;" Heb. v. 8, 9.

Now, the effect of Christ's suffering is, eternal life to all them that obey him; that is, to all who believe in him; for to believe in Christ is the obedience of the gospel. This is the work of God, that we believe on him whom he hath sent. Faith in Christ is the first thing that God requires of every sinner to whom the gospel is sent; it is the first thing that he will acknowledge and accept, as of the nature of obedience to his command; and it is the root and animating principle of all other obedience.

Now the satisfaction to divine justice which Christ made by his sufferings and death, is declared to be so absolutely perfect and complete, as to effect the full and everlasting reconciliation of all who believe in him. "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 39. According to the tenor of the new covenant, the

Almighty declares concerning all who are interested in it, "their sins and iniquities I will remember no more," Heb. viii. 12. Those who by nature were far from God, both in state and character, "are made nigh by the blood of Christ," Eph. ii. 13. "And you," says the apostle Paul to the believers in Colosse, chap. i. 21, 22; "you that were sometime alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, and unblameable, and unreproveable, in his sight." Now, such is the high privilege of those who are so reconciled to God by Jesus Christ, that nothing at all stands marked against them. "There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus," Rom. viii. 1. Their sins are blotted out absolutely and for ever, so far as regards *punishment* in any sense of the word; and it would not be consistent with justice to exact the smallest degree of punishment, seeing Jesus Christ made full satisfaction, when he gave his life a ransom for them.

No man, who understands the nature and design of Christ's sufferings, could imagine for a moment, that God still required something in the way of suffering, by sinners themselves, in order to satisfy his justice. The idea is absolutely heathenish. It has its origin in false notions of the character of God, such as prevail among all heathens, and among all who have corrupted the true religion, and who change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man. This notion, however, is interwoven with the very essence of Popery. Without her confession, and her satisfaction to divine justice, by stripes or by money, the church of Rome would be as destitute as the poor idolater, Micah, who exclaimed, "You have taken away my gods, and what have I more?"

It may be worth while to spend a few minutes in considering the sort of satisfaction which Papists profess to make to divine justice, in order to escape the temporal pain which is due to their sins;—these are "prayers, fasting, alms, &c." and "voluntary austerities." And so, it seems, in the esteem of the holy and infallible church of Rome, prayer is considered a suffering and a punishment, by which, among other things, they expect to make atonement for their sins. Among Christians, it is considered a precious privilege to have access to God, in the name of Christ, by prayer and supplication, for those things which we have need of: but among Papists, the case is very different; their prayers are things in which most of them can take no interest, being chiefly in an unknown tongue; and consisting in the incessant repetition of the same words, without having any distinct ideas attached to them. It is quite natural to look upon such an exercise as a punishment: the error consists in supposing that it is an atonement for sin. Under the notion of its being a punishment, there was policy in ordaining prayer to be in an unknown tongue; but it is surprising that they do not use a language less musical than the Latin. What exquisite torture would the low Dutch, or Anglo-Northumbrian, inflict upon an Italian ear!

I grant that a person may suffer a great deal by fasting, if carried to excess; but so far as it is prescribed as a Christian duty, I have no doubt it is salutary both to body and mind. Almsgiving can be considered as a punishment only by persons who worship their money, and who believe not the words of Christ, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

There may be suffering enough under the head of voluntary austerities; but to think that God is pleased with such things, nay, that he is so well pleased with them, as to accept them "gratefully" as a satisfaction for sin, shows that the most false and degrading notions of the character of God are entertained by the church of Rome. When one thinks of the bloody character of Popery as it appears in this article alone, he cannot help comparing Romish worship with the cruel rites of heathen idolatry; and though he must allow that the worshippers of Juggernaut exceed in their austerities and self-tortures any thing that he sees among Papists, he considers both as acting upon the same principle; both serving an idol that delights in human misery—that requires one to torture his own flesh; another to offer the fruit of his body, as a satisfaction for the sin of his soul.

I shall not torture the minds of my readers by describing the bloody austerities, either enjoined or voluntary, which Papists practise in the way of penance, in order to satisfy divine justice. I shall confine myself to such as are more harmless, and such as are ludicrous, of which I could present an abundant catalogue.

St Dominick began to afflict his body at a very early period of life; for we learn from the Golden Legend, printed in London, 1527, that while yet an infant he would often rise out of his cradle, and lay himself naked upon the cold ground. The author does not inform us what were the particular sins for which the infant imposed this penance on himself. St Francis, as Bonaventure testifies, used to call his body, Brother Ass, because of the rigorous severities, continual whippings, and coarse diet, with which he treated it. Indeed, if he treated his ass in the same manner as his own body, he was guilty of great injustice to the innocent beast, that had never confessed any sin that required penance. The saint took care to sprinkle all his food with ashes. If he had done the same with an ass's food, it is likely the good sense of the beast would have

induced him to leave the whole mess to his master. St Ignatius, the father of the Jesuits, immediately after his conversion, put himself *incognito* into an hospital, where he fasted whole weeks with bread and water, except on Sundays, when he eat a few boiled herbs, but sprinkled with a good seasoning of ashes. He girded himself with an iron chain, wore a hair shirt, gave himself a comfortable whipping three times a day, slept little, and lay upon the cold ground. He resolved to continue these austerities all his life, to go barefoot to the holy land, and then choose a wild desert for his permanent residence. When he had first begun to gather disciples in Paris, and had gained Peter Faber to him, he used with him to lie abroad in winter evenings upon the snow and ice, gazing upon the heavens; and then stripping themselves to their shirts, lay the remaining part of the night upon the cold heap. St Macarius did penance by going naked six months in a desert, suffering himself to be stung with flies. This penance the saint had imposed upon himself for the sin of having killed a flea. See a work entitled, *The Enthusiasm of the Church of Rome,* which contains great abundance of such matter.

It would be to burlesque all religion to say that such things as these are acceptable to God, or that they are sufferings which satisfy divine justice; yet the church of Rome holds them forth in this light; and at this very day, in Ireland, the poor people are so deluded by their priests, as to believe that by such means they can make satisfaction for their sins. A gentleman of that kingdom, at present in Scotland, tells me that it is a common thing with the priests there, to enjoin upon their penitents a long journey, as a suitable satisfaction to divine justice for the sins which they have confessed. A sinner in a remote district is thus compelled to travel to the county town, which is, perhaps, forty miles distant, and the priest takes special care that the work shall be done; for the penitent must bring a ticket from the clergyman of the place, to certify that he was there; if such clergyman be an ordinary priest the ticket costs so much; if a bishop so much more; and the penitent must be very careful that he attend to no other business in that journey, but that of making satisfaction to divine justice, or doing penance for his sins. If he do any other business whatever, he loses the whole benefit of his journey, and must do it over again. My friend relates an instance of a poor man who had performed his penance to the extent enjoined upon him. He appeared before the clergyman of the place to receive his ticket; but the holy father observing a piece of new leather in his pocket, asked what it meant. "Why, please your reverence," said the poor man, "I have bought a bit of leather in this town to mend my shoes when I go home." The priest kindly told him that this vitiated his whole work of satisfaction; so he was sent home without his ticket, to make his journey over again.

The Papist truly represented says, that "he does not think that by the sufferings of Christ, every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings; but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St Paul did, who, by many tribulations, and by suffering in his own flesh, filled up that which was behind of the passions of Christ, and this not only for himself, but for the whole church." Let it be observed that the representer is speaking of such sufferings as satisfy, in some measure, divine justice; and let the reader look at the apostle's own words, Coloss. i. 24, and he will see that they imply no such thing as Papists would extort from them. The apostle is speaking of the afflictions which awaited him in the discharge of his duty as an ambassador of Christ, and which he willingly endured for the sake of the church; but none but a Papist would ever attempt to fix upon him the absurdity and impiety of adding, by his sufferings, to those of Christ, by which he satisfied divine justice for the sins of his people.

There are many errors contained in this one article of Popery, which I have barely room to mention, as I do not wish to occupy another Number with the subject:—First, it is maintained that after the eternal punishment of sin is remitted, in consequence of Christ's satisfaction, divine justice still requires some temporal punishment, which is contrary to all that the Bible teaches with regard to the perfection of Christ's sacrifice, and the full acquittal of all who believe in him. Secondly, the afflictions of Christians in this world are considered as punishments inflicted by divine justice; whereas they are really the effects of divine goodness, and are beneficial to those who are tried by them. A third error, besides those which I have exposed at length, is that which represents the punishment of nations by plagues, wars, &c. as inflictions of divine justice, "notwithstanding the infinite satisfaction made by Christ," as if this were something that God required to satisfy his justice over and above what Christ suffered. Now the sufferings of Christ have no relation at all to nations as such, but only to the individuals of all nations who believe in him. The wicked suffer the punishment of their own sins; but never to the extent of satisfying divine justice; therefore their suffering continues for ever.

No. XCV.

SATURDAY, May 6th, 1820.

My Galloway correspondent, who subscribes

himself "A Friend to Fair Dealing," has favoured me with a long and pretty well written letter. The greater part of it consists of remarks on my reply to his queries in my 85th Number, with which he is not satisfied. The things on which he animadverts, however, regard rather myself and my writings, than the public cause in which I am engaged. For instance, he affects to find me wrong in asserting that it never was a matter of consideration with me or my Protestant readers, what we would, and would not *permit* government to do. He accuses the good citizens of Glasgow of not permitting government to do something, when they opposed the church bill. He is not pleased with my allusion to the man in the moon. He is still of opinion that I ought to attack the Radical Reformers, as being more dangerous than the Papists; but I hope he is convinced by this time that the Radicals are under the control of much more powerful weapons than my pen. He thinks that my writings have too long turned aside the eyes of my readers from the real cause of alarm, and directed them to a quarter which bears no very threatening aspect in comparison of the other. And he labours at great length to justify the practice of the priest's taking money for church dues from poor widows, even though they are supported by public charity. If I were to insert all that he has written on these subjects, and make particular replies, it would take me over a great deal of ground that I have already trodden, and it would fill two or three Numbers, which would be too great an encroachment on the reader's patience. He has, however, brought forward some new matter, which I shall give in his own words, and add such remarks as I may think necessary.

"In perusing," says he, "some of your later Numbers, I have had occasion to notice some very good specimens of your *impartiality* and *consistency* of argument. You mention with much approbation the establishment of the Hibernian Schools, for the purpose of teaching the people of Ireland to read the Bible. All this is very good; but from some passages which have escaped you, it would appear that your approbation of them proceeds from a desire to diminish the authority of the Catholic religion, and to make proselytes to Protestantism, as much as from any desire to communicate instruction. 'Had the same efforts,' you say, 'been made fifty years ago,' that are made now, and which you blame British Christians for not doing sooner, 'the Pope would not at this day have had such hold of the consciences of the Irish people: and it is to be hoped that fifty years hence he will have no hold of them at all.' In order to preserve the semblance of liberality, to be sure, you say that you would not deprive them of the privilege of endeavouring to gain converts; of doing what they can by *fair argument*, to make proselytes. From what follows, however, it appears that you would wish to make the privilege turn to as little account as possible, because you express a doubt if there be such a thing as *fair argument* among them, and assure us that you never saw or heard of it. You give every encouragement in your power to Protestants to tell Papists that they are in error, and that they are training up their people in error and idolatry. You establish it as the undoubted right of the British Legislature to establish schools for the education of the subjects; and I suppose you would consider it to be a very arbitrary government which would deprive any society or individual of the privilege of educating their children in their own religious principles. I suppose if Mr Scott or Dr Kelly were to employ any of their communion to come into your house, or that of any of your Protestant friends, and teach your or their children, to furnish them with Popish catechisms, and to bring them up in the Catholic faith;—if further, when you were employing your paternal authority and influence to prevent such teachers from obtaining a residence with you, and your children from listening to their instructions, (as I take it for granted you would,) they should ask you, as you do them, 'What right have you to such influence?' and should accuse you of rebellion and sedition for employing it: would not you have reason, think you, to complain of 'efforts made to diminish your influence, and mar your interference, in the religious and moral education of your children?' Yet at the same time you will take every liberty short of absolute force, to instruct, that is to convert, Papist children (because you are sure they cannot be saved unless they are converted); but you will neither allow Papists the exclusive right of the religious and moral education of the youth of their communion, nor to enforce the rules of their order upon those who depart from them.

"In proposing further queries to you, I would mention the following as one. In the beginning of your answer alluded to, you set out by saying, that 'an obscure son of the church has done you the honour of addressing you a letter,' alluding to the one I formerly sent you; and that 'it is the only one you have received from *holy church* since you published that of W. D. By 'the church,' and the 'holy church,' I take it for granted you mean the Catholic church; and by my being a 'son of that church,' it is equally clear you are satisfied that I am a Catholic. Now I ask you, by what superior illumination, gift of the Spirit, or mechanical impulse, were you assured that I was a Catholic? or to speak more rationally, from what premises in my letter could you draw such a conclusion?

"It seems indeed to be a maxim with you to form conclusions from very lame premises,

to ascribe actions to motives very foreign to them, and to force consequences out of them, which they were never intended or never calculated to produce; insomuch that were you appointed a judge upon men and their conduct, I suspect that your decisions would be at least equally summary and unwarrantable with those of the Pope, or the court of Inquisition. You who can confidently arraign the Archbishop of Tuam with the guilt of denying original sin, because, in a common mode of speaking, which perhaps no man but yourself would have taken offence at, and which is surely not more objectionable than your "immense files of letters," he mentioned the 'innocent and unsuspecting youth of his charge;' —you who insinuate a charge of rebellion against the Papists on account of their claiming, what every one of us claims, and what government establishes, viz. a right to educate the youth of their communion in their own principles, and to use their endeavours to prevent others from interfering with that right: you who can confidently pronounce W. D. to be no Christian, if he do not at your requisition immediately leave the communion of the church of Rome, and who can infallibly judge that he does not wish to serve God from his heart with all his strength, for this very reason because he is a Papist;—you who can make a Papist guilty of renouncing his Saviour, and forfeiting his eternal salvation, because he believes in transubstantiation, &c. &c.—will find no difficulty in pronouncing one to be a Papist, which with you, I suppose, is a term synonymous with a reprobate, merely because he does what every one is bound to do, namely, to expose error and misrepresentation wherever he sees it, and against what party soever it is employed.

"From your unchristianizing of W. D. if he continue in the church of Rome, and declaring all Papists void of sincerity in the service of God, because they are such;—from your pronouncing the church of Rome to be the antitype of Babylon; the place where Satan has his seat; the reverse of what the name she retains, (that is, Christian) implies; and that the gates of hell have prevailed against her; —as well as from many other inferences you draw from the Popish faith and worship,—I think it may be understood, that you hold for certain that the church of Rome is not the church of Christ; and that therefore, it is the duty of all Christians to withdraw themselves from her communion, and to renounce her jurisdiction. Believing that these are your sentiments till you contradict them, I now ask you, as my concluding question at present, Upon what warrantable grounds do you hold the foresaid opinions?

"When you have answered these, you may expect some more queries and remarks on your work, from—"A FRIEND TO FAIR DEALING."

I have quoted only about a third part of the letter, and yet I have introduced a good deal of matter that is merely personal, and that has little relation to the questions at issue between the church of Rome and THE PROTESTANT; and which, therefore, I shall despatch in as few words as possible. For instance, of what importance is it to the public to be informed how I knew that the writer was a Papist? He does not deny the fact: and if I inferred it from "very lame premises," he ought to give me the more credit for my sagacity. Short as his first letter was, I *guessed*, from the style and manner of it, that the writer was a Papist. I have now become so familiar with the Popish mode of writing, that I find it as easy to distinguish it as to distinguish the features of a Jew in the streets of London. I would not pretend to decide with infallible certainty in either case; because it is possible to be mistaken; and I might have been mistaken with regard to the religion of my correspondent. Had it been so, I would readily have acknowledged it; but I shall not easily be induced to make an apology for being right.

My correspondent might have satisfied himself, without so many words, that I hold for certain that the church of Rome is not the church of Christ: and that it is the duty of all Christians in her communion, if there be any, to withdraw themselves from her immediately. This I hold as a fundamental principle in my controversy with the church of Rome. I declare that she is not the church of Christ, but the greatest enemy that Christ and his church ever had in the world; and when my correspondent asks upon what warrantable ground I hold such an opinion, I must refer him to what I have already written. It has been my object under every head of discussion to draw this inference, that the religion of Rome is the very opposite of the religion of Christ. The church of Christ is built upon the "foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" but the church of Rome is built upon human tradition; and she does not even profess to have a more solid foundation than a fallible creature, whom she calls St Peter. The church of Christ acknowledges only one object of worship; namely, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but Rome, falsely called Christian, has as many objects of worship as Rome pagan had. Every member of the church of Christ is taught to deny his own righteousness, however great it may appear to be in the sight of fellow-creatures, and to trust in that of Christ alone for the salvation of his soul; but the members of the church of Rome are taught to trust in their own righteousness, and in that of mere creatures like themselves; to trust in their own works, or in the works of some whom

they call saints. The church of Christ is composed of persons who are born again; "created anew after Christ Jesus unto good works;" that is, who are subjects of the Holy Spirit's gracious and powerful influence, and who are made holy in life and conversation; but the church of Rome does not even pretend to any greater regeneration than a priest can effect by means of his holy water; and she does not exhibit in the conduct of her members, not even in that of her priests, more real holiness of life than is to be found among mere men of the world, who make no pretensions to Christianity. The church of Rome, therefore, is not the church of Christ, but the counterfeit and the enemy of it. My correspondent might have seen this, if he had read all my papers with attention; and if he has not read them all, I request that he will do so without delay; and this may perhaps save him the trouble of writing some of the other queries which he has in reserve to send me, as it is likely he will find that I have answered them already. I shall be glad, however, to receive as many as he pleases; and I shall answer them too, if they shall be such as relate to the subjects of the controversy.

If I had not guessed the fact before, I would have discovered that this "Friend to Fair Dealing" was a Papist, from the *unfair* manner in which he perverts my words and misrepresents my meaning. I did not bring a charge of rebellion against Papists for claiming a right to educate the youth of their communion in their own principles; but I do charge them with opposing the benevolent design of their Protestant neighbours and rulers, when they do all that lies in their power to prevent them from teaching poor children to read the Bible. I did charge the Pope with an impertinent interference with the civil and domestic affairs of Ireland; and I do not hesitate to say that those bishops and priests who encourage, and endeavour to give effect to such interference, are guilty of a misdemeanour, which in some countries would be held equal to rebellion. I did not say that W. D. was no Christian if he did not at my requisition immediately leave the communion of the Church of Rome; but because if he did not so, *he was not a man of his word;* and I would say of any Protestant as well as of any Papist, if he is not a man of his word he is not a Christian. Speaking of my correspondent himself, I did not call him "an obscure son of the church," as he pretends to quote my words; but "*a more* obscure," &c., that is, more obscure than the Pope and the Popish Archbishop of Tuam, whom I had just mentioned. I spoke of him as obscure only comparatively, but not absolutely; for he may be a priest for any thing that I know.

It is true, indeed, that I did in effect charge the Popish Archbishop with denying original sin, when he spoke of the *innocent* youth of his communion; and I would say the same of any other man who should use such language in a public address intended for the direction of persons who are called teachers of religion. I know that in light conversation, where words are often used in a loose sense, it is usual to call those innocent who are comparatively so; and, if speaking of actual sin, I would have no hesitation in calling infants innocent: but the Archbishop was not speaking of infants, but of youth, whose original depravity must have manifested itself in many of the bitter fruits of actual transgression: and we cannot suppose him to use words in a loose sense in a well-studied address to all the learned clergy of his diocese. As, however, the church of Rome holds the doctrine of original sin, and as it would not be the design of the Archbishop to deny it, he ought not to be offended, but rather to thank me for admonishing him to be more careful of his language.

I readily confess, that if Mr Scott and Dr Kelly were to come into my house, and to attempt to inculcate nonsense and blasphemy even upon my servants, I would send them about their business; and I hope all my Protestant friends would do the same; but this is not the true state of the question: my correspondent, in the most Jesuitical manner, shifts it off the proper ground. I was speaking of the Popish influence which was exercised, not in the way of teaching Popery, but in the way of opposing the teaching of the Bible. I even went so far as to concede to Papists the right of doing all that they could do, by means of fair argument, to gain proselytes, and to prevent their people from becoming Protestants; but I am far from conceding to them the right of preventing Protestants from doing what *they* can by mere persuasion to gain Papists, young or old, from error and idolatry, to the knowledge of the truth and the service of Jesus Christ. Popish priests have no right to speak of their children, because they cannot lawfully have any; but supposing Dr Kelly and Mr Scott to have numerous families, I would not think it lawful to force myself into the midst of them, and to endeavour to convert them, without their consent. I have no wish to diminish the lawful influence of parents of any religious persuasion, or to prevent their interference in what they may consider for the good of their families; but what I complain of is the influence, and the interference, that will not permit those who wish for education to themselves and families to receive it. I claim no right to thrust myself into Popish families against their will, though my object should be the important one of teaching the word of God; but when both parents and children are willing to be taught, and eagerly desiring to learn to read the

Bible, as many of them are, I should consider myself entitled, nay, urgently called upon, to gratify their desire, and that in spite of all the priests in the world: and I do complain of the influence of the priests exercised to prevent those who desire instruction from receiving it. This is an influence and interference which ought to be marred and effectually put down, for it is inconsistent with British freedom, as well as with the benign spirit of Christianity.

My correspondent is right when he says, "I am sure that Papist children cannot be saved unless they be converted." I am perfectly sure of this; and I am equally sure that neither can Protestant children be saved unless they be converted. The word of God concludes all under sin; and there is no name by which any can be saved but that of Jesus Christ; and my object in recommending the Hibernian and other societies, that are teaching the poor Irish to read the Bible, is not with the view of making them Protestants merely, but of making them Christians, through the knowledge of that Saviour whom the Bible reveals. I would "*not* allow the Papists the *exclusive* right of the religious and moral education of the youth of their communion;" for they have no title to it. Every youth among them has a right to seek for the best education he can get, and every British subject has a right to communicate instruction to all who are willing to receive it.

The cavils of my correspondent admit of a much larger exposure; but I satisfy myself with the above, which I hope will also satisfy my readers in general, though it will not satisfy him. I conclude the present Number with the declaration of another Irish Bishop against the use of the Bible in Schools; which is taken from an Irish newspaper.

TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF CLOYNE AND ROSS.

"REVEREND BRETHREN,

"During a series of years, from the time that schools were opened in Ireland, under the patronage of humane and respectable Protestants, for the professed purpose of educating poor Catholic children gratuitously, without infringing in any respect upon their religious principles, we have had repeated cause to complain that these liberal professions were uniformly deviated from; and so widely as to force us into effectual opposition. It was, we imagined, to be presumed, that when the education of the Irish poor became a national concern; when a great number of distinguished personages noted for rank, learning, and affluence, formed an association avowedly for this benevolent purpose; when the Imperial Parliament not only patronised the measure, but supported it by an abundant annual grant,—it was, we hoped, to be presumed, that the narrow views of certain bigoted individuals would be liberalized by the above expanded association, and would merge in its wide liberality. We were the more warranted in this hope by the third article of the laws, which were to regulate the proceedings of the association; for it is there expressly declared, that the leading principle of the Society is to afford equal facilities fer education, to all professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any.—Yet, in too many instances it became difficult to reconcile the practice of the association with its previous professions. But at the last general meeting in Kildare-street, on the 24th day of February, the rejection of Mr O'Connell's motion by so great a majority as 80 against 19, has evinced beyond the powers of tergiversation, that the professions of the society were not intended to regulate its practice; but that under the name of education, proselytism was the determined object. To Mr O'Connell, for his spirited exertions on this occasion, the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due; and surely, if confiding apathy had hitherto benumbed any individual among us, the present electrifying fact must restore his energies, and rouse him to a due sense of the danger. With you, my Rev. Brethren, I am long and intimately acquainted.—Your sentiments on the Bible without note or comment, as an initiatory book for schools, are well known to me. It is important, however, at this juncture, and after what was flippantly asserted at the above meeting, that these sentiments be emphatically declared to the entire kingdom. The Roman Catholic clergy of every other diocese, may now probably feel bound to proclaim their sentiments also. For my own part, I have long since recorded mine upon this subject. The brightest luminaries of the Protestant church have led the way for us, with arguments, to this very moment, unanswered. I shall not here advert to them; neither is it necessary that you should. Your opinion, I am confident, will be unanimous, and in perfect accord with what has been lately published by the most Rev. Dr Kelly, of Tuam, the Rt. Rev. Dr Boyle of Kildare and Leighlin, and the Rt. Rev. Dr Archdeacon of Kilmacdugh and Kilfenora. The plan suggested by the last named prelate, and more forcibly recommended by Mr O'Connell, for educating children of the different religions, in the same school, without any reference to religious subjects, which may more properly be treated by their own clergy in their respective places of worship, has my entire assent, and shall have my most cordial co-operation. Mutual confidence, good understanding, and brotherly regard, may be thus happily promoted throughout this hitherto distracted country; a blessing so invaluable, that every effort should be made by us for the attainment of it. No real friend of Ire-

land will, I trust, be backward to affix his name, and contribute his support, to Mr O'Connell's project of a national association for educating the Irish poor. That such project may be speedily adopted, and that it may promote all the good intended by the benevolent patrons of it, is the ardent prayer of your faithfully devoted friend and humble servant,

"WILLIAM COPINGER."
R. C. Bishop.

Cove, March 6th, 1820.

No. XCVI.

SATURDAY, MAY 13TH, 1820.

I THOUGHT I had done with Dr Kelly of Tuam, when I finished my remarks on his own archiepiscopal manifesto against the Bible and the schools in which it is taught; but I find that this manifesto, together with that of the Pope which occasioned it, has laid the foundation of certain proceedings which require to be noticed in such a work as "THE PROTESTANT." It is evident that the Popish clergy in Ireland are in such a state of anxiety and alarm as was never witnessed before. They are in the condition of persons who know that there is an enemy at their door, and this enemy is *the Bible.* This is precisely the state in which I wish to see them, while they look upon the Bible *as an enemy;* but whenever they shall become reconciled to it, and accept of it as a precious gift of God to sinful men, I wish that their alarm may cease, and that they may enjoy all the peace and comfort which it imparts to every one who truly receives it as the word of God.

I concluded my last Number with an address by Bishop Coppinger to the clergy of his diocese, in which he also discovers his dread of that alarming book, which has been in fact the occasion of all the calamities which have befallen the church of Rome, during the last three hundred years. Our Irish Papists have found out that the Bible is not only formidable in the hands of men and women; but that even in the hands of children it is a most dangerous weapon. Children, therefore, must not be trusted with it, lest they should become champions of Protestantism, and eventually overthrow the infallible church.

Following up the address of the said Bishop, a number of Popish clergymen met, and adopted the following resolutions, which I take from the Cork Mercantile Chronicle of March 27, 1820:—

"We, the Roman Catholic Clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross, being called upon by our Bishop, the Right Rev. Doctor Coppinger, to declare our sentiments concerning the introduction of the Bible, without note or comment, as an initiatory book into Catholic schools, have resolved unanimously, at our several Conferences holden in the course of this present month:

"First—That in the profession of faith adopted universally throughout the whole Catholic Church, it is stated: 'I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother, the church, has held and doth hold, to which it belongs to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'—This article of our belief, precluding, as it does, all private and arbitrary interpretation of the Scriptures, wisely guards the unlearned and unstable of our communion against wresting the sacred volume to their own destruction: it further goes to prevent their being carried about by every wind of doctrine, while it tends to effect what the Redeemer so strongly inculcates, viz. that 'we be all one, as He and his heavenly Father are one:' or, as the apostle has it, 'that we be all of one mind, and that there be no schism among us'—while, moreover, it assuredly does not sanction the Bible, without note or comment, as a fit school-book for thoughtless and inconsiderate children.

"Resolved, Secondly—That however we respect those distinguished personages who patronize and support an opposite system, we never can acknowledge in them, or in any society of laymen, a right to regulate the religious concerns of the poor children committed to our care, much less to force upon them a plan of education obviously incompatible with the principles of their religion.

"Thirdly—That duly appreciating the advantages of a well-regulated education for the poor, we shall be ever ready to co-operate with the liberal and beneficent Protestants of our respective parishes in establishing schools on any practicable plan, not clashing with our tenets.

"Fourthly—That the foregoing resolutions be signed by the several Masters of Conference, in the name and on the behalf of ninety-nine Clergymen, respectively attending these meetings.

"Fifthly—That the avowals elicited by Counsellor O'Connell, at the last general meeting of the education society, in Kildare-street, are to us a subject of regret, equally, and of alarm: we shall not be unmindful of them. The splendid advocacy of that gentleman, in the cause of religious freedom, on the present occasion, demands our warmest acknowledgments, and we beg leave hereby most respectfully to present them.

"The Rev. Wm. O'BRIEN, Vicar-General presiding in the Conference of Buttevant.

"The Rev. J. BURKE, D. D. presiding in the Conference of Fermoy.
"The Rev. JAMES WALSH, Secretary of the Conference of Midleton.
"The Rev. JAMES MOLONY, presiding in the Conference of Donoughmore.
"The Rev. DAVID WALSH, presiding in the Conference of Rosscarbery."

The above resolutions refer to a Society which has been in active operation for about nine years, and by which many of the poor in Ireland have been taught to read, without distinction of religious profession. It was a fundamental rule and leading principle of the Society, "to afford equal facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any;" and that "the Scriptures, without note or comment, shall be read" in the schools; "but all catechisms and books of religious controversy excluded." The Society was composed of both Protestants and Papists; and they proceeded for some time without any apparent schism, doing a great deal of good; but some of the more keen-sighted Papists began to perceive what they thought a snake in the grass. They found out that the permission of the Bible, without note or comment, was likely to produce consequences not very favourable to their religion; and that, moreover, it was inconsistent with the rules of holy church. An attempt was made to expunge that rule of the Society which regarded the reading of the Bible; which, however, was effectually resisted. A similar attempt was made, in another form, at a meeting of the Society, on the 24th of February last. The champion of Bible exclusion, on this occasion, was Daniel O'Connell, Esq., whose speech is given at length, in a Report of the proceedings of the meeting, for which I have to thank my indefatigable correspondent in Lifford. If I were to give the speech entire, it would fill the remainder of this Number; but I conceive it enough to give only those parts which relate more directly to the propriety of excluding the Bible from the schools:—

"I know," says Counsellor O'Connell, "I know that by introducing the mention of the Scriptures, I am treading on delicate and dangerous ground, and shall meet with censure, abuse, and calumny; but conscious of but one motive, I invite such censure, and court such calumny. My motive is pure, though my opinion may be mistaken. By means of this part of your resolution, you have already commenced to impede, and, as your plan goes along and attracts attention, you will still more and more impede, the progress of your Society among a numerous class. I shall now clearly demonstrate that you do so, from actual facts. You do not grant the means of education to that class to which I belong. Let me not be mistaken: I shall always be ready to speak my own conviction, that my profession is the best; if I did not feel it to be so, I would not adhere to it for one hour. Every one here, I will allow, may feel the same. When I do therefore speak on the subject, I must protest against being supposed to infer disparagement to another's belief. I respect human freedom in opinion, and think every created being has a right to worship God according to his conscience: no human dignities would induce me to alter my opinion, whether I uttered it among the senators of England or the inquisitors of Spain.

"Allow me now to revert to the question, Whether making it a preliminary to give the Bible, without note or comment, does not affect the principle? I say it does:—as long as you insist on its being a school-book, you do not afford equal facilities to Catholics. I prove it thus. I begin with the lowest and humblest of my proofs; I begin with myself. I have, in a remote county, some property; not worth speaking of in any other way, than as it imposes on me the duty of assisting in the education of the poor who have claims upon me. I gave a school-house at a low rent and tax-free, and contributed also; still, however, we wanted assistance, and looked for it to your Society; but you would not afford it. I could not let the Bible be a school-book, and you insisted that I should. You, therefore, do not give equal facilities.

"The next proof is from the schools in Tralee, under the Rev. Mr Egan, supported by the voluntary contributions of tradesmen, containing 440 children. There are in it about seventeen or eighteen Protestants—no interference is used—the Catholics are not even taught in the presence of the Protestants.

"There is another school, under the care of the Rev. Mr Denny, a very amiable and liberal man. The number in his school is 20. The Catholic clergyman made this proposal: 'Let us unite five days out of six—let us teach them indifferently without introducing religious instruction; let them separate then, and each teach his own; let us go to the Society and apply for a grant.' Mr Denny would have done so, but that from your resolution he found he could not succeed in such application.

"I state these facts,—for what purpose? Not that you should decide upon them now, but to call on every honest man to pause and say, whether education is not the assertion of truth? Whether the man who asserts one thing and means another, be an honest man? or whether he does not himself most want education, who refuses a committee to inquire whether he may not have been mistaken?

"Since last meeting, matters have occurred with respect to the Catholic persuasion, which may be matters of ridicule to others, but are not so to us. The spiritual head of our church has issued what may not perhaps be ligatory on our consciences, even in spiritual matters, and it is well known that we often oppose him in temporals; but it is at least his advice, *ex cathedra*.—This excludes from Catholic schools the Testament, even with note and comment, even though these might be acceptable to the Catholics. It is, in fact, a bull of the Pope. This, therefore, has caused an additional difficulty; see, then, how you proceed: you say that you will afford equal facilities to each persuasion, and on the other hand comes the bull of the Pope, refusing such aid. Can you now find any one with such powers of face, as to tell me that you give equal facilities? Nothing but religious delusion can account for this.

"To be sure, when I last had the honour of addressing you, my friend Mr Burrowes answered me, and went near to persuade me that I knew nothing of the Catholic persuasion, and made a speech to prove it so; and a liberal and wealthy merchant, whom I see before me, did the same. I know that I shall have the same to encounter to-day I did not wish to enter further into such controversies, and therefore applied to some of the heads of the Catholic persuasion in Ireland. On the Most Reverend Dr Murray I shall make no eulogium. I applied also to the Most Reverend Dr Troy, and in consequence a meeting was held of the principal parish priests in Dublin, in order that I might have an authentic document to read to this meeting, to express their sentiments; and they have resolved that 'The Scriptures, with or without note or comment, are not fit to be used as a school-book.'—To be thumbed by every child in the school.

"I end with a proof that is irrefragable: this document has been sent to me for the very purpose of being read to this meeting. The meeting was held, and this resolution framed, for this very purpose.

"Now, my Lord Duke, see how this document calls on you to accede to my humble motion, to afford a committee to see if really equal facilities are granted. This document says, 'either with or without comment, it is not to be a school-book;' your resolution says it shall; put these together, and see how you can say 'equal facilities.' On the one hand, the determination of the prelates, that it shall not be a school-book; on the other yours, that you will not give assistance unless it is; yet you still say, that you cannot see any thing in this document to require at least the decency of a committee,—the decorum of an investigation. As the only thing that is objected to is the circulation of the holy Scriptures, I will tell you the course you ought to pursue, as honest men:—You ought to come forward to new-model your resolution, and also to give aid to such as refuse to use the Scriptures without note or comment. I well know that I shall hear to-day, as I did last year, something like prose run mad, something like half sermons about the value and the origin of this book, the Bible. *(Applause, mixed with louder hisses.)* If I have trod on the tail of the serpent of bigotry, let it hiss. Oh it was a good hiss! a noble hiss! an excellent hiss! and I thank you for the hiss. Those who hissed may suppose they are acting for the service of God; but they serve God by a falsehood. But there is more honesty in the hiss, than in those gentlemen who assert one thing and then say and do another. I have stated to you my own opinion, and shall restate it, notwithstanding the peril of the hiss. The Bible never can be received without note or comment by the Catholic persuasion. Gentleman hissers, we believe that the entire word of God has not been preserved in writing: we believe that a portion has been preserved in the church which preserved that writing: and this being our tenet, you cannot expect to have the Catholic clergy submit, when their attention is roused, to have the Bible used without note or comment, because they must have *tradition*, which we also call the word of God. Every Catholic is bound in life and in death to assert this;—you assert the opposite in your resolution."

The reader will see that the pleadings of counsellor O'Connell proceed upon the ground that the rules of the society are not consistent with themselves. The leading principle of the society, "to afford the same facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any," is not consistent with the other rule, which requires that the Scriptures, without note or comment, should be read in the schools. At first, Protestants and Papists met on this, which both, in their simplicity, considered common ground. The Protestant knew that the Bible alone was the foundation of his religion; and the Papist, without considering consequences, agreed to admit the Bible alone (that is, without note or comment) into the schools which were supported by the contributions of both parties. But O'Connell has found out that the Bible alone is not the foundation of his religion; and that therefore, the requiring of it to be read in the schools, is inconsistent with the professed object of the society, which is, to afford equal facilities for education to both Protestants and Papists. This is a declaration as plain as words can make it, that, in the opinion of Papists themselves, the Bible is against them. They will rather that their children shall go without education, than that they should have access to the Bible. This, however is by no

means the general feeling among the Irish Papists. Thousands of the peasantry are eagerly craving to have their children taught: but since the Pope issued his bull, which O'Connell admits to be, "in fact, a bull of the Pope," the clergy have taken the alarm, and he appears as their agent in the school society, in order, if possible, to get the Bible expelled from the schools.

This eloquent counsellor uses a somewhat curious argument. "The Bible," says he, "never can be received without note or comment by the Catholic persuasion. Gentlemen hissers, we believe that the entire word of God has not been preserved in writing: we believe that a portion has been preserved in the church which preserved that writing: and this being our tenet, you cannot expect to have the Catholic clergy submit, when their attention is roused, to have the Bible used without note or comment, because they must have *tradition*, which we also call the word of God." Now, suppose we grant that what they call tradition is also the word of God, it must be consistent with the written word: if it contain any thing of an opposite character, it cannot possibly have proceeded from the same source; but if it be the word of God, there can be no harm in giving other portions of the same word without it, or it without the other portions. Protestants admit that the Old Testament without the New, and that the New without the Old, is not the whole word of God; but we never suspect danger in giving the one without the other, though we prefer giving both together, when we can. Nay, I venture to affirm that there is not one book in either of the Testaments, which may not be safely given, and profitably read, though the reader should never see another page of the Bible. It is, in fact, to libel the inspired penmen to say that the writing of any of them would be productive of mischief without the guardianship of the rest. How much greater the libel, when all of them taken together are declared to be dangerous, unless they be subjected to the control of an imaginary being, to whom they give the name of tradition, whose authority, in the church of Christ, is of no more value than that of the traditions of the elders among the Jews, which we are assured, by an infallible witness, made void the law.

Besides; if it be dangerous to give the Bible without tradition, it must be also dangerous to give it with tradition, unless you give the whole mass of it. If the written word must not be given without the unwritten, much less must a part of the latter be given without the whole. I defy the church of Rome to say how big a book this would make; but I apprehend the stoutest dray-horse in the kingdom would not be able to move it. And would the grave counsellor O'Connell really propose to give such a primer to the poor Popish children at school? I apprehend he has no such intention. His object, and that of his reverend Fathers, is merely to get quit of the Bible altogether; and for his exertions in this behalf, the clergy are puffing him up to the skies.

The counsellor insinuates that the Protestant part of the society are guilty of duplicity, in professing to give equal facilities for education to all parties, without interfering with the religious opinions of any; and, at the same time, persisting in giving the Bible to the children. This is plainly admitting, that to give the Bible to a Papist, is interfering with his religious opinions. It is not pretended that any Protestant gentleman of the society, or any of their Protestant teachers, attempted to expound the Scriptures to the scholars, or to show their conformity with one system more than another. There has, therefore, been no *interference* with the religious opinions of any, in the sense in which they understood the word; and it is extremely unjust in the orator to bring such a charge against gentlemen who had done no more than what he and his Popish brethren had agreed should be done; namely, giving the Bible without note or comment. If the Papist believed the Bible to contain his religion, the giving of it was as much an interference with the religion of Protestant children, as the Protestant giving it, was with that of Popish children: and if there was any duplicity in the matter, it must attach to one party as well as the other.

O'Connell's speech received an able reply from Richard B. Warren, Esq. in which, among other things, he proved, that to withhold the word of God from children would be disobedience to the command of God. In answer to the objection founded on the alleged *profanation* of the Bible, "to be thumbed by every child in the school," Mr Warren stated that it was not used as a spelling-book; or used at all, but by those children who had made such proficiency in reading, as to be able to derive instruction from it; and this, I suppose, is the case in every well-regulated school in which the Bible is read.

It appears farther, from Mr Warren's speech, that many individuals and public bodies had contributed large sums; that a legacy had been bequeathed; and that even Parliament had granted pecuniary aid to the society, on the express understanding that the rules were to be adhered to; that is, that the Bible, without note or comment, was to be used in the schools. It is presumable that many of the donors would not have given a shilling to support schools from which the Bible was excluded. The measure, therefore, which Mr O'Connell desired to carry, would have been a breach of faith with both the living and the dead. But as these

were only heretics, the thing might, perhaps, in the opinion of Papists, be lawfully done.

No. XCVII.

SATURDAY, MAY 20TH, 1820.

THE reader is requested to connect what follows with the conclusion of my last Number.

The following striking fact, stated by Mr Warren, shows how Papists do when they get schools, even supported partly by Protestants, under their own management. "The learned gentleman has triumphantly referred to the Friars' School in Cork, as a proof of the anxiety, on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy, to promote the education of the poor: —I thank the learned gentleman for making mention of that school in particular, as I happen to be acquainted with the circumstances which led to its formation. About the time at which this Society was formed, the presence of *Joseph Lancaster*, in this country, excited a very general anxiety on the subject of the education of the poor. A meeting was held in the city of Cork, at which a very large sum was subscribed by all religious persuasions, for the purpose of establishing a school, on such a liberal plan as should be unobjectionable to every denomination of Christians; and after much discussion, it was resolved that the Scriptures should be excluded, lest the children of Roman Catholics might be otherwise prevented from attending. A noble school-house was erected, capable of accommodating (as the learned gentleman has told us), seven hundred children; and a committee was immediately formed; but although many Protestants became subscribers to its funds, few (if any) could be found, who would devote their time to the superintendence of such a school: the management of its affairs consequently fell into the hands of persons of a different persuasion. No statement (as I believe) has ever been published of the system of instruction adopted in this school; but I know, from the testimony of gentlemen who visited it during the last summer, that this institution, which commenced its career by excluding the Scriptures without note or comment, lest it should be offensive to Roman Catholics, has now become a Roman Catholic seminary, in which the Douay version of the Scriptures, with all its notes and comments, is read, to the effectual exclusion of all children who are of a different persuasion; for it cannot be imagined that any Protestant would send his child to a school where he should continually hear those notes read, in which Protestants are so pointedly and repeatedly charged with corruping the sacred text."

Mr O'Connell's motion was lost by the carrying of an amendment, by a majority of 80 votes against 19. Mr O'Connell then declared that he and his friends would be no longer members of the Society.

Bishop Coppinger lauds and praises him, in a high degree, for his exertions in the *holy* cause, as the reader may see in his letter to his clergy, which I gave at the end of my 95th Number. "To Mr O'Connell," says he, "for his spirited exertions on this occasion, the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due; and surely, if confiding apathy had hitherto benumbed any individual among us, the present electrifying fact must restore his energies, and rouse him to a due sense of his danger." The "electrifying fact" is, that the Society did, by a majority of 80 against 19, reject the motion of Mr O'Connell, which was meant to prepare the way for the expulsion of the Bible from the schools. And Bishop Coppinger considers this as having "evinced, beyond the powers of tergiversation, that the professions of the Society were not intended to regulate its practice; but that, under the name of education, proselytism was the determined object."

I do not profess to be acquainted with the powers of tergiversation. I am not sure if ever I wrote the word before; but no doubt the Right Reverend Bishop comprehends it in all its extent and power. He, very probably, knows from experience what it can do, and what it cannot do. In the present instance, it seems, it cannot exculpate the Society from the accusation, that its professions were not intended to regulate its practice. That is, in plain English, tergiversation cannot save the Society from the charge of duplicity; but I hope the Society will never ask the aid of such an agent to save them from any thing. Let them leave tergiversation, (that is, shift, subterfuge, evasion) to the Papists; and they will find no difficulty in vindicating themselves by means of plain truth and common sense.

The accusation is, that proselytism, under the name of education, is the determined object. But the Bishop has not adduced, or referred, to a single instance, in which the Society, or its Protestant members, directly or indirectly attempted to make proselytes of Popish children to their own faith. They do, indeed, give them the Bible. They furnish them with means of learning to read it. This is all that can justly be laid to their charge; and it is not even insinuated that they do more. If proselytes are thus made, it is not they that make them, but the Bible. If children are won to the faith, by this means, it is not to their faith, but to the faith of the Bible. Protestants do indeed believe that their faith is contained in the Bible; but when they give the book itself, without *a*

word of their own, either oral or written, they leave it to speak for itself; and they are perfectly willing that the reader should embrace that which he finds in it, though it should be different from their own opinions. This is not proselytism to the tenets of a party. It is not a Society seeking to gain persons to itself, for the purpose of increasing its own strength; and, therefore, it partakes nothing of the character which Bishop Coppinger ascribes to the Society in Dublin. Let it be remembered, that the Papists themselves, at first, agreed to have the Bible, without note or comment, read in the schools. Now, had they found, by experience, that Protestant children were by this means induced to embrace the faith of Rome, we should not have heard a word from them of proselytism being intended, under the mask of education. They would gladly have received all the proselytes which the schools produced; and they would have raised a hue and cry against the Protestants, if they had attempted to prevent such proselytism, or to remove the Bible, which was the cause of it. But they will not allow to others what they claim for themselves. They know and feel by woful experience that the Bible is against them; that no man, woman, or child, will ever find the faith of Rome within its pages. Nay, they know, at least the learned among them know, that the Protestant faith, or something very like it, is to be found in the Bible; and this is virtually acknowledged by Bishop Coppinger, and all those of his brethren, who publicly maintain, that simply to give the word of God, without note or comment, is the same as to attempt to make proselytes to the Protestant faith.

The "electrifying fact," that the Society intend to proceed as they began; that is, to teach poor children to read the Bible, is calculated, says the Bishop, to restore the energies of such of his brethren as have been benumbed by apathy, and to rouse them to a due sense of their danger. This danger proceeds from the Bible, and from the Bible *alone*. Will any man, after this explicit avowal, have the effrontery to maintain that the religion of Rome is Christianity? The word of Christ cannot possibly be dangerous to the religion of Christ. But we have the declaration of a Romish Bishop that it is dangerous to the religion of Rome; from which the inference is unavoidable, that the religion of Rome is not the religion of Christ. I might very properly close my argument here. With those who respect the word of God, it is enough to know that a thing is against that word; and knowing this, they are sure that it cannot be of God. This is the state in which the church of Rome stands convicted, and virtually admitted by Bishop Coppinger, and all those clergy who, at his call, have been roused to a sense of the danger that arises from the reading of the Bible. And, as it is thus proved, that the religion of Rome is not of God, there is only one other author to whom it can be ascribed,—it is the working of Satan, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.

Yet, after all, the Papists are extremely desirous of having it believed that the Bible is on their side. They are like certain litigants, who wish to retain the most respectable counsel; not that he may advocate their cause, which they suspect no honest man will do, but merely that he may not appear against them. Thus Papists express great reverence for the Bible. They will not even allow it to be thumbed by children, lest it should be profaned by the contact of their fingers with the paper on which it is printed, or the skin that covers it; though, I suppose, it will be found that he who thumbs his Bible most, pays the greatest respect to it, and makes the best use of it. If you will believe the Romish priests, it is from great veneration of the Bible that they cannot consent that children should read it; and because they fear they would misinterpret it to their own destruction. They profess to hold the key, that is, the power of rightly interpreting it, in their own hands. Let us see, then, how they interpret some passages. And I venture to affirm, that there is not a child in any of the schools in Ireland, who would expound it so foolishly as Popes and Cardinals have done.

"Moses saith, 'God made man in his own image;' Pope Adrian interpreteth, 'therefore images must be set up in churches.' St Peter saith, 'Behold, here are two swords;' Pope Boniface concludes, 'therefore the Pope hath power over the spiritual and the temporal.' St Matthew saith, Give not that which is holy unto dogs;' Mr Harding expounds it, 'therefore it is not lawful for the vulgar to read the Scriptures.' St John saith, 'There shall be one fold and one shepherd;' Johannes de Parisius tells us, 'this place cannot be expounded of Christ, but must be taken for some minister ruling in his stead.' The prophet David saith, 'Thou hast put all things under his feet;' Antoninus expounds it, 'thou hast made all things subject to the Pope: the cattle of the field, that is to say, men living in the earth; the fishes of the sea, that is to say, the souls in purgatory; the fowls in the air, that is to say, the souls of the blessed in heaven.' And whereas our Saviour witnesseth of himself, 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: Stephen, Archbishop of Patræa, applied it to Pope Leo the Tenth, in the council of Lateran, in the audience of the Pope himself, who thankfully accepted it, and suffered it to be published and printed; and, as it is rightly observed by the learned Du Moulin, Pope Innocent the Third, in his book of the Mysteries of the Mass; the book of

Sacred Ceremonies; Durant's Rationales; Tolet, and Titleman, and others, do most ridiculously wrest the Scriptures, altogether different from their right meaning, and the expositions of the fathers: as for instance, the Scripture saith, 'The rock was Christ;' therefore, say they, 'the altar must be of stone.' It is written, 'I am the light of the world;' therefore, 'tapers must be set upon the altar.' It is written, 'Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth;' therefore, 'the priest must kiss the altar.' It is written, 'Thou shalt see my back parts,' (Exod. xxxiii. 23.); therefore, 'the priest must turn his back to the people.' It is written, 'Wash me again,' *Lava me amplius,* (Ps. li.); therefore, 'the priest must wash his hands twice.' It is written, 'Put off thy shoes, for this place is holy,' (Exod. iii. 5.); therefore, 'the bishop at mass changeth his hose and shoes.' The Pope himself, at the time of his coronation, casteth certain copper money among the people, using the words of Peter, 'Silver and gold have I none, but that which I have I give thee.'" See page 259, of Sir Humphrey Lynde's *Via Tuta et Via Devia;* a work which contains a great deal of information, in a small compass. The fourth edition, revised by the author, was published in 1630. The edition before me was published last year, by order of "The Society for the distribution of Tracts in defence of the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established."

I question if there be a child in any school, in the three kingdoms, who would give such foolish comments upon passages of Scripture as the grave doctors of Rheims have done. Every page of their New Testament is full of downright nonsense, as any one may see who will open the book. The following is the first of their annotations; it is on the name *Thamar,* as it occurs in the genealogy of our Saviour, Matth. i. 3. "Christ abhorred not to take flesh of some that were ill, as he chose Judas among the apostles. Let not us disdain to receive our spiritual birth and sustenance of such as be not always good." This is an exhortation to submit to the priests, be they ever so wicked; than which a more pernicious and dangerous doctrine was never taught by any perverter of the word of God.

Mr O'Connell goes no farther than to make tradition equal to the Scriptures, as being also the word of God; but some great doctors of the church of Rome go much farther, and declare tradition to be superior to the written word. Thus Cardinal Baronius teaches: "Tradition is the foundation of Scriptures, and excels them in this, that the Scriptures cannot subsist unless they be strengthened by traditions; but tradition hath strength enough without Scriptures." (*Baron.* An. lviii. n. 2.) "Traditions," says Linden, "are the most certain foundations of faith, the most sure ground of the sacred Scriptures, the impenetrable buckler of Ajax, the suppressor of all heresies. On the other side, the Scripture is a nose of wax, a dead and killing letter without life, a mere shell without a kernel, a leaden rule, a wood of thieves, a shop of heretics." (*Linden Panopl.* l. i. c. 22, &c.) Costerus, the Jesuit, assures us, "It never was the mind of Christ either to commit his mysteries to parchment, or that his church should depend upon paper writings." Again, "The excellence of the unwritten word doth far surpass the Scriptures, which the apostles left us in parchment; the one is written by the finger of God, the other by the pen of the apostles. The Scripture is a dead letter, written in paper or parchment, which may be razed or wrested at pleasure: but tradition is written in men's hearts, which cannot be altered. The Scripture is like a scabbard that will receive any sword, either leaden, or wooden, or brazen; and suffereth itself to be drawn by any interpretation. Tradition retains the true sense in the scabbard; that is, the true sense of the Scripture, in the sheath of the letter." (*Coster. Eucharist.* cap. i. p. 44.) From Andradius we learn, that "many points of (Roman) doctrine would reel and totter if they were not supported by the help of tradition." (*Andrad. de Orth. expli.* lib. 2.) "Many things," says Petrus de Sutor, "being taught by the Roman church, and not contained in the Scriptures, would more easily draw the people from the traditions and observances of their church." And he shows that this is one special cause why the Scriptures were denied to the lay people. (*Sutor. de Translat.* Bibl. c. 22.) Another reason why traditions are preferred before the Bible, is given by Bishop Canus. "Because tradition is not only of greater force against heretics than the Scripture, but almost all disputation with heretics is to be referred to tradition." (*Canus, Loc. Theol.* lib. iii. cap. 3.) See a great deal more to the same purpose, in *Via Tuta et Via Devia,* edit. 1819, page 300—309.

Thus it is plainly admitted that the church of Rome cannot stand upon the ground of Scripture. She cannot contend with heretics on any other ground than that of tradition, which is, by these authors, exalted above the Bible. It is easy to see then what sad work Mr O'Connell and his brethren would make in the schools, if they had the command of them. The Bible would be expelled, and they would probably substitute St Wenefride, and the "Life of St Ann, the mother of the Mother of God, and the grandmother of God himself." See an account of this blasphemous work, page 183.

Bishop Coppinger himself deserves to be more particularly noticed. His address to his clergy is written in a very artful style. He

endeavours to prepossess the reader in favour of what he has to say, by complimenting the Protestant society in Ireland, who have opened schools for the education of the youth of the Roman communion, as humane and respectable. But the compliment seems intended to hold up the society to the greater detestation, whose professions, the Bishop says, are not intended to regulate its practice; but that, under the name of education, proselytism is the determined object. This great evil, proselytism, is that which seems to have taken possession of the mind of this Bishop, and which he would deprecate as more dangerous than the typhus fever, or the plague itself. Now, the more the Popish clergy cry out against this evil, the more ought Protestants to labour to promote it. I have already said that I wish not to gain proselytes to Protestantism, considered merely as a sect or party; but I wish to gain men from error to truth; from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of Christ. If the Bishop were a subject of the latter kingdom, he would be as glad to win them to it as any Protestant can be. That the church of Rome is not this kingdom, but the enemy of it, is what I have been endeavouring to prove; and no man has yet answered so much as one of the arguments by which I have attempted to establish the fact. The church of Rome is a confused mass of superstition, will-worship, idolatry, and all sorts of wickedness. Every benevolent man ought to endeavour to undeceive the miserable dupes of this mother of abominations. Call it proselytism, or what you will, he is engaged in a good work who is labouring to detach men from the religion of the Pope, and to gain them to that of Christ; and I do not think the School Society in Dublin, or the Hibernian Society, or any other, has yet done what they ought to do for the attainment of such an object. Proselytism is not the professed object of these societies; and they have never, so far as I know, made it appear to be their object, in any shape whatever, further than giving the Bible, and teaching the people to read it; and if that be the thing that makes them vile, in the esteem of Bishop Coppinger, I hope he will live to see them become yet more vile.

Popery being proved, and even admitted, by great authors of the Romish faith, to be not founded in Scripture, or even defensible by Scripture, but only by tradition, and that tradition as vague and intangible as the winds; it must appear to every serious reflecting person that the sooner it is overset the better. It is, in fact, a system of falsehood and delusion invented by the devil, and propagated by cunning and designing priests, to enslave the understanding, pick the pockets, and ruin the souls of men. The work of proselytism has never yet been seriously taken up by Protestants; but I am not ashamed to tell Bishop Coppinger, that it is the duty of every Christian to gain as many proselytes as he can to the religion of the Bible; and as I understand my work is republishing in Cork, as well as in Dublin, I hope this will soon meet the eye of his Reverence; and I will be glad if he shall attempt to show cause why the Bible should not be allowed to be read in the schools.

He does not expressly tell us what his sentiments are upon this subject; but he says he has long since recorded them; and he says, "the brightest luminaries of the Protestant church have led the way for us, with arguments, to this very moment unanswered." Who these luminaries are, the Bishop does not tell us; and perhaps he gives it as a great stretch of liberality to admit that there ever were luminaries among heretics. But I can tell him that there are none, whom Protestants themselves acknowledge to have been luminaries among them, who were not steady friends of the Bible, and desirous that every man, woman, and child, in the world, should have one, and be able to read it. Dr Coppinger will perhaps refer me to a Marsh and a Wix; but these divines, so far as relates to this subject, are in no more estimation with serious Protestants than the Bishop himself, or than the Pope of Rome.

I am indebted to a learned correspondent for the following correction of an expression, in my 95th Number, which is liable to misconception:—"In reading p. 402, 2d col. 14th line from bottom, 'The church of Christ acknowledges only one object of worship, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:' Should not this have been a little explicited? The church worships *only one God;* but it considers Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as an object of worship, as well as the Father; because it considers the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as only one God. St Stephen prayed to Christ; St Paul prayed to Christ; and St John says, 'This is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us;' (1 John v. 14.) *You* do not want these proofs of Christ being an object of divine worship; but our Unitarians overlooking them, deny him to be so. The Godhead being one in essence, or ουσιᾳ, as the Greeks call it, but three in ὑποστασει, or person, and each person being inseparable from the Godhead, each person is, in truth, the only God, because there is only one God. Our Unitarians, making their own understanding, and not the Scripture, the measure of their faith, deny Jesus Christ to be an object of divine worship."

No. XCVIII.

SATURDAY, MAY 27TH, 1820.

I FIND by several letters, which I have received within these few days, that great interest has been excited by the extract of Mr O'Connell's speech, which I gave in my 96th Number. It is, I understand, pretty generally considered as one of the most valuable documents which I have given since the commencement of my work; because it establishes, beyond all doubt, the important fact, that the Papists of the present day are as hostile to the word of God, as they were even in the dark ages; and having this fact ascertained, who would hesitate for a moment to pronounce the Church of Rome the very antichrist?

O'Connell, standing alone upon his own responsibility, could not have given much importance to the sentiments which he uttered; but he appears in an official character, representing what Bishop Coppinger calls "Catholic Ireland;" and to him, for his exertions in attempting to expel the Bible from the schools, the Bishop assures us "the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due." Here, then, is a right reverend pillar of the Roman Church giving the sanction of his high authority to the sentiments avowed by the lay orator. And "the Roman Catholic clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross," adopt the sentiments of their diocesan, and express their "warmest acknowledgments" to counsellor O'Connell, for his "splendid advocacy in the cause of religious freedom." The whole body of the Roman clergy, then, within that district at least, have declared O'Connell's sentiments to be their own. They cannot allow the reading of the Bible by the children at school, lest the children should become Protestants; a plain admission that the Bible is the religion of Protestants.

Above all men in the world, Papists possess the art of giving bad things a good name; that is, of pressing into their service such expressions as are popular, and convey a good meaning, in order to cover some error and absurdity, which they do not like to hear called by its own name. Religious liberty is one of those phrases which Papists know to be popular in this country, in the present age. They do, therefore, most impudently appropriate it to themselves. They would have the world believe that they only are the friends of religious liberty, though all the world knows that they are the most intolerant and persecuting sect upon the face of the earth. The exertions of Mr O'Connell, to get the Bible banished from the schools, are called, by the clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross, "his splendid advocacy" "in the cause of religious freedom." In the common acceptation of the words, religious freedom signifies the privilege of every individual's reading the Bible, of forming his own judgment of its contents, of freely expressing what he thinks he finds in it, and of worshipping God according as he understands his will, with regard to the manner in which he ought to be worshipped. This freedom exists in our country, in its fullest extent;—nay, it exists much beyond what I have here stated; for it is not even required that a man shall read the Bible, and form his judgment and practice according to what he finds in it. A man may spend his whole life without ever reading a page of it; and, so far from being compelled to worship his Maker alone, as the Bible teaches, he may worship the Virgin Mary and all the saints, in direct opposition to the dictates of the divine word; and yet his religion is tolerated. He enjoys the utmost freedom in the exercise of it; without being subjected to pains and penalties of any kind.

But Papists, in Ireland, profess to be in bondage; and they call their orator, O'Connell, the advocate of "religious freedom." The freedom they want, is to be freed from the Bible; and certainly, if any person were insisting upon them, or attempting to compel them, to read and study a book which they hate with a perfect hatred, they might with justice complain that they were not left to the freedom of their own will. But this is not the point in question. There is nobody, so far as I know, so zealous as to propose to compel the Papists to read the Bible; but there are many benevolent persons desirous of giving it to those who are willing to receive it; they are giving it to the children in the schools, and through them to their parents; many of whom desire most earnestly to have it. This is what grieves the priests and their lay orator;—this is what they wish to prevent, by all possible means; and the endeavours of the eloquent counsellor to prevent this, are called, by the clergy, "his splendid advocacy" "in the cause of religious freedom." That is, the *freedom* of keeping in the *bondage* of ignorance the great mass of the Irish population;—it is the freedom of *compelling* the benevolent part of the community to abstain from every attempt to impart freedom from ignorance, and vice, and misery, to degraded millions of our fellow creatures. Yes; our Papists are great advocates of religious freedom; but it is the freedom of making their will, or that of their ghostly father in Rome, the law by which alone we are to be regulated, in all our thoughts, and words, and actions.

As for the orator himself, it does not appear that he has any distinct knowledge of either religion or religious freedom, or any sentiments of his own upon the subject. He had been actually accused of ignorance of even the "Catholic persuasion," at a former meeting; and now, therefore, he does not choose to risk

his reputation, by speaking from his own knowledge. He "applied," he says, "to some of the heads of the Catholic persuasion in Ireland." He came to the meeting in the leading-strings of Drs Troy and Murray, and the other clergy who held a meeting for the purpose of furnishing him with "an authentic document to read to this meeting, to express their sentiments;" and then he gives their sentiments, with as much pomp and solemnity, as if they had been expressed by a voice from heaven. "They have resolved," says he, "that the Scriptures, with or without note or comment, are not fit to be used as a school-book." I believe I said long ago, that a council of bats and owls would probably resolve and declare that the sun was a great nuisance; and there would be as much wisdom in the declaration as in that of the Roman clergy in Dublin, that the Bible is not *fit* to be read in schools, or any where else.

In the first article, in the resolutions of the clergy of Cloyne and Ross, (see No. 96, page 405), we learn, "that in the profession of faith adopted universally throughout the whole Catholic Church," Papists receive the Bible, in the sense which their holy mother the church held, and doth hold; that to her it belongs to judge of the true sense of the Scriptures; and the Papist engages that he will never "interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." He who comes under this obligation, binds himself that he will never interpret the Scriptures at all: for there never was a unanimous consent of the fathers on any leading doctrine of the Bible, much less with regard to all that is contained in it. It is impossible to interpret the Scriptures, without doing it otherwise than some Fathers have done; and therefore the only safe course is to let them alone. This is most effectually to set aside the Bible; for it is needless to read it, if we are not to consider the meaning of what we read. If we attempt to understand any part of it, we are entering upon the work of self-interpretation which the church of Rome so strongly deprecates. It is well that the Roman clergy of the present day have made such an explicit avowal of their principles; because they will thus convince every reflecting person that they have abandoned the ground of Christianity, and have taken their stand upon that of downright infidelity.

And if, in the regions of infidelity, there be degrees of wickedness, as I doubt not there are, that system must be the most wicked which professes to be founded on the word of truth,—this is Popery. The Church of Rome has not the honesty of the hardy infidel, who at once rejects the word of God; but she has the low cunning of professing to respect it, while she most effectually sets aside its authority. There cannot be greater insolence practised in civilised society, than to misconstrue an honest man's words, and turn them against himself; but this is the insolence with which Papists are continually treating the word of God. Thus the clergy of Cloyne and Ross have the effrontery to profess to quote the words of the Bible against the use of the Bible. Like all other writers of their communion, they make use of the words of Peter, relating to the unwise and unstable wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction; and they use this as an argument for withholding the Bible from the lay people altogether. But this was not the tendency of the apostle's argument: his words clearly imply, that the unlearned and unstable had liberty to read the Bible, else they could not wrest it. Peter asserted the fact, that there were some things in Paul's epistles which the unlearned and unwise did wrest to their own destruction; but he did not, on that account, prohibit the reading of the epistles of his beloved brother Paul;—nay, he proceeds upon the acknowledged fact that they were accessible to all men, and especially to those whom he addressed, that is, to the "strangers scattered abroad," &c. Paul had expressly written to *them*, as Peter tells us, (2 Ep. iii. 15.) and it was in his address to *them* that there were some things hard to be understood. Now, we cannot suppose that the faithful apostle, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, would address an epistle to the Hebrew Christians in general, the tendency of which was so dangerous, that he did not wish the people in general to read it, lest it should do mischief to them; yet this impious absurdity is maintained by these Popish priests, who will not allow the word of God to speak for itself to the lay people, lest they should pervert it to their own destruction.

Besides, if the language of Peter shall be considered as authority for keeping the Bible from any person, it will apply much more properly to the priest than to the lay people. There is, comparatively, little danger of a plain man, whose mind is unsophisticated by the jargon of the schools, mistaking or wresting any part of the plain testimony of the apostles, concerning Jesus of Nazareth, the Saviour of sinners; but the priests, who have been bred in the schools of Scotus, and St Thomas Aquinas, and Pope Pius IV., are in the greatest possible danger of wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction; because they come to them, if they do come at all, with minds preoccupied by doctrines quite opposite to those contained in the Bible; yet with an assurance that they are in the Bible. This is the worst possible state of mind in which persons can come to the study of the word of God; for then they come to it, not to receive implicitly what the Holy Ghost teacheth, but for the express purpose of making the Holy Ghost speak their own sentiments: that is, of

extorting from the Bible what they have already been taught by fallible men in the schools; and thus they will, almost to a certainty, wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction.

When the wise man spoke of "a jewel of gold in a swine's snout," he referred to something that was quite out of place: and, I think, nothing can be more so than the passages of Scripture which the clergy of Cloyne and Ross quote from the Bible, about the unity of the church. They tell us, that the receiving of the true sense of the Scriptures simply, as holy church is pleased to give it, "further goes to prevent their being carried about by every wind of doctrine, while it tends to effect what the Redeemer strongly inculcates, viz. that we be 'all one, as he and his heavenly Father are one;' or, as the apostle has it, that we be 'all of one mind, and that there be no schism among us.'" Christ speaks of the oneness or unity of his people, as a unity in the truth; and his word is the truth. The unity of his church is founded in the knowledge, belief, and profession of the truth of God's word; and this truth does unite all, who believe it, to God and to one another. But these Popish clergy take up the words of Christ and his apostle, which relate to this heavenly union, and apply them to a union that is founded on the exclusion of the word of God, and on human authority substituted for it. This is, in effect, turning the word of God against itself. There is not a more impious way of wresting it; and as this is the work of the clergy, and not of the poor laity, we ought to exculpate the latter from the accusation which the former are daily bringing forward, that they are not to be trusted with the Scriptures, lest they should wrest them to their own destruction.

Bishop Coppinger declares his assent to a plan recommended by Mr O'Connell, for educating children of the different religions in the same school, without any reference to religious subjects; and the clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross declare their readiness to co-operate with Protestants, "in establishing schools on any practicable plan, not clashing with our tenets:" that is, upon any plan that shall not incur the risk of the scholars of the Roman communion becoming Protestants. This will be considered by the Papists, I dare say, as a fair concession; but, in fact, it is no concession at all; for it is not possible to teach children to read, without giving them an ability to detect the impositions of Rome, even if they should not read the Bible; and this must be, in some measure, clashing with their tenets. Papists, however, must not, in the present state of public feeling, avow themselves the enemies of education. They must make a show of being willing to educate their youth, as the Pope has taught them; but it will soon be seen that all this zeal has evaporated, unless they shall be able to turn all their schools, like that of Cork, into Popish seminaries.

I intend to commence, in my next Number, a discussion of the alleged supremacy of Peter, and of his pretended successors; and I conclude the present with the following letters:—

TO THE PROTESTANT.

"DEAR SIR,—I hope your papers are extensively circulated and read in Ireland. The hostility to the word of God, and the spirit of domination exhibited by the Popish clergy there, demand the most vigilant attention, and the most decided resistance. They have generally or universally applauded and adopted Mr O'Connell's sentiments, lately delivered at a meeting in Kildare-street, Dublin, on the subject of the Hibernian schools. As a specimen of reasoning, his speech was sufficiently contemptible; but the arrogance, effrontery, and spirit of usurpation, exhibited in it, are no less remarkable. One of the provisions of the schools,—a provision adopted by both Protestants and Papists, in order to give equal facilities to children of parents of either profession,—was to exclude all catechisms and controversial writings, on both sides, and to use the Bible, which both parties professed to believe to be the word of God; at same time, leaving the explanation of this to the respective religious instructors out of school. By this plan the Society did afford, what they reckoned, equal facilities of education to the different classes. And on this plan, I believe, many mixed, and some Catholic schools are conducted in other places.

"But, says Mr O'Connell, 'No! this is not to give equal facilities. The Pope has lately emitted a bull against the use of the Bible in schools; and the dignified clergy have published, authoritatively, their manifestoes to the same purpose.' These, whether obligatory or not, are respected by the Catholics; so that the Society, by their rules, must, it seems, accommodate their procedure to every new bull of the Pope, and to every new manifesto of the clergy; or they cannot preserve the facilities for education '*equal*.' O'Connell's demands amount to no less than this; that the Society, in adhering to one of its rules, should take the meaning of that rule from these authorities, and suffer it, and all their other rules, to be modified by their dictation. The absurdity is here apparent; but the arrogance of the demand, and the effrontery of the accusation of dishonesty, applied to the School Society, are intolerable. The Society, at first, explained what they meant by equal facilities of education. They have adhered to that meaning. Who infringed these facilities? The infringers are the Pope, the clergy, and their orator, Mr O'Connell.

But here, as usual, the aggressor is loudest and first in the complaint.

"It is well that such decided opposition to Mr O'Connell's project appeared at the meeting. Had the Pope's bull been admitted, in this instance, with the clergy's manifesto, and the traditions of the church, Protestants might have bidden adieu to all interference with the schools. Say the clergy, 'We never can acknowledge, in any Society of laymen, a right to regulate the religious concerns of children committed to our care.' 'Regulate,' *i. e.* so much as to give the Bible with or without note or comment, &c., and without attempting to teach them its meaning on controverted points. Had the Society submitted to this usurpation, a new bull might have been soon expected, excluding all school-books not approved by the Pope; excluding the Bible from the use of even Protestant children, lest they should communicate the sentiments of their books to the rest; excluding Protestant children and Protestant teachers for similar reasons. All this, and more, would accord well with what Popery used to be; and if bulls, manifestoes, traditions, and the Church, are to regulate these matters,—adieu to any thing saving Popish management. We know not what the next bull and manifesto may contain;—we know not; Papists themselves know not; Mr O'Connell knows not, what is contained in the treasury of the traditions. The infallible church holds the keys of this treasury, and no person can tell where this church is to be found; for we find the individuals who profess to belong to it, often opposing each other, in doctrine and in practice.

"It required no small degree of effrontery in Mr O'Connell and the clergy, to mention such a proposal to the Society, as submission to such foreign and usurped domination, and such indefinable authority; but it accorded well with the Popish system. The Pope refuses to a British people and parliament, the right to instruct subjects in their youth, by that perfect rule of morality, justice, and loyalty, which the Bible contains. The clergy claim authority over all the young people and their parents, not only without their consent, but against it. This, especially in a Protestant country, is usurpation. They have no right to any power, but by voluntary submission. All this, however, is but arrogance and domination with respect to fellow creatures. God says, 'Hear my word;' and, respecting Christ, 'Hear my Son.' The Pope and his clergy say, 'No; at your peril, hear us only.' *Thus*, God said to the first pair, 'Obey my voice;' the old serpent said, 'Nay; obey mine.' But God's word shall stand. Even to Popes and their clergy, as well as to other egregious sinners, he mercifully says, 'Hear and your souls shall live.'—Yours, AN IRISHMAN."

"*May 16th*, 1820.

"*Glasgow, 15th May*, 1820.

"DEAR SIR,—I was extremely glad to see, in the 'PROTESTANT' of Saturday last, that you have again brought the enemies of the Bible into notice. Too much cannot be said, in reprobation of their misanthropic principles: and it will require all the eloquence of the Irish barrister to make them appear otherwise than odious. The counsellor blames the Hibernian Society, for not showing a readiness to enter into an investigation of their resolutions, and for not removing or avoiding the obstacles thrown in the way of affording 'equal facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians.' But if Papists, belonging to the Society, who certainly knew their own circumstances best, could not foresee the consequences of standing upon common ground with the Protestants, how could it be thought that the latter would anticipate them? Is the idea to be entertained, for a moment, that such a respectable body, connected, as it is, with some of the most distinguished personages of the British empire, and whose majority, I presume, is composed of friends to Bible reading, will crouch to the bull of a Pope, or the determination of the prelates of his communion? This, however, is precisely what they would wish to see; nor is this all, if we may judge from the conduct of their Tertullus; they would be 'lords of the ascendant,' and dictate, whenever they pleased, what gentlemen ought to do; and then, with the utmost effrontery, impute falsehood and dishonesty to those who might, in any degree, disapprove of their measures, or differ from them in opinion.

"But suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Bible and Testament were excluded from the schools in question, would this satisfy these alarmists? No: they would, if possible, extort farther concession, until nothing but the superstition of Jesuits and Douay doctors was inculcated on the simple and unsuspecting, of the Protestant, as well as the Popish persuasion; and, instead of being commended as Timothy was, for having 'known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make men wise unto salvation,' they would be reproved as fools, for 'following lying vanities, and forsaking their own mercy.'—I am, &c."

No. XCIX.

SATURDAY, JUNE 3D, 1820.

As an introduction to the subject of Papal supremacy, I lay before the reader the following communication, by a judicious and intelligent correspondent:—

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"DEAR SIR,—I have ventured to trouble

you with a few thoughts on the Pope's supremacy. As the whole Popish system is built on that supposed supremacy bestowed exclusively on Peter, to whom they pretend the keys of doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, were committed; and as you do not appear to me, as yet, to have designed a full and formal discussion of that subject, I shall take the liberty to suggest a few hints to you, which probably may be of use to you, to facilitate the discussion of it, and which you are so capable to improve upon. The first and main text on which they build, is that in Mat. xvi. 18. 'And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c. The apostle John records a circumstance which will give us a little light into this matter. Speaking of Peter, he says, ch. i. 42, 'And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona, thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, being interpreted, a stone.' Cephas is not a Greek but a Syriac word, and therefore required to be translated into the Greek language, in which the New Testament was wrote. The Greek word, therefore, is Petros, a stone; and, strictly speaking, such a stone as we can handle, or turn over and move from its place. When names were given to men, as recorded in Scripture, whether compounded or not with the names of animals, or inanimate things, it was done in allusion to the natures and qualities of these animals, or things. And it was not the Jews only that practised this, but other nations also.

"What the reasons were why our Saviour gave him this name we are left to conjecture, as they are not revealed. What they were not, we can decide upon, positively, as they are revealed. The obvious qualities then of such a stone, are hardness or durability, and mobility. That this name, then, was not given him to signify his stability or infallibility is most certain; for of all the apostles, both before and after the ascension of Christ, he was the most unstable and versatile.

"Witness his effrontery in taking upon him to rebuke his Master, which drew from him this severe retort, 'Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.' Also his denying his Lord and Master; likewise his dissimulation, for which the apostle Paul reproved him to his face. These are the only three things in which the Popes are successors to Peter, and may be said to form the Pope's triple crown. I question if Peter himself knew the meaning of his new name, or had it explained to him at that time; but I have no doubt but he would come to understand it in that night of dreadful darkness and perplexity, after he had denied his Master, and saw him condemned and crucified, when his busy mind would be searching on all sides for comfort, he would then think on the name Christ had given him, connect it with his prayer for him, and draw hope and comfort from it. As if Christ had said, 'Simon, Simon, you think you are a strong and stable man, little considering how fallible you are, how easily turned about like a stone, or wheat in a sieve, by Satan who desires to sift every particle of faith out of you; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.' Hereby he would know the reason of his being compared to a stone, in regard to its durability, that he should not be, like numberless other substances, liable to be utterly decompounded, or dissipated into smoke. We shall now see what bearing this has upon the above quoted passage in Mat. xvi. It is there said, 'And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter.' Here the translators have made a mistake, which, though at first sight it may appear trifling, yet is of serious import in different respects; it puts into the mouth of Christ what appears a childish senseless conceit,—'And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter.' Here the word Peter stands in the verse as a mere name, without connection, and so without sense or meaning. Besides, though Christ gave him this name, he never afterwards addressed him by it, but always by the name Simon. It should have been translated, 'And I say also unto thee, that thou art a stone, and upon this rock.' Here is another mistranslation to which the former has given rise, for the Greek particle καὶ is frequently used as an adversative,—in English, *but;* and so it must be used here, because our Saviour manifestly contrasts Petros, a moveable stone, with Petra, an immoveable rock. 'But upon this rock.' Here the translators are short again, it should have been, 'the rock,' for the Greek article is put to it, which always pointed to a particular person, or thing, already known. But upon this 'the rock,' that you have so often read of in the Old Testament, 'the rock that begat thee;' 'the rock of ages;' 'the rock of salvation;' 'the rock of refuge;' and, as Paul says, 'they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ." It is impossible, therefore, that Christ could mean the same persons by Petros and by Petra, as they are different words, and of different genders, and the accidents opposite—mobility opposed to immobility. The whole verse then will run thus, 'And I say also unto thee, that thou art a stone, but upon this, the rock, I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' The Greek word δὲ, rendered *also*, being a discretive conjunction, is meant, therefore, to distinguish between things that are spoken about. The plain sense and meaning of the verse then will

be, 'And I say unto thee, that notwithstanding of this glorious revelation now made unto thee, be not high-minded, but fear; beware of thinking too highly of thyself, this will give thee no pre-eminence. Though I have called thee to be an apostle, remember the name I have given thee—a moveable stone; and that thou wilt find ere Satan have done with thee. Thou art not fit, therefore, to be a foundation for my church; no, it is upon this rock alone, (in all probability pointing to himself), whom thou hast confessed to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, that I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' It would appear here that our Saviour, foreseeing what would come to pass, meant to leave Papists totally inexcusable, by pointing out how entirely unfit Peter was for a foundation to his church. Besides the church, both of the Old and New Testament, is but one church, and must, therefore, rest on one foundation—Christ. For Paul says, 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ,' and "are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." Signifying, according to the Greek construction, that Christ was the foundation the apostles and prophets themselves built upon. The apostle Peter himself says the very same thing, 1 Pet. ii. 6. And it is not unworthy of remark, that the apostle Peter sanctions all Paul's epistles, and ranks them along with the Scriptures of the Old Testament; a thing decidedly against the Papists, who could wish all Paul's epistles sunk in the bottom of the sea. 'Tis a wonderment that they have never as yet seen this, as an evidence of Peter's fallibility. But let us see what could entitle Peter to such a distinguished favour, for Christ appears to address him in terms of high consideration,—'Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' Was it simply because he had it revealed to him? Certainly not, for there could be no merit in that, though he was blessed in having it revealed to him. Was it because he had it exclusively revealed to him? Surely not, for the knowledge and acknowledgment of this was the very ground on which all the disciples joined him, and in which even his brother Andrew had the start of him, John i. 41. 'We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.' Was it because he was more beloved by Christ than the rest? No; none of them had grieved him so much; besides, John was the beloved disciple, and would, therefore, have been preferred to the supremacy before Peter. Was it because he was more solid and stable than the rest? No; any of them would have had it before Peter for this reason. As this confession of their faith was common to them all, so they were all equally blessed, and so the keys were given unto them in common; and they had all in common the promise of the Spirit to enable them to exercise them, as appears from Mat. xviii. 18. What he says in the xvi. chapter to Peter individually, he says in the xviii. chapter to them all universally. All this must go for nothing with the Pope, who can impose any sense upon Scripture he pleases; he can even contradict the most express commands of Christ; and, what is still more base, make Christ contradict himself in the most flagrant manner. What can be more flagitious than to pretend that Christ gave the supremacy to Peter, after he had prohibited them, in the most express and peremptory manner imaginable, to exercise superiority one over another, Mat. xx. 20. When James and John, with their mother, came to Christ to ask of him this piece of pre-eminence, to set the one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom, it is said, 'and when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them.' And Luke adds, 'and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister.' Can words convey a more direct and peremptory prohibition than this? Impossible; especially if we consider the kind of example used, and caveat added. Christ does not take his example from the high-priest under the law: that did not suit the object he had in view; for though the high-priest had the inferior priests under his hand, as it is said, yet the duties of both were clearly prescribed to them by the law. But the kings of the Gentiles were all perfect despots: their will was the law. But such is the Pope of Rome, his will is the law; so that Bellarmine says of him, 'if he should command vice to be virtue, and virtue to be vice, the church is bound to believe it.' A remarkable incident took place upon presenting the petition of these two brethren. It is said, 'and when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren.'

"This is precisely what might have been expected in the present state of human nature; and the same ambition, after such a seducing object, will ever produce the same effects as it ever has done. Witness the wickedness carried on in the conclave: what lying, fraud, knavery, bribery, perjury, hypocrisy, and contention; and out of doors, what wars and excommunications, Pope delivering up Pope to the devil, and frequently setting all Europe in a flame,—the native consequence of ambition, and this direct violation of Christ's command, and caveat likewise.

"According to Mosheim, the bishops, that is, presbyters, or overseers, as the word bishop in the original signifies, and they were undistinguished in their character during the first and second centuries, 'The bishops,' he says, 'who lived in the cities, had, either by their own ministry, or that of the presbyters, erected new churches in the towns and villages adjacent. These churches continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops in cities, by whose labours and councils they had been engaged to embrace the gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called dioceses.' Behold here, then, the first rise of the man of sin, the consequence of transgressing the caveat. These bishops in cities, because, forsooth, they had been benefactors, claimed authority over them; and although that authority was moderately exercised at first, yet it grew up gradually from less to more, that it issued at last, in the revelation of a certain person whom Bellarmine calls a god on earth, and who, the Scripture says, exalts himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. Another passage we shall adduce, is from Mat. xxiii. 8, 'But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ.'

"We have seen this passage quoted in the controversy, but never, in our opinion, fully explained or applied, so as to exhibit the peculiar force of it. It is manifest our Saviour does not mean to prohibit them the use of the word master, or father, as applying either to natural or spiritual generation, in every sense and application of it, for he himself acknowledges Nicodemus a master in Israel. A different word indeed is used, in the original, but quite synonymous; but he prohibits them to use it, or apply it to any man upon earth, in the same sense as it was applicable to him, and was due to him, as he taught as one having authority, and whose word was to be received and believed, merely because it was his word. And likewise the name father; in this sense it was due to God. Papists transgress this express prohibition, in both instances. The Pope is a master, in the same sense as Jesus Christ is, or he is nothing. The Pope calls himself father, and it must be in the same sense in which God is a father, for he is styled a God on earth, and he calls his votaries,—his sons,—his children.

"Now the apostle says, 'ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ.' In the very same way, therefore, are persons the children of the Pope, viz. by faith in the Pope. 'For one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.' Now brethren are all equals. Can any thing be more clear and express than this? The whole passage can neither be wrested nor explained away. But to give the supremacy to Peter is a flat contradiction of it. That however has been already shown to be utterly groundless—for Christ did not say that he would build his church upon Petros, a stone, but upon Petra, a rock. Neither did he say that Simon was Petra, a rock, but Petros, a loose moveable stone.

"But Papists have another fort to flee into, in case they should be beaten out of the former, viz. these three words in the last chapter of John's Gospel, 'Feed my sheep.' We know that shepherds feed sheep, but that a shepherd should feed shepherds is rather a solecism in pastoral affairs. But let us give them all fair play. Persons of every denomination are Christ's sheep, and these words give him a commission to feed them. This looks specious. But did not Christ give the very same commission to every one of the apostles, in these words, 'Go and preach the gospel?' but to preach the gospel, is to feed the sheep with the doctrines and ordinances thereof; so that they are one and the same thing in every point of view whatever. And at his final parting with them, did he not give the same extended commission to all of them? Mark xvi. 15. 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' John xx. 21. 'Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.' Where then is the pre-eminence of Peter? It is by these texts destroyed for ever. The same commission to feed the sheep, and to exercise the keys, is given to them all jointly. But let us examine a little farther into this matter. Peter had three times denied his Master, by denying that he was his disciple, and the last time, to put an end to all strife, he denied it upon his solemn oath, and declared that he knew nothing at all about him. From that moment, Peter was no more an apostle of Jesus Christ than Pontius Pilate. Apostleship, supremacy, keys, and all went together. But though Peter had cast off Christ, Christ had not cast him off, and meant to restore him to his apostleship again, and as he had thrice denied him publicly in the face of God, angels, and men, he calls upon him three times to confess his love to him, and as often renews his commission, 'feed my sheep.' This it seems Christ thought necessary. There was something very remarkable took place the third time. It is said Peter was grieved because he said to him the third time, Lovest thou me, as if he had doubted of his sincerity. Peter had denied him three times, but had

grieved Christ exceedingly the third time, by calling upon God, the searcher of hearts, to attest the truth of his entire ignorance of him, even before his Master's face. Christ therefore drew from him a corresponding appeal to himself as the searcher of hearts, that he really did love him, and Christ says nothing against it. If Judas fell from his apostleship by transgression, as Peter says, as certainly Peter fell from it by his denial of his Master by oath. The commission, "feed my sheep," restored him to his apostleship, but nothing more; for it was that commission, that made both him, and all the rest, apostles at first. It was building the church upon him, as they pretend, and giving him the keys, that invested him with the supremacy. But not a word is said here about a rock, or keys, or any thing else. These poor deluded men therefore do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures.—The next thing is the Pope's infallibility, which they found upon the words of Christ, 'And lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.' The Popes always assumed it; but before the council of Trent some of their writers affirmed it belonged to a general council,—others to a general council, with concurrence of the Pope,—others to the Pope, with concurrence of a general council. Since that period the Pope seems to be exclusively invested with it. Christ has been present with his church since the apostles' days, and will be with his faithful ministers to the end of the world. But if the Popes lay claim to such inspiration, as to render them infallible, we should expect them all to be men of singularly holy lives and conversations. Such was Peter himself, in the general tenor of his life, and such, he says, were all the inspired men of old. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But have there not been Popes, and not a few of them whose lives were a disgrace to human nature? Have there not been Popes who have rescinded the apostolical decrees and bulls of former Popes, who had every way the same claim to infallibility as themselves? Does not this infallibility prove the fallibility of the Papal chair, themselves being judges? But that such things have taken place, is confirmed by all historians, even by those of their own profession.

"There is one thing, however, that Papists must prove, otherwise their whole system must fall to ruin, "like the baseless fabric of a vision," viz. that Peter actually exercised this supremacy, and that the rest of the apostles submitted to him in the exercise of it. But not only can they not do this, but the contrary can be clearly proven against them. Peter, in both his epistles, styles himself simply an apostle of Jesus Christ, not arch-apostle, or prince of the apostles, as Papists call him; directs them to Christ as the living stone, the chief corner stone. Here was the time to put in his claim, if he had any. He, good man, however, never dreamed of any such thing. Nor is there one word, in either of his epistles, or in all that is recorded of him, in the Acts of the Apostles, that savours of it in the least. When he writes to the elders, he says, 'The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder.' Why this notandum, but to show them that he was so far from claiming any higher dignity than that of apostle, that he considered himself only as a co-presbyter, for so the word is in the original, and that he was going to give them no exhortation that he could not take to himself as a co-presbyter. And so he exhorts them not to take the oversight of the flock, for filthy lucre, neither as being lords over God's heritage. Is this the character of the Popish clergy? It does not appear, therefore, that Peter ever claimed any supremacy over the church. But did the church ever acknowledge it? No: Paul withstood and reproved him to his face, because he was to be blamed. When a point of faith was to be settled anent circumcision, it was not Peter that was consulted, but the whole apostles and elders, and the decree run in their name, not his, and in the terms of James' sentence, not his. But what puts the matter beyond all doubt, is, that he actually received and executed a commission from the apostles, at Jerusalem, in their presbyterial capacity, and so acted under their authority. And what greatly confirms the matter is, that he acted jointly in the commission with John, as his equal. For it is said, Acts viii. 14, 'Now, when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John.' Now, our Saviour says, whether is greater, he that sends, or he that is sent? The answer is an axiom. He that sends is greater than he that is sent." "J. C."

No. C.

SATURDAY, JUNE 10TH, 1820.

ON the subject of the alleged supremacy of the apostle Peter, I have little to add to what has been so well said by my judicious correspondent J. C. It must be evident, to all who understand our Lord's words, Mat. xvi. 18, that whatever honour he meant to confer upon that apostle, he did not constitute him the rock, or foundation, on which he was to build his church. Peter was no more fit to be such a foundation, than he was to create the universe: and it is the avowed doctrine of St Augustine, one of Rome's greatest oracles, that Christ did not promise to build his church upon Peter, but upon himself, the rock which Peter had

confessed. Augustine writes as follows: "Thou art Peter, and upon the rock which thou hast confessed, upon this rock which thou hast known, saying, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' will I build my church: I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee." *August. de Verb. Domin.* Serm. 13. See Via Tuta and Via Devia, p. 167. It must be admitted that this great divine was not a thorough-bred Papist. It was some ages after his time before the man of sin came to maturity, or that the Pope was declared universal bishop. Augustine was not fully initiated into the doctrine of Peter's supremacy. He did not foresee the use which was afterwards to be made of such a pretext, by the bishops of Rome; and accordingly, taking the words of Christ in their plain simple meaning, he gave them the true Protestant interpretation, that Christ himself, and not Peter, was the rock on which he would build his church.

Augustine, however, is one of the fathers of the church, whose unanimous consent is pleaded by Papists, as establishing all their nostrums. I consider the authority of this father, and of all the rest, with regard to the meaning of any passage of Scripture, as no greater than that of any divine of the present age: but when I can produce such an authority against the church of Rome, it is of great weight upon her own principles. I would tell the Pope, if he would admit me to an audience—"You teach that Peter is the rock on which Christ built his church; that you are Peter's successor: that you consider the whole weight of the church as resting upon you; and that this is according to the unanimous consent of the fathers of the church from the earliest ages." In reply to the last assertion I would say: "Here is one of the greatest fathers of the church, one who presides to this day over all your divines, even as St Crispin presides over cobblers, and St Gallus over sheep and geese, (see page 308) who plainly declares that Christ did not build his church upon the stone πέτρος, but upon himself (τῇ· πετρᾳ) the rock." I have many weightier reasons for rejecting the whole doctrine maintained by the church of Rome, on this point; but I think the above is enough to show, that she cannot plead on her behalf the unanimous consent of the fathers.

Dr Campbell of Aberdeen, in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, (Lect. v.) has conceded a good deal, on the subject of Peter's primacy, at least among the apostles; though he by no means concedes the point of supremacy; and it appears to me, that even on the point of primacy, the celebrated critic has conceded more than enough. There is no evidence in the New Testament, either that Christ appointed that apostle, or that his brethren chose him to preside over them, or that the whole of them, even upon the day of Pentecost, were not upon a footing of perfect equality; nay, from the circumstance of Peter's being appointed by the rest, as observed by my correspondent J. C. to go upon a mission to Samaria, it is very evident that the other apostles did not look upon him as their superior, from whom they were to receive instructions, seeing they actually gave him instructions, at least an appointment, to go upon a certain work, in the service of their common Master.

It is true that Peter makes a more conspicuous appearance in the evangelical narrative, during our Lord's personal ministry, than any other of the apostles; and his name is first mentioned as engaged in the great work of the day of Pentecost. But there is nothing of supremacy, or even of primacy, in this. In every company, however small, some one will be found more fit for business than the rest; some one, perhaps, more forward, more courageous, and more ready to engage in any enterprise; some one to whom the rest of the company will insensibly give place, or tacitly concede a temporary precedence, merely for the sake of present convenience, or for the attainment of some object which may be better effected by one hand, or one mouth, or one pen, than if a dozen of such instruments were employed about it, all at once. I have often seen in the affairs of this world—in public business—in the management of public charities, for instance, that the work falls almost naturally into the hands of two or three individuals, whose aptness for such business is known and acknowledged; and of these two or three, one will be looked up to, as better qualified to be a leader or president, than either of the other two. Providence has thus wisely ordered that human talents should find their level, and have scope for exercise; and if there were not a voluntary concession of precedence, in favour of those whose personal endowments qualified them for it, the business of the world could not be carried on, with any degree of regularity.

The same remarks apply to religious society. Suppose a few Christians, entire strangers to one another, were to meet in a desert. Suppose them to enter into conversation upon the subject of the common salvation, they would not have talked for an hour, till some one would engage the affections of the rest so far, as to induce them to request him to take the lead, and preside in their worship, while they continued together, and be their mouth in offering up their united prayers and thanksgivings to the God of their salvation. This would not give the distinguished individual a primacy or superiority over the rest. The very circumstance of his being greatest in spiritual gifts, would teach him to be the servant of all, and to consider himself the least of all.

In the small company of the apostles, Peter appears to have been such a character as I have here described. He was not the first of them who became Christ's followers. He was not the most distinguished by his Master's private friendship, for this honour was conferred on John, perhaps in a still greater degree upon Lazarus and his sisters; but Peter was a man of a bold and decided character; of a generous and ardent temper, rather too much inclined to what is called forwardness. From the more retiring disposition of the rest, they would naturally fall into the rear of him when they had any communication to make to their Master; and as he sometimes spoke to Christ in the name of all the apostles, Christ would of course reply more directly to him. This precedence, however, was merely personal, not official, as the church of Rome would have it. It arose out of the natural or spiritual endowments of the *man*, but conferred no superiority of *office*. If Christ had appointed Peter to the primacy, or if, in virtue of his qualifications for rule over the other apostles, they had chosen him to be perpetual president, he would then indeed have had an official superiority, but nothing of this kind appears from the New Testament. Though we admit that he presided in the first meeting of the church in Jerusalem, when there were present a hundred and twenty disciples, including the eleven apostles, this does not imply that he was superior to the other ten, any more than a minister preaching to a congregation, in which there are other ministers, would imply that the preacher was superior in office, to his brethren in the ministry. It is necessary for the sake of order, in every meeting for worship or business, that some one preside; to lead the worship, or state the business of the meeting. Peter seems to have done so, in the meeting above referred to, when the business was to elect an apostle in the room of Judas; but Peter did no more than what any other of the apostles might have done. He had no superiority but that of order for the time, and which any other of the apostles might have, the next time they met. Ministers in the church of Scotland have no superiority over one another. The Moderator of the General Assembly is, indeed, officially above them all while the Assembly sits; but immediately on the dissolution of that venerable body, he returns to a station of perfect equality with his brethren.

It does not appear that Peter presided in the meeting of the church in Jerusalem, with the apostles and elders, of which an account is given in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It is not indeed said explicitly who presided there; but the probability is that it was James. After a good deal of discussion, Peter stood up, and stated some plain facts; and then declared his judgment upon the question before them. He was followed on the same side by Barnabas and Paul: after which James performed the part of president, by summing up the substance of what had been narrated, especially by Peter; showing its conformity with Old Testament prophecy; and proposing to the whole body the sentence which he thought should be pronounced. The brethren were satisfied, the thing was unanimously agreed to, and the question was set at rest. In the whole passage there is not a word of superiority claimed by, or conceded to Peter, by the other apostles, except it be the honour of having been chosen by God to preach the gospel to the Gentiles; an honour which was afterwards more abundantly conferred upon the apostle Paul.

From the history of the last mentioned apostle, and from the epistles which he wrote, it is very evident that he at least acknowledged no superiority in Peter. Had Peter been then acknowledged as the vicar of Christ on earth, the regular way would have been for Paul to go to him, and receive his commission from his hands. But Paul tells us plainly, that this was not the case; for the gospel which he preached, he received not from man, neither was he taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, Gal. i. 12. He did not hold his commission at second hand from Peter, as all the Popish priests hold theirs of the Pope; and he adds in the second chapter of the same epistle, that not even the three apostles, James, and Cephas, (*i. e.* Peter) and John, who had been distinguished above all the rest on several occasions, particularly on the mount of transfiguration, added any thing to his authority as an apostle of Christ. These three, indeed, he says, seemed to be pillars, that is, leading men even among the apostles; but jointly or severally, he concedes to them no superiority over himself. Certainly then, he was not a believer in the Popish doctrine that Peter was the vicar of Christ, and prince of the apostles.

It seems to have been admitted, that in the apostolic college, as it is called, there was a difference of rank, arising solely from the endowments or gifts of the Holy Ghost, who divided to every one according to his own will. All the apostles were vessels meet for their Master's use; but some were honoured more than others. Thus we find that Paul speaks of some whom he calls the very chiefest apostles (2 Cor. xi. 5.) which implies that there was a distinction among them; but then he tells us that he was not a whit behind the *very chiefest*. Certainly, then, he acknowledged no superiority on the part of Peter, who, though a chief apostle, and a pillar, had no pre-eminence above him, who was as one born out of due time.

In the same chapter, (Gal. ii.) we have a melancholy evidence of the fact, that Peter was not the rock on which the church was

built; but at best only a moveable stone, by his dissimulation with the Gentile converts, in order to keep on good terms with the Jewish ones. For this, Paul reproved him to his face, because he was to be blamed. Paul does not say that he approached him, as the vicar of Christ, with a humble representation and remonstrance, as would have been proper, had Peter been his ecclesiastical superior; but as one upon a footing of equality, and as one Christian would admonish another, when he is to blame, Paul reproved his brother apostle for the grievous error into which he had fallen, which was not only disheartening to the believing Gentiles, but which actually had the effect of seducing Barnabas, a most faithful disciple, from the simplicity of the gospel. See this subject treated more at length in No. vii.

Upon the same passage of scripture, Mat. xvi. 18, 19, the church of Rome builds this other error, that Peter exclusively was entrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Christ did indeed promise them to him, but not to him alone; any more than he described the blessedness of him alone, when he said, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Christ had put a question to *all* the apostles, "Whom say *ye* that I am?" Peter answered for them, "thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Christ, on receiving this answer, pronounced the blessing as above, which evidently extended to the other apostles to whom the same truth was revealed, and who concurred in the same confession. We might then as well say, that Christ blessed Peter exclusively of the rest, as that he promised the keys to him alone. But the matter is put beyond a doubt, by the declared purpose for which the keys were to be given; "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." This was a promise to Peter, that he should have power and authority (for of this the keys were a symbol), in the kingdom of heaven; that is, the New Testament church. But that Christ's promise extended to the other apostles, is evident from the fulfilment of it. When the appointed time arrived, that is, when he was about to ascend to heaven, he conferred this power on the eleven apostles without distinction. Binding and loosing in the kingdom of heaven, are terms of precisely the same import as remitting and retaining sins. They relate to the authority which Christ conferred on his inspired apostles with regard to doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the church. It is certain, then, that Christ conferred this upon all the apostles. Thus we read, John xx. 21—23, "Then said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Here there is no superiority or supremacy conferred upon Peter. He stands upon a perfect equality with his brethren in the apostleship; and as for what Christ afterwards said to him, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep," it implied no more than what was required of the rest of the apostles, and what they were all alike empowered to do, by the divine commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Much has been said and written about the power of the keys; that is, who is entitled to exercise authority in the church of Christ? and I am inclined to think that the only satisfactory answer that can be given to the question, is, that the power still remains where Christ originally placed it; that is, in the hands of the apostles, who were his accredited ambassadors. Christ himself is Lord and King in his own church. He hath the key of David. This symbol of authority is laid on his shoulder. "He openeth, and no man can shut; he shutteth, and no man can open." "The Father hath given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him." But when Christ went to heaven, he left his apostles to act and speak on his behalf; and he invested them with such authority, that he who heard them, heard him, and he who despised them, despised him. As the Father sent him, so he sent them. This was connected with the promise and gift of the Holy Ghost, which was conferred on the day of Pentecost, in virtue of which they became infallible teachers and rulers in the kingdom of heaven. What the apostles did and taught under this divine influence, was divine teaching and divine operation. The Holy Ghost brought to their remembrance, and enabled them to state with infallible precision, the things which Christ himself had told them; and the Divine Spirit also instructed them with regard to all the other matters, which were necessary for the edification and government of the church; which things Christ himself only "*began* to do and teach," (Acts i. 1.) while he was personally with them; reserving the finishing lessons, to be imparted by the Holy Ghost, of whom he said, "when he is come, he will teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance."

Now Christ himself having the key of David; that is, sovereign authority in the church, was pleased to devolve the exercise of that authority upon his apostles; but only in connection with their receiving the Holy Ghost; so that all that they did, and spoke, and wrote, should be under his divine inspiration. Authority exercised under such influ-

ence, was nothing less than divine authority. Such was that which the apostles exercised in their personal ministry in the churches which they planted; and having committed to writing what the Holy Ghost dictated for the government, instruction, and edification of the church in all future ages, their writings are the only authoritative rule by which the conduct of Christians and Christian churches is to be regulated. Christ gave authority to them, and they only of the human race have been honoured to carry the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

I am perfectly aware, that a claim of right to exercise the power conferred by the gift of the keys, is made by church rulers of all denominations of Christians; and I think nothing that I have said will be considered as interfering with such right, if it be kept in its proper place. In every church, however great, or however small, there must be the power of binding and loosing; of receiving and excluding members; of administering divine ordinances, whether of doctrine, worship, government, or discipline; but whether this power be lodged in the hands of many, or in the hands of few, it is only ministerial. It is, in a subordinate sense, making use of the keys which Christ gave to the apostles; but if the eye and the hand of Him who inspired the apostles, do not guide every turning of the keys, they will be used not for the edification, but for the destruction of the church. In plain English, the written word of the apostles is the only rule by which the power of Christ is to be administered in his church; and therefore, properly speaking, they only are the holders of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and he would not have intrusted such power even to them, had he not ordained the exercise of it to be under the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghost, so that they should be infallibly secured against falling into error, in the exercise of the authority which he committed to them. There are many who despise church authority; and certainly the usurpations of the church of Rome are calculated to make men both dread and despise it; but all lawful authority in the church, is the authority of Christ; and he who despises it must bear his own burden.

It is worthy of remark, that in the very passage, (Mat. xviii. 15—18) which churches and church-rulers plead as their warrant for exercising the power of the keys, that power is expressly referred to the apostles. Offenders, after private means for their recovery to repentance have been used in vain, are to be reported to the church: and if any one shall refuse to hear the church, it is commanded that he be considered as a heathen and a publican; that is, that he be put away from their communion; and it is added, not absolutely or unconditionally, what the church shall do, shall be confirmed; but "Verily I say unto you (my apostles) whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." The confirmation in heaven, therefore, of the sentence of any church upon earth, depends upon its being a sentence of the apostles. It must be a binding or a loosing; a retaining or a remitting of sins, according to their word; otherwise it is of no authority whatever in heaven, though it should have the sanction of all the councils and all the congregations in the world.

In all such discussions as these, we ought to remember that Christ himself hath the key of David. This prerogative he claimed for himself, after Peter was dead (Rev. iii. 7); and he holds the key in his own hand still. He has the entire disposal of the treasures of everlasting life. "It pleased the Father that in him all fulness should dwell;" and this fulness is dispensed, according to the testimony of his apostles, to all who apply to him. "Out of his fulness they themselves had received, even grace upon grace;" that is, favour upon favour, more than they could express: and what they saw, and heard, and contemplated of the word of life (1 John i. 1—3) they have declared to us, that we also may have fellowship with them, whose fellowship truly is with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ. But supposing the key of such treasures to be transferred to the Pope of Rome, the pretended successor of Peter, the church would be left in dependence upon a fellow-creature, upon a broken reed that could afford no help, but would wound and disappoint him who should be so foolish as to lean upon it.

No. CI.

SATURDAY, JUNE 17TH, 1820.

A GRAVE author of the Church of Rome derives the supremacy of Peter from something like a pun, in the new name Cephas, which Christ gave him. This word, pronounced Kephas, which signifies a stone, resembles a Greek word which signifies head; therefore, he will have it, that Peter is the head of the church. "For therefore," says Optatus of Milevis, in Africa, "Christ gave him the cognomination of Cephas, ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, to show that St Peter was the visible head of the catholic church." In Scotland, there are several families of the name of Roy, which is almost the same as *Roi*, which, in French, signifies king; *ergo*, all the Roys must be kings; and the M'Ilroys, or Macs-les-rois, must be princes of the blood royal. I am afraid the herald's office would not confirm this doctrine; but I am sure it is as good as that of the African divine, who

finds the supremacy of Peter in the resemblance between the Greek word κεφαλη, "the head," and the Syriac word Cephas, "a stone." I find the words of the above named Optatus in Jeremy Taylor's Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying, edit. 1647, page 127.

The first thing which Papists wish us to believe concerning Peter, is, that he was the vicar of Christ and prince of the apostles; the next is, that he was the founder and first bishop of the Church of Rome. Having shown that he was not, by divine authority, invested with the former office, I come now to show that he never held the latter; at least, that there is no evidence of his having done so; and, in a matter of so much importance, we ought to have the most positive evidence. In fact, the whole system of Popery rests upon the assumption that Peter was the first bishop of Rome, that is, the first Pope; and if this cannot be proved, and it certainly has never yet been proved, the whole fabric must fall to the ground.

It is my wish to do justice to this, as well as to every other subject that comes under my review; and, therefore, I shall give here the entire chapter, or "table of St Peter," as it is laid down by the translators of the Rhemish New Testament, omitting the years of the Roman emperors and of the ascension, and noting only the common Christian era.

"Anno Domini, 34. Peter causeth the disciples to proceed to the election of another apostle in Judas' room, Acts i. Receiveth, with the rest, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, on Whitsunday. He made the first sermon, and converted 3000, Acts ii. He cureth one born lame; preacheth Christ and penance to the Jews; so that 5000 believed, Acts iii. and iv. He is imprisoned, released again, threatened, and commanded to preach no more; but he, with John, answereth, that they must obey God more than man, Acts iv. He striketh dead, with a word, Ananias and Sapphira, for sacrilege, Acts v. He is sent with John to Samaria, to confirm the newly baptized, where he reproveth Simon Magus, Acts viii.

"A. D. 35. He healeth Eneas at Lydda, and raiseth Tabitha from death at Joppa, Acts ix. He is warned and taught by a vision to preach to Cornelius, a Gentile, Acts x. He defendeth his receiving of the Gentiles, Acts xi.; and records, (Acts xv.) that God called the first Gentiles by his ministry; so that Paul's first preaching to them, and his going to Arabia, must be after this. See *St Chryst. in Act.* No. 22, *Euseb.* lib. ii. cap. 3.

"A. D. 36. He continueth preaching in divers parts of Jewry, and the provinces adjoining. About two years after this, St Paul visiteth him in Jerusalem, Gal. i. He preacheth in Syria, and the provinces of Asia Minor, Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, ordaining bishops and priests in divers places, 1 Pet. i. *Niceph.* lib. ii. c. 35. *Platina in Petro.*

"A. D. 39. He goeth to Antioch, and preacheth there, and maketh that his seat; yet not remaining there continually, but, for the affairs of the church, departing thence sometimes to Jerusalem, sometimes to other places. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Ignat. ad Magnesianos.* At Jerusalem he is cast into prison, after the putting of St James to death, by the commandment of Herod. He is prayed for by the whole church, and delivered out of prison by an angel, Acts xii.

"A. D. 44. Avoiding the fury of Herod, he leaveth Jewry again. He appointeth Euodius bishop of Antioch. *Euseb. in Chron.* and lib. li. 3. cap. 16. *Suidas Ignat. ad Antiochen.* And passing by Corinth, HE CAME TO ROME, to convince Simon Magus. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Euseb.* lib. ii. cap. 12, 13, 24. *Concil.* tom. i. He approveth and declareth the gospel of St Mark to be canonical. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Euseb.* lib. ii. cap. 14. Having founded the Church of Rome, and planted his apostolical seat there, afterwards absent from the city, (either expelled thence, with other Jews, *Cornel. Tacit. in Claudio;* or rather, according to the office of his apostleship, leaving it for a time,) he visited other churches, and came to Jerusalem again, using, both in his absence and presence, Linus and Cletus for his coadjutors. Tom. 2. *Concil.* p. 656. *Epiph.* tom. 2. *Hiero.* 27.

"A. D. 51. He holdeth the first council, Acts xv. He is reprehended at Antioch by St Paul, Gal. ii., except that difference fell before the council, as some think, *August.* op. 19. He returneth to Rome again. The Roman faith, by his diligence, now made famous through the world, Rom. i. and xv. *Theodoret* in xvi. Rom. Thence he writeth his first epistle, 1 Pet. v. *Euseb.* lib. ii. cap. 14. *Hiero. in Catalogo.* He sendeth St Mark to Alexandria, and others to plant the faith in divers parts of the world, *Grego.* lib. v. cap. 60, and lib. vi. ep. 37, *Nicepho.* lib. ii. c. 35. He writeth his second epistle, a little before his death, which Christ revealed to him to be at hand, 2 Pet. i. He taketh order for his successor.

"A. D. 70. He was finally crucified at Rome. *See the last Annot. John* c. 21."

The annotation here referred to is as follows:—"Another shall gird thee. He prophesieth of Peter's martyrdom, and of the kind of death which he should suffer, that was crucifying; which the heretics, fearing that it were a step to prove that he was martyred in Rome, deny; whereas the fathers, and ancient writers, are as plain in this, as that he was at Rome." Then follows a reference to Origen, as quoted by Eusebius, and Eusebius himself, &c. &c., which may be allowed to make it as certain that Peter was crucified in Rome, as that he was bishop of Rome, or that he ever saw Rome, both of which yet remain to be proved; for nothing that these fathers have written tends

to prove the fact of the apostle's having been there, except that there was a vague tradition on the subject, which is surely a foundation extremely slender for building such a fabric as the Church of Rome professes to build upon it.

If Peter ever was in Rome, he would have been there a person of much less consequence than the youngest dissenting minister is, at present, in Glasgow, not to speak of doctors in divinity. We know that when Paul was brought to that great city, with a military escort, and under all the solemnity of an appeal to Cesar, he was suffered to live for two years in a hired apartment, without being an object of public attention, except to such Jews and others as chose to call upon him. Nay, he was in such obscurity, that it required very diligent search to find out where he lodged, see 2 Tim. i. 17. Now, had Peter found his way to the same city, bringing no other news than the news of salvation by Jesus Christ, he would have been considered a person of no more consequence than any other wandering Jew, who might come to Rome upon business of his own. If he had proceeded to perform miracles, he would probably have engaged public notice. His miracles having been performed, to whatever power they were ascribed, would probably have been attested by some eye-witness; and we should have had some record of it by some of the writers of the day. We cannot even produce this evidence of Paul's having been in Rome; and we know the fact of his having been there from no other source than the apostolic record. We have not this evidence of Peter's having been there; and, therefore, we cannot reasonably be called upon to believe it; much less to build a system of religion upon it, as is done by the Church of Rome.

On such a subject, the vague tradition of fathers, who lived hundreds of years after the apostolic age, is of no authority whatever. I adhere to my position, that the apostle Peter was not in the esteem of the Roman empire, or even of Roman citizens, a person of such consequence, as to engage the particular notice of the historians of the day. There was, therefore, no record of his travels and labours preserved, except what was taken by his Christian brethren, and preserved in the New Testament. We know how difficult it is to come at the truth, with regard to persons who lived within a few years of our own time, especially if no written memorial of them has been preserved. It must have been much more difficult in the first ages of the Christian era, and in the disturbed state of the Roman empire, to ascertain any fact with regard to the life and death of men who were so generally abhorred, and so cruelly persecuted, as the Christians were, except what they and their cotemporaries had written. Though the writers who speak of Peter's having been at Rome, had lived within fifty years of his death, they would not have been able to ascertain the fact without great difficulty; surely then, where two or three hundred years had elapsed, it must have been impossible to know any thing of the matter, with certainty. There were few authors, and no printing, in those days. Real facts, with regard to a man politically so insignificant, could only be transmitted from mouth to mouth, by persons still more obscure; and, by the time of Origen or Eusebius, no man could tell what was true and what was not, except what the Christian churches had preserved, as the authentic testimony of eye and ear witnesses; that is, just what we have in the New Testament, and nothing more can be depended on.

Besides, the traditionary account of Peter's having been in Rome is not consistent with itself, or with the authentic account of him which we have in the New Testament. "Concerning the time of his coming to Rome," says Fulke, "the ancient writers do not agree. Eusebius saith, it was in the time of Claudius; but by Hierom, who saith he sat there twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, it must follow, that he came thither the second or third of Claudius; yet Damasus saith, he came to Rome in the beginning of Nero's empire, and sat there twenty-five years; whereas, Nero reigned but fourteen years. He saith also, that his disputation with Simon Magus was in the presence of Nero the emperor. Eusebius reporteth it under Claudius. Anterius, bishop of Rome (as Nicephorus testifieth), did write that Peter was translated from Antioch to Rome, and from thence he passed to Alexandria, because he might more profit the church there." These are all matters of mere hearsay, reported hundreds of years after Peter's death, and, therefore, entitled to no credit at all. Had Peter been twenty-five years bishop of Rome, he must have been sitting there at the time that Paul was there, or, at least, when he addressed an epistle to the church in Rome; and yet it is a fact, that in his epistle to the believers in Rome, and in all his epistles written from Rome, Paul makes no mention of his brother apostle; but he does make mention of some things that would have been most disgraceful to Peter, had he been there. No salutations were sent to Peter by Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, while he pays this respect to a host of meaner persons, chap. xvi. And when he was a prisoner in Rome, he sent no salutations from Peter to any of the churches or individuals to whom he wrote; surely, then, Peter was not there. Paul says, "at his first appearance, no man stood by him, but that all forsook him." Surely, if Peter had been in Rome, he would not have deserted his brother in his affliction, and when brought before Nero to answer with his life. The church in Rome, of which Paul had heard so many good things, before he saw them, had declined so much by the time he came to them, that he spake as if

there had not been one among them in whom he could confide. "All men," says he, "seek their own, not the things which are Christ's," Phil. ii. 21. He would surely have made the exception of Peter, had he been there.

The fact seems to be, that the tradition of Peter's having been at Rome, and his coming there to contend with Simon Magus, seems to have arisen out of a confused account of what took place in Samaria, Acts viii., in which it is recorded, that the apostle had a sorcerer to contend with. It was easy, after the lapse of two or three hundred years, to transfer the scene of this contest to Rome; especially when the church in the imperial city began to put forward her claim to be the mother and mistress of all churches. Then it appeared to be a matter of great importance to have it believed that the highly honoured apostle, Peter, was their founder, and first bishop. The slightest surmise would eagerly be caught hold of, and would be repeated from mouth to mouth, and from age to age, until the thing became fixed in the minds of all, as an undoubted truth. The meaning which was unjustly affixed to Christ's words, "I give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," as addressed in the first instance to Peter, served to confirm the delusion.

One cannot help reflecting, with some degree of melancholy, on the low and contemptible ideas which Papists must have of the office and work of the apostles. Peter, according to them, came to Rome for the express purpose of opposing Simon Magus, as if this had been an object worthy of so long a journey, by so great a man. When such deceivers, as Simon and Elymas, came in the way of apostles, we are informed how they dealt with them; but we never read of apostles going out of their way to seek for them. These sorcerers were indeed enemies of the truth, but the apostles had as great enemies as they to contend with, in the hearts of all the men whom they addressed, until they were subdued by the gospel. It would have been matter of great triumph for Satan, if he had got all the apostles set a hunting after jugglers, and to neglect the work of preaching the gospel to sinners.

It might be admitted, were there the slightest evidence of it, that Peter, in the course of his journey, came to Rome; but Papists would gain nothing by the admission, unless it be farther shown that he was bishop of Rome, of which there is not the shadow of evidence. Nay, I maintain that his holding such an office would have been inconsistent with the higher office of an apostle, with which we are sure he was invested by Christ himself. The bishop of any one church has the official oversight of that church, but not of any other. Had Peter been chosen by the church in Rome to be their bishop, he could not have accepted of the office, without laying down that which he had received from his Lord and Master, and which made it imperative upon him to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. Upon Paul came daily the care of all the churches, especially of the Gentiles, which he had planted: and upon Peter, no doubt, came the care of all the churches, especially among the Jews, of which he was entrusted with the more immediate charge, as seems to have been intimated by the opening of Providence, and the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, and acquiesced in, by the two apostles themselves, Gal. ii. 7. The apostles doubtless were bishops in the highest sense of the word, that is, they were overseers or pastors of Christ's flock, wherever they were; but the oversight, or pastoral charge of particular churches, they committed to men who were also bishops, but in an inferior sense. It was part of the work of apostles to ordain ordinary bishops; and this power seems also to have been conferred on the evangelists Timothy and Titus; but the apostles themselves, so far as appears, never consented to become bishops of particular churches. Yet, wherever they had their residence, at any time, the bishops of the churches who had access to them, and the churches themselves, would, no doubt, look up to them as their spiritual fathers, and overseers in the Lord. Thus we may admit, that James in Jerusalem, and Peter in Antioch, and Paul in Rome, and John in Ephesus, exercised episcopal authority in these places, without supposing them officially attached to them as their *peculiar* charge. Who first preached the gospel in Rome, and planted the church there, we do not know; but it does not appear that ever they were favoured with the presence of any of the apostles, except Paul; and it is not even pretended that he was their bishop. Some of the fathers, indeed, join him with Peter, in laying the foundation of the Church of Rome; though it is certain, from Rom. i. 10, 11, that there was a church there before Paul came to it.

Christ's words to Peter, as explained by John, chap. xxi. 18, 19, lead us to believe that Peter must have suffered martyrdom; but where, or in what manner, we know nothing with certainty. The apostles fell one by one, when it pleased their Master to call them from labour and suffering, to rest and glory with himself; but it does not appear that any of them appointed successors; indeed, that was a power that did not belong to them. Each of them had received his commission directly from Christ, and to Him he resigned it, along with his life. They left bishops or pastors to oversee the churches, and feed the flock of Christ, after their death, and to the end of the world; and they left their writings, as the infallible rule of faith and manners to all their churches, and to all the pastors. But their office, as

apostles, they did not leave to others; and, therefore, in this sense, they had no successors.

When James, and Peter, and Paul, were taken away by violent death, and when several others of the apostles were probably removed in the same way, it is reasonable to suppose that such of the original twelve as survived, would be looked up to, as possessing the authority of all the rest. The apostle John, we have reason to think, outlived Peter by a number of years. Had Peter then been prince of the apostles, and vicar of Christ, it might have been expected, that, had he bequeathed his power to any one, it would have been to this beloved disciple. This, however, is not so much as pretended; but it is pretended that Peter appointed Clement and Linus to be his co-adjutors, and one of them, it is not certain which, to be his successor in the see of Rome. Now this would have been very irregular procedure, had there been any truth in it. Who was Clement, and who was Linus, that either of them should have been promoted over the head of the apostle John, to be Christ's vicar on earth, and universal bishop?

"It is no way likely," says Dr Jeremy Taylor, "that a private person should skip over the head of an apostle; or why should his successors at Rome enjoy the benefit of it more than his successors at Antioch, since that he was at Antioch, and preached there, we have a divine authority; but that he did so at Rome, at most, we have but a human; and if it be replied, that because he died at Rome, it was argument enough that there his successors were to inherit his privilege; this, besides that at most it is but one little degree of probability, and not of strength sufficient to support an article of faith; it makes that the great divine right at Rome, and the apostolical presidency, was so contingent and fallible as to depend upon the decree of Nero; and if he had sent him to Antioch, there to have suffered martyrdom, the bishops of that town had been head of the Catholic church."—*Liberty of Prophesying*, page 134. Had such a headship been really conferred upon Peter, and had there been any credible evidence of the fact, it would not have been invalidated on account of its having been effected by a decree of Nero, because this might have been part of the plan ordained by Providence for carrying the thing into effect; even as it was by the determinate council and foreknowledge of God, that Christ was, by wicked hands, crucified and slain. But then the fact remains to be proved. It remains to be shown that Peter was divinely appointed head of the Catholic church. While this point remains unproved, we have a very good right to say, that had Nero sent Peter to be put to death at Antioch, or any where else, and had it been appointed that the place of his death should give name to his see, and to the church in all time coming, then it depended upon the man who commanded his death, whether Rome, or Antioch, or Jerusalem, should thenceforth give name to the Catholic church.

These things are extremely trifling, but we must sometimes descend to trifles, when we engage with children, and even with the fathers of Rome, who cannot rise above childish things. In short, there is no sensible man who would venture the value of a new hat upon the proof of the fact that Peter was bishop of Rome; and yet Papists are so simple as to venture their all, both for time and eternity, upon it.

No. CII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 24TH, 1820.

IN the evangelical history, Peter's name is usually, if not uniformly, mentioned first, when the names of the apostles are given; and in one instance, (Mat. x. 2,) Peter is called the first; but for any thing we know, this may have been because he was the oldest man. It is impossible to give a list of names without putting one before another, and some one first, unless it be in the form of a round robin; and the order in which they are first written will generally be that in which they are repeated. This circumstance appears a very slender ground for building a great system upon; but Popish authors, and especially bishop Hay, lay great stress upon it. Now, if Peter was vicar of Christ at all, he could not properly be acknowledged such, till after Christ had left the earth. It was when Christ was about to ascend to heaven, that he conferred upon his apostles all the authority which he meant them to exercise; and he instructed them to wait for the promised effusion of the Holy Spirit, before they entered upon their work. Peter's headship could not properly commence sooner than Christ's ascension; and yet it so happens that after this, he is not always mentioned first when apostles are spoken of. In 1 Cor. i. 12, and iii. 22, he is mentioned the last of three,—Paul, Apollos, and Cephas; thus, one who was not an apostle at all in the original sense of the word, is put before Peter; and in 1 Cor. iii. 5, he is omitted altogether; and only Paul and Apollos are mentioned, though the subject under discussion is the same as that in which his name has been mentioned. Paul mentions himself before Peter, Gal. ii. 7, and in the 9th verse of the same chapter, the arrangement is, James, Cephas, and John, which would never have been the case, had Peter been the Pope of the day. No man writing from Rome at present would say, Cardinal Gonsalvi and the Pope; he would doubtless mention the Pope first, if he had a particle of

good manners in him; and had Peter been looked up to by the other apostles as their holy father, Paul would doubtless have respected, and spoken of him as such, for no man understood better, or taught more plainly, the duty of giving honour to whom honour is due.

"St Peter," says bishop Hay, in his Sincere Christian, vol. i. chap. xii., "acted in this supreme capacity as head of the church, both when he called the brethren to deliberate about choosing one in the place of Judas, Acts i., and also when he gave the definitive sentence in the council of Jerusalem, after there had been much disputing, Acts xv. 7; but when he had spoken, all the multitude held their peace, ver. 12, and submitted to his decision, as did also St James, who assented to, and confirmed what he had said." The right reverend bishop must have been aware, that he was writing this for persons who had not Bibles, or who were not allowed to look into them, or who would not be at the pains to look into them, if they had them. He represents the whole multitude's holding their peace when Peter had spoken, as an implicit acquiescence in what he had said, and submission to him. Had it been so, it would have been right, seeing he was an inspired apostle; but in point of fact it was not so. The people held their peace, or kept silence, not as a sign of submission to Peter, but that they might give audience to Barnabas and Paul, and hear what they had to say, which would have been unnecessary had they considered Peter as having settled the controversy by his *ipse dixit*.

It is true that James assented to, and confirmed what Peter had said. He confirmed it by a quotation from the Old Testament, which was always reckoned a satisfactory confirmation, by believers who were originally Jews; but it is not true that all the people submitted to Peter's decision, for neither the proposal nor the decision was his. The proposal was that of James, who said, *My sentence is*, &c.; and the thing was agreeable to "the apostles and elders, with the whole church," ver. 22, but the decision itself was that of the Holy Ghost, on whose testimony it was founded, and by whose authority it was announced. "It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us," ver. 28, is the language in which the decision is addressed to the church in Antioch. The decree, therefore, as it is called, had all the authority of the Holy Ghost speaking in the Old Testament scriptures, and also speaking by the mouth of apostles who were inspired and infallible interpreters of the Old Testament. It was a decision from which no one could dissent without rebellion against God. On this point I suppose all Protestants, at least, are agreed; and it is not necessary that I should enter upon the discussion of minor points, on which some of the most enlightened of them differ in opinion; and on which there is much said on all sides. It is enough that I have shown that the decision in this case was not that of Peter; and that, therefore, the circumstance furnishes no evidence of his supremacy.

"Again," says bishop Hay, "the writers of Christianity, and holy fathers in every age, have always attested it as a truth revealed by God, that Jesus Christ did constitute St Peter prince of the apostles, and visible head of the church," vol. i. chap. xii. The bishop does not say to whom this was revealed; and as we have no authentic, or even credible revelation later than that of "St John the Divine," we cannot reasonably be required to believe any thing that comes after him, in the form of a revelation to any other divine or father of the church. But it is not true, that holy fathers in the church, in every age, have always attested this. The thing was quite unknown in the first and purest ages of the church, as is known by every man at all acquainted with the subject; and Papists themselves know, that they cannot maintain the point but by barefaced forgery, lying, and impudence.

"It is an undoubted fact," says the bishop, "that Peter's successors have always claimed this supreme authority, and have exercised it throughout the whole church, as occasion required, in every age, from the very beginning. Now, considering the nature of man, it is evidently impossible that any bishop of the church should have acquired such authority over all the rest, even in the most different nations and the most distant kingdoms, or that he could have exercised it every where among them, if it had not been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ." I admit that since the bishops of Rome pretended to be Peter's successors, they have always claimed this supreme authority, that is, more authority than Peter himself possessed; but for ages after this apostle's death, there were none who pretended to be his successors, and of course none who claimed such authority. I request the reader not to take this on my word; but to read all the histories that he can obtain, even those of Papists themselves, and he will find that what I assert is true.

The bishop finds the Pope in possession of supreme power over all who choose to submit to him; he takes it for granted, that he enjoys this as Peter's successor; and he considers it impossible that he should have acquired such power over all other bishops, unless it had been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ. The same argument may be used on behalf of all the despots and wholesale murderers that have been in the world. This will give a divine origin to the religion of Mahomet, and to the usurpation of Buonaparte. To confine our remarks at present to the latter, if the mere possession of absolute

authority over the human race be a proof that it emanates from Christ, then Buonaparte must have held his power under a divine right. It is not more wonderful that one bishop in the church should acquire authority over all the rest by fraud and cunning, than that one French general should acquire power over all the rest by the same means, with the addition of the power of the sword, in the hands of thousands of soldiers whom he had won to support his cause. Both instances were no doubt divinely permitted, like every other usurpation upon the civil and religious rights of men; but the things themselves were according to the working of Satan.

It is asserted by bishop Hay, that "considering the nature of man, it is evidently impossible that any one bishop should have acquired such authority over all the rest," &c., "if it had not been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ." Now, in opposition to his reverence, I maintain, that it was from the very nature of man that such a thing was possible, and practicable, and that the attempt became successful. I speak of man as a sinful creature, estranged from the love of God, and the way of righteousness. Such a creature naturally desires to usurp the place of God upon any scale of usurpation that may appear attainable, from the low degree of making his own will the rule of his own conduct, up to the high degree of making his will the rule of conduct, not only of fellow-creatures, but even of God himself. The radical vice of human nature is lust of power. This has appeared in the Church of Rome as much as it did in Pagan Rome, or in any kingdom whatever. Now where this passion exists in a high degree, with a corresponding degree of cunning and boldness, and where the state of society and other circumstances favour the design, the highest degree of power may be obtained by one man over his fellow-creatures. One favourable circumstance for the attainment of such an object, is a state of general ignorance and corruption of manners; and if the man who aims at supreme power be able to command a few agents possessed of some degree of knowledge, and animated by similar ambition, he may by degrees come to rule the world as he pleases. The bishops of Rome found society in the third and fourth centuries deplorably ignorant and vicious; and they found a numerous priesthood ready to aid them in deceiving the people, and building up the power of the see of Rome, expecting that Rome would, in return, help to establish their power in their respective sees and parishes. The plan succeeded, as the world knows to its cost; and it would be difficult to account for it, without "considering the nature of man," as deeply tainted with the love of power on the one hand, and on the other, immersed in ignorance and the love of vicious indulgence.

I do not recollect any other argument in favour of Peter's supremacy which I have not answered in my seventh Number, and in my later ones, beginning at the ninety-ninth.—I think it will appear to the satisfaction of the reader, that there is no evidence to be found in Scripture, that Peter was vicar of Christ, prince of the apostles, and visible head of the church. That Peter held no such office is the point which I have been endeavouring to establish; and I leave the reader to decide whether or not I have succeeded. If I have, the main pillar of Popery is subverted; and if I have not, I have yet other matter in reserve, which I hope will accomplish my purpose.

But in the mean time let us attend to what Papists maintain about the necessity of a visible head of the church on earth. Real Christians are content that there is a spiritual and glorious Head of the church at the right hand of God in heaven, to whom they can come with all their petitions, in the full confidence of having their sins forgiven and all their need supplied: but this is not enough for Papists. They must have a head on earth, who is a sinner like themselves, and who will indulge them in their sins, without damping their prospects of happiness in the other world; and precisely such a head the Pope of Rome is, and has been, for many hundred years.

Bishop Hay asks; "Why did Christ institute one visible head of his church upon earth?" and he answers:—"Because, as the church is a visible body, or society of men, it was most becoming they should have a visible supreme head among them, like to the members of whom the body is composed. Besides, as the church was ordained to spread over all nations, differing from one another in language, customs, government, and every thing else except religion, it would have been morally impossible to have kept them all united in one body, if there were not one common visible head of supreme authority among them, to which all must submit: so that this head of the church is the centre of unity, by which the church of Christ, throughout the whole world, is joined in one body."—*Sincere Christian*, chap. xii.

In reply to this, I maintain, that the church of Christ is never represented in the New Testament as a visible body, having a visible head on earth; and therefore all that the bishop says about the necessity of such a head must go for nothing. He is not speaking of any particular or national church, and neither am I, but of the church of Christ; that is, the whole body of believers in Christ, and the sanctified through his blood, of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations. These were never meant to be one visible body on earth; they could never all meet in one place, or be the subjects of one earthly head, in any sense of the word. They are all united to

Christ, and to one another in him, who is really the head of his body, the church; and who never devolved the honour of this headship upon any creature. A mere human head could be of no use to such a body; because it could communicate no life, and it could not take an oversight of all or of any of the members; but Christ, by his word and Spirit, gives life to all the members of his body; by the same divine influence, he unites them to himself, and to one another, in an invisible, but indissoluble bond of union; he takes the oversight of every one of them; he feeds his flock like a shepherd; he leads them in the way of righteousness, and guides them with his eye.

To descend from this view of the Church of Christ and her divine Head, to the Church of Rome, and the Pope as her head, is such an example of the βαθος, or art of sinking, that I scarcely know how to write it. If the Pope were to limit his claim of headship to the Church of Rome, it might be conceded, that the head is good enough for the body; but when he claims to be the head of the catholic or universal Church of Christ, the thing is more absurd and impious than human language can express.

The headship which the Pope claims over the church, makes him virtually head of the state also, in all countries where Popery is the established religion. He claims, and has conceded to him, an allegiance more sacred than subjects yield to their princes; and from the hold which he has of the consciences of the people, by the agency of his priests, their allegiance to their civil rulers is just what the Pope pleases to make it. Nay, he is not satisfied with the allegiance of the subjects of all kings and princes where his religion prevails; but he must have the allegiance of sovereign princes themselves; and to these arrogant claims may be ascribed half the wars which desolated Europe for a thousand years.

Lord Clarendon, in his Introduction to his work entitled, "Religion and Policy," represents this usurpation of the bishop of Rome as having been "without doubt the cause of more rapine, and the effusion of more blood, than all the ambition of other princes and usurpers that hath been since the death of our Saviour; and," says he, "the propagation of Christianity hath been more obstructed by that obstinate, humorous, and senseless ambition, than by the arms and tyranny of the Turks and infidels. And how can we reasonably hope," continues his Lordship, "that those great and powerful princes, who command so much the greater part of the world, will ever embrace the Christian faith, when they know that they are not only thereby to cease to be Mahometans, but to cease to be monarchs, and admit another prince to have an equal, if not superior, command over their own subjects in their own dominions, and must cease to be emperors before they can be admitted to be Christians? When our Saviour himself, whilst he was upon the earth, and instituted that religion by which all men are to be saved, was so tender of, and jealous for, the entire power, prerogative, and privileges of kings and princes, that he would not suffer them either to be invaded or affronted for the advancement of the gospel itself; and consequently never intended, that by becoming Christians and followers of him, from being Jews and Gentiles, they should lose any of the pre-eminences they were possessed of; or that their subjects should pay them a less entire obedience and submission than they had formerly done; and when he intended that their conversion should be the most effectual means to reduce all the world to the faith of Christ; as indeed it was like to have been, till the Popes' usurpation of a spiritual distinct sovereignty obstructed the progress of it, and drove more from it, than ever it reconciled to it."

The same consideration must have a tendency to induce Mahometan and heathen princes to oppose the propagation of Christianity among their people. If Popery were Christianity, they would be sensible at once that they could not embrace it, without becoming subjects of a foreign power, and that none of their subjects could embrace it, without having their allegiance transferred to the Pope. If these princes were to see Christianity in its true character, as the friend of order and subordination, they could not oppose the propagation of it, without obstructing the peace and comfort of their subjects, as well as of themselves; but when they see Christianity only in the light of Popery, it is not surprising that they hate and oppose it, as the bane of every country into which it has found its way. But for Popery, the gospel might long ere now have been preached and believed throughout the whole world, as we hope it will be when Popery is destroyed; and as this grand consummation has been obstructed chiefly by the Church of Rome, for many centuries, that church, and all her adherents, may be expected to suffer, when the time shall arrive, the dreadful punishment which such wickedness deserves.

In showing how absurdly the Popes of Rome pretend to be the successors of Peter, I shall make considerable use, in my next Number, of the work of the noble and learned historian above quoted; and I shall make my extracts the more freely and largely, because I believe the work itself is in the possession of few, if any, of my readers on this side of the Tweed. I do not know a work of greater value in relation to this part of the controversy between Protestants and the Church of Rome. The edition before me, which, I believe, is the first and only one, was printed at Oxford as lately

as 1791, with sufficient attestation of its authenticity. But before I give the result of Lord Clarendon's researches, I shall present the reader with the confused account which the Popish historian, Dupin, gives of those whom he conceived to be Peter's successors in the see of Rome.

"Let us begin," says he, "with the successors of St Peter, in the Church of Rome, the first and principal church." It is worth while to attend to this mode of expression. Dupin found, that during the first three centuries, there was not so much as a hint, that the Church of Rome was the catholic, or only true church of Christ; and he calls it only the first and principal church, for no reason that can be shown, but that Rome was the first and principal city at that time in the world. In what follows, he gives nothing as certain, with regard to Peter's successors, but only as a commonly received opinion hundreds of years after the period to which he refers.

"According to the common received opinion, to St Peter succeeded St Linus, to St Linus, Anacletus or Cletus, and to him St Clement. This order is observed by St Irenæus, Eusebius, and St Jerome, and in the ancient catalogues of the Popes; but Optatus, Rufinus, and St Augustine, and some other Latin authors, substitute St Clement immediately to St Linus, and place Anacletus in the third rank. Some distinguish Cletus from Anacletus. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions says, that St Linus was ordained by St Paul, and St Clement by St Peter. St Epiphanius conjectures, that St Peter at first ordained St Clement; but he refusing to accept the pontificate, and going out of the way, that St Linus and St Cletus did sucessively govern the Church of Rome, and that after the death of St Peter, St Clement succeeded to St Cletus. The best way is to hold the most common and most ancient opinion." Vol. ii. chap. 2.

The plain English of the above is, that nothing is certainly known of the matter, which is a strong presumptive argument, that the knowledge of it is of no importance to the comfort and edification of Christians. The author tells us with great gravity, that after the death of St Peter, St Clement succeeded St Linus; but he cannot tell, and no man in the world can tell, who was Peter's immediate successor, supposing it were admitted that he was bishop of Rome, which it is not. It is of no use to refer to a commonly received opinion, in the time of Eusebius or Augustine, hundreds of years after the thing is supposed to have happened, for they could know no more than we do. Dupin, writing of the succession of bishops in the see of Rome, tells us, that in the third century, after the death of St Fabianus, the see of Rome was vacant a whole year. The Church of Rome has often been called a many-headed monster; but here she appears as a monster without a head, and how she could live a whole year in this state, is not easy to divine.

No. CIII.

SATURDAY, JULY 1ST, 1820.

SUPPOSING it were granted that Peter was the first bishop of the church in Rome, the Pope would gain nothing by it, unless he were to become such a bishop as Christian bishops were in those days. Amidst the immense population of that great city, the Christians who composed the church were a poor and despised company, ever exposed to the violence of their heathen neighbours and superiors; and their bishop or pastor, whoever he was, would be looked upon in no higher light than the ringleader of the sect, and the principal object of hatred, by all the votaries of the idols of Rome. It is absurd to speak of a bishop, in these circumstances, having a see, and a chair, and a throne. These symbols of majesty the Pope pretends to have derived from the first bishop of Rome; and doubtless there is as much justice in the pretence, as there is in the impositions practised at Loretto, where a gaudy image, dressed up in silk, and gold, and precious stones, is given out as a true representation of Mary, the wife of Joseph of Nazareth. Let the Pope put himself upon a footing of equality with his pretended predecessor. Let him go about preaching remission of sins, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Let him renounce the vanities of this world, as Peter did; and let him forbear meddling with the civil affairs of worldly kingdoms, which Peter claimed no right to do. In short, let him become a minister of the gospel, and, if any church shall call him to it, a bishop, in the New Testament sense of the word; and though I will not even then concede to him that he is Peter's successor, I will do him the greater honour of calling him one to whom the apostle would not have been ashamed to say, "The elders who are among you I exhort, being also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock: and when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away," 1 Pet. v. 1—4.

When Papists think of the see of Peter, they form in their minds an image of a peaceable and prosperous state of society, such as we may see in our own day, in what are called Christian countries, where bishops reign as

kings, and where the people, if they be virtuously and peaceably disposed, may reign with them, in the enjoyment of all the happiness which the world can afford. When they think of the chair of Peter, they consider him as having occupied a seat of eminence, in a tranquil and unmolested seminary, like a professor of divinity, in one of our colleges. The chair, by degrees, is elevated to the dignity of a throne; and then Peter is considered as having been exactly what the Pope is now; or rather what he was five hundred years ago, when he reigned over the kingdoms, and even over the kings of the earth. But such notions are as absurd as the metamorphoses of Ovid; and they have no more to do with truth than the Arabian Nights' Entertainments.

When the church in Rome, in the days of primitive purity, on the martyrdom of one bishop, were looking about for another, the question would not be, Who is the most cunning politician? or, who has the greatest number of crowned heads on his side? but, who is most ready, and most willing, to have his head cut off, or to be thrown alive to be devoured by wild beasts, for his confession of the name of Jesus? Such was the state of the church in Rome, for the first three centuries, that her bishops could claim scarcely any pre-eminence but that of suffering; and they had not even in this respect a pre-eminence over other bishops; though, in virtue of their more conspicuous place in the church, they would be more exposed than their private brethren.

I have made these general remarks, in order to introduce Lord Clarendon's account of what is known, or rather of what is not known, of Peter, and of those who are reported to have been his nearest successors:—"If we look," says he, vol. i. page 12, "upon the fountain of all ecclesiastical story, from the time of the apostles even to that of Constantine, which was about 320 years, in which there were three and thirty Popes, we may reasonably say, that no rivulet conveyed any thing of moment from that pure fountain—of moment to us, more than what the Scripture itself tells us of the very history. There is not only no authority that obliges, but no reason that persuades us, to believe any thing positively in the transactions of the church or of churchmen; nor does it appear from whence we have the very lives of the apostles, and other holy men, which are derived to us; and which we have much more reason to suspect, because, as there was no collection of them in writing, till after Constantine's time, so what was afterwards put in writing hath been oftentimes altered, many things having been reformed and left out, according to the discretion and gravity of the age; and that body of the lives of the saints, which hath now most reputation amongst the Catholics, was compiled but in our own age, by the Jesuit Ribadineyra, who was chaplain to Philip II. in England, when he married Queen Mary, and of whose skill in collecting history we may make some judgment, by what he hath left us of England; which, relating only to the transactions of twenty years, is so full of mistakes and errors, with reference to persons, times, and actions, that no Englishman, who is best versed in the accounts of that time, can receive any information. But, as I said before, his collection of the saints hath most reputation in all Catholic countries, of any other, and is translated into all languages, though it contains not half the particulars, even of St Paul himself, as former and more ancient editions do; and yet it contains very much more than any learned and wise Catholic will seriously profess to believe.

"There is no consent in the very succession; very little pretence to jurisdiction over any other persons where themselves resided; and no mention of the manner of their election, and how they came to be chosen, till after three hundred years."—His Lordship then gives an account of the confusion and contradictions of authors about the succession of the Popes, which is anticipated by the extract from Dupin, in my last Number, and then proceeds:—"And if their tradition be so uncertain an evidence of such an historical verity, in so few years after Christianity was first preached or professed, how can we, or any reasonable man, give credit to those allegations of many things done, and words spoken, by our Saviour himself, and of his apostles, for which they allege no other proof but tradition, so concealed between themselves, that nobody ever heard mention of either, till nine hundred years after the death of Christ? But let tradition be as weak and as partial a witness as it must be still reckoned to be, we do deny that they have even such a witness for them; and, by the particular disquisition we shall make into every half age, and less, of the church, it will appear, that this their pretence is not in the least degree supported or favoured by tradition."

The Pope claims to be head of the church, and as such to have jurisdiction over all other bishops; but his own oracle, tradition, gives him nothing of this in the first ages. "Towards any thing that looks like jurisdiction (and how far it extended and was submitted to is not apparent), there is some dark mention of the bringing in of holy water, and of ordaining that no priest should say above one mass a day, by Pope Alexander the first; and of the ordering of three to be said on Christmas eve, by Pope Telesphorus; and of the appointing godfathers and godmothers in baptism, by Pope Hyginus, which the Anabaptists will hardly be persuaded to believe." Let it be observed, there is only a dark mention of these things by tradition, for we have no

evidence that the words *mass* and *holy water* belonged to the phraseology of the second century, about the beginning of which, Alexander the first is said to have begun his *reign*. "The difference about Easter, indeed," continues his Lordship, "made a great noise, and divided the churches, and was determined by Pope Pius the first; but revived and continued, with great passion and animosity, for forty years after, until Pope Victor, in a council at Rome (which they say was the next lawful council to that of the apostles at Jerusalem), with as much passion, declared his judgment in that particular; which is a shrewd evidence that the authority of Pope Pius was not considered with a full resignation. Some particulars of less moment, as the ordering that no vessels of wood should be used in the mass, but of glass, and shortly after, that cups of plate only should be used in that service, are mentioned to be established about or soon after that time.

"But in what manner those orders were issued and accepted, and what obedience was paid thereunto, is nowhere mentioned, and may be best guessed at by the respect that was given to Pope Pius, in the point of Easter. And certain it is, that no act of solemn jurisdiction, by the Pope, or church itself, will be found manifestly to have been done, till the emperor became Christian; nor can it easily be conceived, that any of those edicts could be digested or published with any formality, or that they were communicated with less secrecy than the Pope concealed his own person or the place of his abode; either of which was no sooner known than he was seized upon and carried to his execution," p. 15. It must be very evident that, in such circumstances, the church in Rome would have little to do with councils, or decrees, or jurisdiction over other churches; and her bishops must have had something else to do than to think of lording it over other bishops. They would think it honour and privilege enough to be allowed to meet in the most private manner, to observe divine ordinances, to edify one another, and to fortify one another's minds in the prospect of death, which was constantly before them, and which many of them were called to suffer, in its most hideous forms, for no crime but that of being Christians. My learned author gives a number of particulars that clearly prove, by their own traditions (if these can prove any thing), and by the writings of saints, in a later age, many of whom must have derived their materials from tradition, that no authority or jurisdiction, like that afterwards claimed by the Pope, was understood to be vested in the church or bishop of Rome. The supposition, indeed, is absurd; for the thing was impossible in the then circumstances of the church. In condescension, I suppose, to popish authors, and not wishing to dispute about a word, Lord Clarendon speaks of the bishops of the church in Rome, from the beginning, under the name of Popes; but this word owes its birth to a much later age. The bishops or elders of all the churches might, in the way of respect, have been called fathers, that is, Papas, or Popes. It was not, however, till the bishop of Rome had obtained the ascendency, that he was called, by way of distinction, *the* Pope; and those who afterwards wrote the histories and traditions of the church, in order to give the authority of antiquity to the name, and the usurpation which is expressed, gave the title to all the preceding bishops in that see. This has an imposing effect upon the mind of the reader. He reads of the Popes of Rome, in narratives which relate to the first and second centuries; and as he finds the bishops of no other church called by that name, he is insensibly led to think, that the church of Rome and her bishops must have had a superiority of some kind, from the very beginning; but the charm will be dissolved, when he reflects, that the bishops of Rome were not called Popes in primitive times, either by themselves or their contemporaries, but only by persons who wrote about them, after the church of Rome, and the Pope as her head, had appeared as the antichrist, and the oppressor of the true church.

Though the bishops of Rome were not in circumstances to exercise jurisdiction over other bishops and churches, till the emperor became Christian, and took them under his wing, it appears that, before that time, some of them had departed from the faith and purity of the first Christian bishops. We find that one of the holy fathers was not only guilty of idolatry, but also of denying the fact after it was detected. Marcellinus, who is placed about the end of the third century, "terrified by the persecution in the time of Dioclesian (when, in thirty days, there were 17,000 Christians put to death for their religion), preserved his life by sacrificing to the idol gods, and was for that scandal and impiety, they say, convened before a number of bishops, in Sinuessa, in the kingdom of Naples, who might more securely have met in Rome itself; he, for some days, passionately denied the charge, until he was convinced (convicted) by thirty witnesses, when he made great submission, professed great repentance, and declared that he deserved to be deposed, but the council refused to do it, for want of power; whereupon the dejected Pope assumed new and unnecessary courage, returned to Rome, defied and reviled the emperor to his face, till he caused his head to be cut off."—*Religion and Policy*, p. 17.

Dupin professes to disbelieve this story, and he represents it as merely an accusation of the Donatists (vol. ii. chap. vi.); but the Rhemish translators, in their note on Luke xxii. 31, ad-

mit the probability of it, as well as the fall of several other Popes, without derogating in the least from their infallibility; because, though the men fell, the *chair* stood firm: that is, the Popes erred personally, but the office did not.

The election of one Pope, on the death of another, which is now a matter of great political interest, and has been, for more than a thousand years, does not appear to have been fixed by any definite rule, during the first three centuries. In the times of persecution, when the man who was chosen bishop to-day, was, on that very account, in danger of being murdered to-morrow, there was little temptation to aspire to the office, from worldly motives. The election was probably made by the people with so little noise, that no public notice would be taken of it; and the individual, on whom the choice of his brethren fell, would consider himself called upon, by the voice of Providence, to accept the office, with all its labours and dangers, without ever thinking that he was thereby to become a sovereign prince, and the head of the whole church. There is not even a tradition with regard to the mode of election in those days; from which we may infer, that there was no controversy about the matter, but that, when the office became vacant, the people would exercise their Christian liberty, and invite the man whom they thought best qualified for the office, to preside over them as their bishop; and it is not unreasonable to suppose, that they had sometimes more than one at a time, to preserve order and dispense ordinances, seeing they were cut off so rapidly by the sword of persecution.

"To the end," says Lord Clarendon, "of Pope Marcellinus, who was put to death, in the year 307, there was no form prescribed for the election, nor any persons appointed, or who pretended power to elect; and, it is probable enough, that the Pope dying might recommend his successor; for, besides that, they say that St Peter nominated St Clement; they say likewise that Stephen the first was recommended by Pope Lucius, that went before, who was the three and twentieth Pope; and, it is very probable, that those pious persons, who were all martyrs (for of the first three and thirty Popes, the last of which was Melchiades, who suffered in the tenth and last persecution, under the emperor Maximianus, there were not above three or four who died natural deaths), I say, it is very probable that they had all so great a reverence and veneration from the people, that they were very willing to receive any man whom the Popes recommended to be their successors; and most of the admittances being within five, or six, or seven, or eight days, after the death of the last Pope, may persuade us that there was very little faction or formality in the election; there being then no room for any ambition (except it were for martyrdom), or any secure place to assemble in, for such business; so that we may reasonably presume, that they who, during that long time, supplied that high office, did it rather by a general admission and acceptation, than by any formal election," p. 20. One pastor about to die, *recommending* a successor, is perfectly consistent with Christian liberty; and may, in many instances, be a Christian duty. I am only sorry that the author should have dishonoured the holy men of whom he speaks, by calling them Popes.

Our next inquiry shall be, to discover what claim or exercise the Popes had to any jurisdiction, in other kingdoms and states, in or after the reign of Constantine, and whence they derived it: and what opposition and contradiction they met withal, from time to time, by which the ancient opinion of antiquity will best appear.

"It is agreed, I think, on all hands, that Silvester the first was bishop of Rome, when Constantine came to be emperor; though there is no mention what interval there was between the death of Melchiades and the election of Silvester, or in what manner he was chosen; and there seems to be some contradiction in the authors about the computation of that time; for Silvester is said to have reigned three and twenty years and ten months, and to have died in the year 334, whereas it was in the year 321 that Melchiades was put to death; between which several times, there are but thirteen years, or thereabouts. However, it appears that Silvester was then Pope, and some authors will have it, that Constantine was christened by him. Sure it is, that as that emperor performed many acts of piety, in building of churches in several places, for the exercise of the Christian religion, so he paid great respect to Pope Silvester, and gave him a rich crown, which they say he never wore himself, though he left it to his successors," p. 21. It will readily occur to every reader, that from that day the bishop of Rome would appear in a new character. To every carnal mind, the crown of gold would have more attractions than the crown of martyrdom. Unconverted men, mere heathens in principle, would now profess themselves Christians, as a step towards the favour of the emperor; and they would insinuate themselves into the priesthood, with the view of one day obtaining the rich crown. Crowns are not made for nothing: they are not worn for mere ornament. A man wearing a crown, without the sovereign power, of which it is a sign, would be an object of contempt to himself, and to all the world. Having obtained this shadow of sovereign power, the bishops of Rome could not rest till they obtained also the substance, which they did, in the course of a few ages. Every successive Pope kept this object steadily in his eye; and

the uniformity and harmony of their exertions, for hundreds of years, without so much as one instance of a Pope undoing what his predecessors had done, in the way of advancing the power of his see, shows clearly, that it was one spirit that animated the whole, namely, the wicked one, who worketh with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. I do not suppose that Silvester's immediate successor, to whom the crown was bequeathed, or his successors for a hundred years, contemplated the giddy height to which their remote successors were to rise; but it was the study of every one to add something to the power and influence which he had received from his predecessor, and thus to raise his see to sovereign authority over every other.

The authority of Silvester, notwithstanding the favour of the emperor, does not seem to have been very extensive. The council of Nice was held in his time, but he does not appear to have had a voice in it, much less authority over it. Constantine himself was present in this council, and he alone confirmed the decrees and acts thereof, and sent them so confirmed to Pope Silvester, who thereupon called a council at Rome, of 267 bishops, who confirmed all that had been done at Nice, which confirmation was no other than a submission and conformity thereunto; as the council at Granada, in Spain, which was then likewise assembled, and is called the first Eliberitan council, likewise did. And there needs no other evidence of the emperor's supreme authority in that council, than his letter to all churches, for the due observance of all that was done at Nice, and for the observation of Easter, and the burning of all books written by Arius, which he commanded to be done in a very imperial style: "Si quid autem scriptum ab Ario compositum reperiatur, ut igni id tradatur volumus; ut non modo improba ejus doctrina abrogetur, verum etiam ne monumentum quidem aliquod ejus relinquatur. Illud equidem prædictum volo; si quis libellum aliquem ab Ario conscriptum celare, nec continuo igni comburere deprehensus fuerit, supplicium ei mortis esse constitutum. *i. e.* But if any writing, composed by Arius, be got hold of, our will is, that it be committed to the flames; that not only his accursed doctrines be extirpated, but also, that not even the slightest vestige of him may be left. This, also, I desire to be proclaimed, that if any person is caught concealing any treatise written by Arius, or neglecting instantly to burn it, the punishment ordained for him is death."

No. CIV.

SATURDAY, JULY 8TH, 1820.

THE bishop of Rome, having got the emperor of Rome on his side, began to strut and swagger at a mighty rate. Then he would have all the world submit to him, in matters of religion, even as they submitted to the emperor in secular and civil matters. The world, however, or rather the churches in different parts of the world, were not yet so submissive. Some bishops, in the east, had held a council, without asking leave of the bishop of Rome. Julius, the Pope of the day, reprehended them for their presumption; and they, knowing that they owed him no subjection, treated the reprehension with great contempt, and, shortly after, met in a council at Antioch. *See Religion and Policy*, vol. i. p. 23. This was in the fourth century, from which the reader will see, that it was a long time after the death of Peter, ere his pretended successors even laid claim to the power which they afterwards possessed; and that, after the claim was made, it was for a time indignantly resisted.

The bishops of Rome continued, from age to age, adding to their power, and encroaching upon the liberties of the people. "We now come," says Lord Clarendon, "to the time of Gregory the First, (afterwards surnamed the Great,) who, being a monk of St Bennett's order, wrote a letter to the emperor Mauritius, beseeching him not to approve of his election, and fled to a mountain, to avoid being found, until he was discovered by a pigeon; and when he could not avoid the acceptation of his office, to show his great humility, he introduced a new style into his bulls; for he was the first who inserted that expression, *Servus servorum Dei*, (Servant of the servants of God,) though Monsieur Mazeray (who deserves to be looked upon as the most accurate and impartial historian this age hath produced) assures us, that the title of Pope, of Father of the church, of His Holiness, of Pontifex Maximus, of Servus servorum Dei, were common to all bishops before his time, of which we shall say more hereafter. But let him be as humble in his title as he please, it cannot be denied, that, from the time that he was Pope, he used all the means he could, fair and foul, to make himself greater than any of his predecessors. And so indeed he did; for, notwithstanding all his obligations to the emperor Mauritius, and the professions he had made to him, Phocas no sooner rebelled and killed Mauritius, and made himself emperor, than Pope Gregory acknowledged him, sent a legate de latere to him, gave him all the assistance and countenance he could to support his wicked action and title, and received again from him all those offices which might contribute to his own greatness: and he did indeed many great things, and raised the papacy to a higher pitch than ever it had been at: and this was about the year 600, for he died not till 605."—*Religion and Policy*, vol. i. p. 47.

As this was the most important era of the

papacy, and as the events, above referred to, prepared the way for the bishop of Rome's being declared universal bishop, it may be worth while to enter a little more into detail; and I shall merely remark, in passing, that if it were true that the Popes, as the successors of Peter, were to be really the head of the Catholic church, and universal bishops, it is somewhat strange, that 600 years should elapse ere the church was favoured with this head on earth, which is now declared, by all good Papists, to be so necessary to her existence.

Gregory the Great will be allowed to have been, in comparison with some, a good, and in comparison with others, a great man; but these very qualities gave him the power of exalting the dignity of his see above all its former greatness. "It has ever been," says Bower, in his life of this Pope, "even from the earliest times, a maxim with the Popes, never to part with any power or jurisdiction which their predecessors had acquired, by what means soever they had acquired it; nor to give up the least privilege, which any of their predecessors, right or wrong, ever had claimed. From that maxim no Pope has hitherto swerved, no, not Gregory himself, however conscientious, just, and scrupulously religious, in other respects."

It fell out, during the reign of this Pope, that the bishop of Constantinople began to assume the title of universal bishop, or patriarch; and it appears, that he had, at least, the authority of one council, and the consent of one emperor, for his so doing. Constantinople was now an imperial city, as well as Rome. It threatened to become even *the* imperial city; and who could then deny its bishop the title of *the œcumenical* or *universal bishop?* When Gregory heard of the new title of one whom he considered his inferior, he became dreadfully alarmed, as well he might; for it now depended upon the caprice of an emperor or empress, whether Rome or Constantinople should be the mother and mistress of all churches. Gregory, for a time, forgot all other cares. He saw the very Christian religion in imminent danger; not because the bishop of Constantinople had assumed a higher title than he possessed, but because the title itself, as he maintained, was impious and antichristian. He wrote letters to his nuncio at Constantinople, (for Popes, by this time, had their ambassadors at foreign courts), charging him, as he tendered the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, to use his utmost endeavours with the emperor and with the empress, and above all, with the bishop himself, his beloved brother, to divert him from ever more using the *proud*, the *profane*, the *antichristian* title of universal bishop. Such, let it be observed, was Pope Gregory the Great's opinion of the title which has been borne by his successors for twelve hundred years. His nuncio did all that he could to persuade the eastern patriarch to renounce his new title; but he could not prevail. It had been bestowed upon him, he said, by a great council, and not upon him alone, but also on his successors; that he had not power to resign it, nor would his successors stand to his resignation, if he should.

Gregory afterwards wrote a long letter to the patriarch himself, loading the title of universal bishop with all the opprobrious names he could think of; calling it vain, ambitious, execrable, antichristian, blasphemous, infernal, diabolical; and applying to him who assumed it what was said by the prophet Isaiah of Lucifer: "Whom do you imitate," says he, "in assuming that arrogant title? whom but him, who, swelled with pride, exalting himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him?" "The apostle Peter," continues Pope Gregory, "was the first member of the universal church. As for Paul, Andrew, and John, they were only the heads of particular congregations; but all were members of the church under one head, and none would ever be called UNIVERSAL." Here is a plain avowal, by a Pope, that no Pope, or even apostle possessed the authority of universal bishop, or head of the church. "Again," says Pope Gregory to his dear brother of Constantinople, "if none of the apostles would be called universal, what will you answer on the last day to Christ, the Head of the church universal? You, who, by arrogating that name, strive to subject all his members to yourself."—"But this is the time which Christ himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed, with the plague and the sword; all things that have been predicted are now accomplished; the king of pride, that is, antichrist, is at hand; and what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him; for they who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and meekness, are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition." *Greg.* l. 4. ep. 32. If any Pope had written in the same style a thousand years after, he would have been called a reformer, and a follower of Luther and Calvin.

Finding it impossible to make any impression upon the stubborn patriarch, or Pope of the east, Gregory wrote letters to both the emperor and the empress, begging and beseeching them to prevail upon the said patriarch to give up his diabolical title. After declaiming against the title, as quite antichristian, against the patriarch, as a disturber of the peace of the church, and the good order established by Christ, and against all who encouraged him in so impious and detestable an attempt, he addresses the empress thus: "Though Gregory (speaking of himself) is guilty of

many great sins, for which he well deserves thus to be punished, Peter is himself guilty of no sins, nor ought he to suffer for mine. I therefore, over and over again, beg, intreat, and conjure you by the Almighty, not to forsake the virtuous steps of your ancestors, but, treading in them, to court and secure to yourself the protection and favour of that apostle, who is not to be robbed of the honour that is due to his merit, for the sins of one who has no merit, and who so unworthily serves him." *Greg.* l. 4. ep. 34. Here Gregory lets out the secret cause of his opposition to the title assumed by the bishop of Constantinople. It was derogatory to the see of Peter, which he himself had the honour to fill. It was therefore antichristian, diabolical, and every thing else that is bad.

He was as unsuccessful with the emperor and the empress, as he had been with the patriarch himself; nay, the emperor rather favoured the new title, as befitting the bishop of what he now wished to be considered the imperial city. Gregory, almost in despair, wrote letters to some of the greatest bishops in the east, endeavouring to excite their zeal against the proud title assumed by their patriarch. The bishop of Alexandria wrote a letter to Gregory, in which he calls him also universal bishop, thinking it would end the controversy, if the two rivals were called by the same title, and put upon a footing of equality; but Gregory spurned at this with great indignation: "If," says he, in his reply, "you give more to me than is due to me, you rob yourself of what is due to you. I choose to be distinguished by my manners, and not by titles. Nothing can redound to my honour that redounds to the dishonour of my brethren. I place my honour in maintaining them in theirs. If you call me universal Pope, you thereby own yourself to be no Pope. Let no such titles, therefore, be mentioned, or ever heard among us. Your Holiness says in your letter that I commanded you. *I* command *you!* I know who you are, who I am. In rank you are my brother, by your manners my father. I therefore did not command; and beg you will henceforth ever forbear the word. I only pointed out to you what I thought it was right you should know." *Greg.* l. 7. ep. 36. *See Bower's Lives of the Popes:—Life of Gregory.*

Perhaps it would be uncandid to say, that all this was said in hypocrisy, while Gregory was really labouring to get the obnoxious title transferred to himself alone. There are circumstances, however, which excite a strong suspicion that it was even so. Seeing the emperor, Mauritius, did not enter into his views, but that he countenanced the bishop of Constantinople, Gregory seems so far to have withdrawn his allegiance from him, as to rejoice in the successful treason of Phocas, who murdered his master and his children, and was proclaimed emperor in his stead. Gregory was unable to contain his joy at this event. He wrote Phocas in the most fulsome style of congratulation. "We," says he, "have been hitherto most grievously afflicted; but the Almighty hath chosen you, and placed you on the imperial throne, to banish, by your merciful disposition, all our afflictions and sorrows. Let the heavens therefore rejoice, let the earth leap for joy, let the whole people return thanks for so happy a change. May the republic long enjoy these most happy times! May God, with his grace, direct your heart in every good thought, in every good deed! May the Holy Ghost, that dwells in your breast, ever guide and assist you, and that you may, after a long course of years, pass from an earthly and temporal to an everlasting and heavenly kingdom."

Phocas received the imperial throne by treason and murder; and when in possession of absolute power, he shewed himself as great a monster of cruelty and wickedness, as any of his predecessors have been; but Pope Gregory the Great lauds him, and praises him, and calls upon heaven and earth to praise him, for no other reason, so far as appears, than that he would deliver the see of Rome from the disgrace of having the patriarch of Constantinople preferred before the bishop of Rome, under the title of universal bishop. It was the manner of Popes to attach themselves to those successful monsters who could help them to the attainment of the object of their ambition; and they again lent all their influence to confirm such monsters in the power which they had usurped. If you will get me proclaimed emperor, I shall take care that you be proclaimed universal bishop, seems to have been the understanding between the traitor and murderer, Phocas, and the most holy father of the Church of Rome. The thing was done. Phocas became emperor; and though Gregory did not live to enjoy all the fruits of this revolution; though he did not receive, in his own person, the high title of universal bishop, Phocas lived to confer it upon one of the Popes within three years of the death of Gregory. Yes, Boniface III. prevailed upon the bloody monster, Phocas, to revoke the decree, settling the title of universal bishop on the patriarch of Constantinople; and he got a new decree, settling this title upon himself and his successors. Gregory the great had condemned this title, as vain, proud, profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, antichristian, heretical, diabolical; but no matter; when it came to be applied to the Pope of Rome, it was all good and lawful. It has been claimed and borne by the Popes to this very day; and therefore, they are justly chargeable with all the blasphemy and execrableness which their great Father, *saint* Gregory, laid to the account of it.

Now indeed the Pope appeared as a god on earth. He sat in the temple of God, showing

himself as God. He received his high dignity from a traitor and a murderer; and, it must be allowed, that the power which it conferred has been often exercised in a manner corresponding with its origin, and the character of him who conferred it. The title of universal bishop, as vested in the patriarch of Constantinople, seems to have been no more than a badge of honour; at least he did not pretend to universal jurisdiction in virtue of it. But no sooner was the title transferred to the Pope of Rome, and he thereby declared head of the church, than he began to show his power and authority in a very arbitrary manner. He immediately called a council at Rome, and had it decreed, that no election of a bishop should thenceforth be deemed lawful and good, unless made by the people and clergy, approved by the prince or lord of the city, and *confirmed by the Pope*, interposing his authority in the following terms: We will and command, *volumus et jubemus*. See *Bower's Life of Boniface*. This bound the bishops, in all countries, to the Pope of Rome, through them it bound all the inferior priests, and through them, all the people to the same supreme head, so that in fact the Pope became absolute monarch of what was called Christendom. It is true that some countries yielded more prompt obedience than others, and some never submitted at all; but these were comparatively few, at least in the western empire. Thus was the papal supremacy introduced and established, in the year 607, which is usually marked as one of those periods at which the prophetic number of 1260 years is understood to commence.

The Pope, however, was not yet high enough. He had got the full command of the spiritual sword, but the temporal one was also necessary, in order to give the necessary effect to the other. A temporal kingdom, and the power of calling out an armed force were necessary, in order to his maintaining the dignity to which he had attained. It is true, the Pope never made any great figure, as a military commander; but he found it necessary, in order to the maintenance of his dignity, to get the sovereign power over certain portions of rich territory in Italy; and he obtained this by the aid of another traitor, whose usurpation he encouraged. This was Pepin, who was a sort of prime minister to Childeric, king of France. The king was a silly, and the minister was a clever man; and the latter saw no good reason why he should not occupy the place of the former. He resolved, therefore, to take the opinion of the Pope, as upon a question of morality, or divinity, or casuistry, or politics, no matter which. The question which he proposed to his Holiness, was, "Who best deserved to be styled king; he who was possessed of the power, or he who was only possessed of the title?" The crafty Pope, says Bower, in his Life of Pope Zachary, well understood the true meaning of that question; and therefore solved it, we may be sure, in favour of Pepin; declaring that, "in his opinion, he ought rather to be styled king, who possessed the power, than he who possessed only the title."

Pepin had now what would be received as a divine authority, for supplanting his master, king Childeric; and this was immediately done. Most of the great men in the kingdom were Pepin's creatures and dependents, and therefore easily brought over to maintain his title to the kingdom. Now, as one good turn deserves another, the Pope naturally looked to Pepin, as one able and willing to advance his power and dignity. The Pope of the day did not live to reap the fruit of his good offices, on behalf of the usurper; but, as usual, his successor took advantage of his labours, and improved them for the aggrandizement of the holy see. Stephen II. successor of Zachary, had a quarrel with the king of the Lombards; and the holy father, being unable to cope with so powerful a prince, applied once and again to Pepin, now king of France, to help him. Pepin acknowledged his obligations to his holy father; and brought such a powerful force to bear upon the king of the Lombards, as soon made him submit, and promise to give up the territory, which he had violently taken from the emperor, not to the rightful owner, from whom he had taken it, but to the holy see of St Peter, so as to make the holy apostle appear to the world as no better than a resetter of theft.

The king of the Lombards, however, after Pepin had withdrawn his army, refused to perform his promise. He attacked the Pope a second time. He besieged Rome itself, and reduced the city to the greatest extremity; when the poor Pope was obliged to apply to Pepin again, to save his city and his life. He first addressed a letter to Pepin, as from himself, in the following style:—"To defend the church is, of all works, the most meritorious; and that to which is reserved the greatest reward in the world to come. God might himself have defended his church, or raised up others to defend the just rights of his apostle, St Peter. But it pleased him to choose you, my most excellent son, out of the whole human race, for that holy purpose. For it was in compliance with his divine inspiration and command, that I applied to you, that I came into your kingdom, that I exhorted you to espouse the cause of his beloved apostle, and your great protector, St Peter. You espoused his cause accordingly; and your zeal for his honour was quickly rewarded with a signal and miraculous victory. But St Peter, my most excellent son, has not yet reaped the least advantage from so glorious a victory, though owing entirely to him. The perfidious and wicked Aistulphus (the king of the Lombards)

has not yet yielded to him one foot of ground; nay, unmindful of his oath, and actuated by the devil, he has begun hostilities anew, and, bidding defiance both to you and St Peter, threatens us, and the whole Roman people, with death and destruction." The Pope, however, doubtful of the effect of his own eloquence upon the mind of the French monarch, is said to have procured a letter from the apostle Peter himself, which he sent to Pepin as a genuine epistle from his great predecessor, the prince of the apostles. The following is an extract, from which, I am afraid my readers will infer, that Peter did not improve in the art of letter-writing after he left this world:—"Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to the three most excellent kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman; (the two last were Pepin's sons) to all the holy bishops, abbots, presbyters, and monks; to all the dukes, counts, commanders of the French army; and to the whole people of France: Grace unto you and peace be multiplied."—"I am the apostle Peter, to whom it was said, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, &c. Feed my sheep, &c. And to thee will I give the keys, &c. As this was all said to me in particular, all who hearken to me, and obey my exhortations, may persuade themselves, and firmly believe that their sins are forgiven them."—"Hearken therefore to me, to me Peter, the apostle and servant of Jesus Christ; and since I have preferred you to all the nations of the earth, hasten, I beseech and conjure you, if you care to be cleansed from your sins, and to earn an eternal reward, hasten to the relief of my city, of my church, of the people committed to my care, ready to fall into the hands of the wicked Lombards, their merciless enemies. It has pleased the Almighty that my body should rest in this city; the body that has suffered, for the sake of Christ, such exquisite torments. And can you, my most Christian sons, stand by unconcerned and see it insulted by the most wicked of nations? No, let it never be said, and it will I hope, never be said, that I, the apostle of Jesus Christ, that my apostolic church, the foundation of the faith, that my flock recommended to you by me and my vicar, have trusted in you, but trusted in vain. Our lady, the virgin Mary, the mother of God, joins in earnestly intreating, nay, and commands you to hasten, to run, to fly to the relief of my favourite people, reduced almost to the last gasp; and calling in that extremity, night and day, upon her, and upon me. The thrones and dominions, the principalities and the powers, and the whole multitude of the heavenly host, intreat you, together with us, not to delay, but to come with all possible speed, and rescue my chosen flock from the jaws of the ravening wolves ready to devour them. My vicar might, in this extremity, have recurred, and not in vain, to other nations; but, with me, the French are, and ever have been the first, the best, the most deserving of all nations; and I would not suffer the reward, the exceeding great reward, that is reserved in this and the other world, for those who shall deliver my people, to be earned by any other."—*Bower's Life of Stephen II.*

It is difficult to say what effect the eloquence of the holy apostle might have had upon the mind of Pepin and his two sons, had it arrived in time; for as no swift angelic messenger was employed, Pepin had left France with an army, to help the Pope, before Peter's letter reached him. He effectually subdued the king of the Lombards. He took the provinces and cities, which Aistulphus had taken from the emperor, and most magnanimously gave them to the Pope, thus enriching the holy see with what was not his own.

Thus was the bishop of Rome raised to the rank and sovereignty of a great prince. This is usually considered the last step of his elevation. It took place in the year 756; and this, I believe, is the latest period to which the commencement of the prophetic number of 1260 years is referred. Supposing the book of Revelation to have been written in the year 90, which is the period usually assigned to it, the time which elapsed between that and the last stage of papal usurpation, is precisely 666 years, which reminds us of the number of the name of the beast, Rev. xiii. 18. I mention this merely in passing, as it is by no means my intention to enter, at present, upon the Apocalyptical signs of Antichrist. To those who wish to see this subject discussed, in a serious and sensible manner, I beg leave to recommend a pamphlet, just published, by the Rev. Mr Mason, of Wishatown, on Daniel's Prophetic Number of 2300 days.

No. CV.

SATURDAY, JULY 15TH, 1820.

THE preceding Number traced the progress of papal usurpation, from the time of Constantine the Great till the year 756, when the Pope became a temporal prince. The means by which he obtained his greatness, and the instruments that helped him to it, were such as the god of this world usually employs, for carrying on his work of deceit and violence, in order to effect the ruin of both the bodies and souls of men. This fact alone should convince every Christian, that popery is not of God, but of the devil; that it is not Christianity, but the opposite of it, and its irreconcilable enemy. As there is no evidence, either in Scripture or credible tradition, that the Pope of Rome was divinely appointed head of the

church, it might have been expected, that such modern papists, as possess a portion of common sense, would have been very tender of the subject, and cautious how they brought it forward for public discussion. But as it is the main pillar of their system, they must give it a prominent place in all their books of controversy, even at the risk of being considered destitute of common sense.

In Bishop Hay's "Sincere Christian Instructed from the Written Word," we have the following catechetical exercise. "Q. Who are the successors of St Peter as head of the church? A. The bishops of the city of Rome, of which St Peter was the first bishop, and suffered martyrdom in that city for the faith of Christ, leaving his successors there the heirs of all his power and authority." To this statement I have only one objection:—namely, it is not true. It is one of those palpable lies by which Satan deceives those who love darkness rather than the light; and I again defy the Church of Rome to produce a particle of evidence, that Peter transmitted his power and authority to any man whatever. "Q. Wherein," continues the catechist, "consists the power of the bishop of Rome, as head of the church? A. As he is appointed by Jesus Christ, to be the supreme head and pastor of the church under him, to be the spiritual father and teacher of all Christians, with full power to feed and govern the whole flock; therefore he is the supreme judge and lawgiver, in all things relating to religion, whether as to faith, manners, or discipline. The primacy, both of honour and jurisdiction, over all other bishops, belongs to him: and all the members of the church are obliged to pay the greatest respect, veneration, and obedience, to his decrees and orders, in all things belonging to religion. Q. How is the head of the church commonly called? A. He is called *the Pope*, which word signifies father, and is given to the head of the church: because, being the vicar of Jesus Christ, he is the common spiritual father of all Christians." One of the first things we should expect to find in a spiritual father is, that he be a spiritual man; but it is notorious to all the world, that the greater part of the Popes were merely carnal men, and more taken up with the cares of this world, than with things spiritual and eternal. And if we could suppose a Pope to be a spiritual man, in the Bible sense of the words, he would have more modesty and more humility, than to pretend to be the "common spiritual father of all Christians;" which title, as he would know, belongs to God alone.

I long ago maintained, that the head of the catholic or universal church must be infallible, otherwise there would be no security against defection; but bishop Hay seems not to be quite certain whether the Pope be infallible or not, though he seems rather inclined to believe that he is. He puts a question, and gives an answer thus:—"Q. When the head of the church emits any decree concerning faith or morals, to which he requires submission from all the faithful, is he himself infallible in what he there teaches? A. This is not proposed as an article of divine faith, nor has the church made any decision concerning it. Great numbers of the most learned divines are of opinion, that in such a case the head of the church is infallible in what he teaches; but there are others of a contrary opinion, who think that his decree is not to be considered as infallibly certain, till the body of the bishops receive it, either by their express approbation, or by their tacit submission to it, by which it becomes a decree of the whole church, whose infallibility is undoubted." Chap. xii.

By the admission of the reverend prelate at the beginning of the above answer, he furnishes materials for overthrowing his own doctrine. If the infallibility of the Pope be not a matter of divine faith, and if the great and learned divines of the church be not agreed about it, what has become of the boasted unity of the Church of Rome in all matters of faith? and how does it appear, that the Pope was appointed head of the church, for the very purpose of maintaining unity of doctrine, when the members of the body are not agreed about a most fundamental doctrine, namely, the seat of that infallibility which is held undoubtedly to be in the church? I shall suppose that the Pope gives out, or, to use the bishop's own language, "*emits* a decree concerning faith;" and that the subject of it is his own infallibility, which he commands to be believed by all the faithful; great numbers of the most learned divines would require no more than his own word for it; because they are of opinion, that the head of the church is infallible in what he teaches: but there are others of a contrary opinion. Then there is a schism in the church; and that too, in relation to a point of vital importance; for if the opinion of the first class of divines be the true one, then, whatever the Pope decrees, ought to be instantly and implicitly accepted and obeyed; and those who refuse are guilty of rebellion against the authority of the holy see, which, in a Papist's esteem, is the same thing as rebellion against God.

On the other hand, if the true and catholic doctrine be, that a decree of the Pope "is not to be considered as infallibly certain, till the body of bishops receive it, either by their express approbation, or by their tacit submission to it," then, those who receive such decrees on the authority of the Pope alone, and obey them, are guilty of contemning the whole "body of bishops," and setting at nought their authority, though it be admitted that they are the same as the whole church. This

must be a very grievous error; for it is maintained, that their sentence, being that of the whole church, is undoubtedly infallible. The infallibility of the Pope alone is not so undoubted, for there are some who deny it; therefore, those who believe in it, and act upon it, must be in a most dangerous condition; I might even call it damnable, if I were to adopt the language of the *holy* Council of Trent.

Again, if no decree of the Pope is to be considered infallible, or to be received with a divine faith, till the "body of bishops," meaning, I suppose, all the bishops in the world, receive it by their express approbation, or tacit submission, then it may be a hundred years, and more, after a decree is *emitted* by his Holiness, ere it can be lawfully received by his spiritual children; for they may not, during all that time, have received sufficient evidence, that the "body of bishops," in all parts of the world, have approved of such decree. It is some hundreds of years since the Pope pretended to be infallible, as he ought most certainly to be, if he be Christ's vicar, and head of the church; but it seems, at this very day, the "body of bishops" are not agreed about it; and what confidence then can the people in general have in it? The truth is, Papists are trusting in a broken reed that will do more than disappoint them in the day of trial. It will pierce and wound every hand that leans upon it.

Bishop Hay, as I have said, seems inclined to adopt the opinion of those, who think that "the Pope himself, when he speaks to all the faithful, as head of the church, is infallible in what he teaches;" and he says, that for this opinion there are "several very strong reasons, both from Scripture, tradition, and reason." He introduces his proof from Scripture as follows: "Because this privilege of the particular direction and assistance of God, in teaching true doctrine, was given to the high priest of the old law, and the synagogue being only a figure of the law of grace, and of the Church of Christ, the same privilege must certainly be given to the high priest of the church also, otherwise the figure would have been more perfect than the thing figured, the shadow more privileged than the substance." I do most readily grant, that the same, and greater privilege, is granted to the high priest of the church under the law of grace, as the bishop calls it, though I believe what he calls the old law, was as really a law of grace as the new. But the question will occur, Who is the high priest, of whom the high priest of the old law was a figure? The bishop will have it to be the Pope of Rome; and because the high priest of the Jews was infallible in what he announced as the mind of God (which, however, may reasonably be doubted), therefore the Pope of Rome is infallible in all his decrees. This is Popish Episcopal logic of the highest order; and if all men are not thereby persuaded to fall down and worship the Pope as the great high priest of the Christian profession, the guilt of disobedience must rest upon their own heads.

Now it appears evidently from the New Testament, that the high priest of our profession, of whom Aaron and his sons were a figure, is no other than the Lord Jesus Christ himself (Heb. iii. 1, 2.); and that he is infallible there can be no doubt among Christians; but to ascribe this office, and this infallibility, to the Pope of Rome, is such an instance of impiety and presumption, as we shall search for in vain, except in the writings of such men as Bishop Hay, who are determined, at all hazards, to support the usurpation of him who sitteth in the temple of God, and who exalteth himself above all that is called God, and that is worshipped.

The other scripture proofs relate to Peter, as the rock on which the church is built; and Christ's words to Peter, "I have prayed for *thee*," &c. which I have already considered. The proofs from tradition, are the mere ravings of ghostly fathers, whose authority is not the weight of a straw, in relation to a matter that ought to rest upon divine authority, if it is to command the faith of Christians. The proofs from reason are partly as follow, for I have not room for them all; but such as I give will afford as fair a specimen of Popish lying and impudence as any man could wish to see.

"The proofs from reason," says Bishop Hay, "are founded on facts, and on principles received by all members of the church as divine truths; for, (1.) There never was an instance of any Pope who proposed any doctrine to be believed by the church, that was contrary to the sacred truths of faith revealed by Christ; for, though there have been a *few*, and *only a few* Popes, that were bad men in their own practice, yet the most inveterate adversaries of the Catholic faith could never yet show that any Pope taught bad doctrine. (2.) Never yet did any Pope *emit* any decree concerning the truths of faith or sound morality, but was received by the great body of the bishops, as containing the most solid and wholesome doctrine. (3.) Many different heresies that have arisen in different ages in the church, have been proscribed and condemned by the authority of the head of the church alone, both before the first general council was held, and since. (4.) In all controversies of moment that have arisen in the church about points of faith, the bishops have always had recourse to the head of the church, as the supreme tribunal for settling them; and, if the obstinacy of the party condemned by him made it advisable to have recourse to general councils, these councils never were

found to do any thing else, after the most mature examination, but to confirm the sentence already passed by the head."—*Sincere Christian*, &c. chap. xii.

I question if there was ever so much downright falsehood contained in so small a space, as in the first of these four particulars which Bishop Hay gives as *facts*. It is false, that no Pope ever yet taught bad doctrine; for, not to speak of others, the creed of Pope Pius IV. as we shall see by and by, is error and nonsense throughout. It is false, that only a few Popes were men of bad lives, for very many of them were monsters of wickedness. This must have been very well known by Bishop Hay, unless, indeed, his moral perceptions and feelings, like those of other Papists, were so depraved, that the grossest wickedness practised by great ecclesiastics, did not make them, in his esteem, "bad men in their own practice." He must have known, that very many of the Popes were habitually guilty of such crimes as would have entitled them to the appellation of bad men among the virtuous part of the community. He cannot, therefore, be acquitted of the crime of writing a falsehood, knowing it to be such. I request the reader not to take this sweeping accusation against the holy fathers of Rome upon my bare word, for I admit, that standing alone, it is of no more authority than that of the Bishop. But let him read attentively the most respectable ecclesiastical histories, even those written by Papists, and he will find that the assertions of Bishop Hay are directly opposed to truth. That "the body of the bishops" received the decrees of the Pope, and that they appealed to him as head of the church, are matters of no importance, for after they had become dependent upon him, as they all were, when their election was declared invalid without his confirmation, they would readily lick up any thing that he was pleased to "emit."

But suppose I were to admit the fact, that the Popes never taught bad doctrine, and, that very few of them led wicked lives, this would not prove the Pope to be infallible; because the same thing may be affirmed of hundreds and thousands who never made so high a claim. Yes, in the churches of England and Scotland, and among dissenters of different names, there are many pastors who cannot justly be accused of teaching error, or leading wicked lives; but it would require a logician like Bishop Hay, to prove them all infallible.

In opposition to Bishop Hay's assertion, that "the most inveterate adversaries of the Catholic faith could never yet show that any Pope ever taught bad doctrine," it might be enough to assert, that every enemy of Popery, that ever lifted a tongue or a pen, has most abundantly shown this very thing. Every Pope has taught bad doctrine, and nothing else, ever since he began to teach that he was head of the church, and the vicar of Christ. Pope Pius IV. whom I have already mentioned, was at the pains to draw up, or order to be drawn up, a digest of the errors of the Church of Rome, which had accumulated by his time; he proposed them to be believed by all the faithful as infallible truths; and they are at this day received and held by all sound Papists, as of equal authority with the word of God. As I think this document ought to be generally known, in order to show what bad doctrine the Pope teaches, I shall give it here entire.

"I most firmly receive and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and the rest of the observances and constitutions of the church.

"I do also receive the holy Scriptures in the same sense that holy mother church does, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them; neither will I receive nor interpret them otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

"I do likewise profess, that there are seven sacraments of the new law, truly and properly so called, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; and that they are necessary to the salvation of mankind, though not all of them to every one, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, may not be repeated without sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the received and approved rites of the Catholic church, in the solemn administration of the above-said sacraments.

"I do embrace and receive all and every thing that hath been defined and declared by the holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.

"I do in like manner profess, that in mass is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is a change made of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of wine into the blood, which change the Catholic church calls transubstantiation.

"I believe also, that under one kind only, a whole and entire Christ, and a true sacrament, is taken.

"I do firmly maintain that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained, are relieved by the prayers of the faithful.

"I do likewise believe, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be worshipped and prayed unto, and that they do

offer up prayers for us, and that their relics are to be worshipped.

"I do most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, always a virgin, and of the other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration is to be given to them.

"I also affirm, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to Christian people.

"I do acknowledge the holy, catholic, apostolic, Roman church, to be the mother and mistress of all churches, and do promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome and successor of St Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

"I do also, without any doubt, receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared, by the sacred canons and general councils, and especially by the holy Council of Trent: and all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematised by the church, I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematise."

To make the matter as sure as possible, an oath is subjoined to the above creed, to be taken by all the clergy. Having made profession of their faith, they add, "This is the true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved, and which at this time I freely confess and truly embrace; and I will take care, by the help of God, that the same be retained and firmly professed, whole and inviolate, as long as I live, and as much as in me lies; that it be held, taught, and preached, by all those that are under my power, and by such as I shall have charge over in my profession, thus I, N. N. do promise, vow, and swear; so help me God, and these his holy gospels."

Such is the famous creed of Pope Pius IV. which is understood to express the whole faith of a Papist, in addition to the twelve articles in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed. It is made the basis of several catechisms, which are in my possession. The above is a translation of it, as given by Mr Bennett in his Memorial of the Reformation, 2d. edit. chap. i. I have given it at length, not for the purpose of making an exposure of its errors at present, as I have exposed most of them already; but for the purpose of exposing the impudence of such writers as Bishop Hay, who assert that no enemy of Popery could ever yet show that any Pope ever taught bad doctrine. It may safely be left in the hands of any child who can read the Bible with understanding; and I have no doubt that any such child would soon perceive its doctrine to be bad in the extreme.

On this creed, and the solemn oath with which it is swallowed, I only remark farther at present, that it binds every Romish priest to believe both parts of a contradiction, and to abstain from every attempt to understand the Word of God. He swears to believe all that has been delivered by general councils, especially the Council of Trent; and that he will never receive or interpret the Holy Scriptures otherwise than according to the *unanimous consent* of the fathers. Such unanimous consent never existed, and when a priest swears that he will never receive the Scriptures *otherwise*, it is the same as to swear that he will never receive them at all; and from the manner in which some of the priests speak and write of the Bible, we may charitably believe that they are true to their oath. Besides, it is well known that there are many contradictions in the decrees, canons, and definitions of general councils. How then can a man swear to receive and obey them all, without an absolute surrender of his reason and his conscience? I know that Papists think very lightly of surrendering their reason, for it is what they do openly and avowedly every day, when they worship a piece of bread as the God that made them. But they do not yet so explicitly surrender their conscience; though it is virtually done by their avowal of implicit belief that a thing is and is not at the same time; or, for instance, that the Pope is above a council, and that a council is above the Pope, are both true.

No. CVI.

SATURDAY, JULY 22D, 1820.

THE infallibility of the Pope does not imply foreknowledge, which is one reason why the holy father commits so many blunders, both in his teaching and administration. It is in the recollection of many of my readers, that, about twenty years ago, the Pope blessed Buonaparte as his dear son in the faith, and even consented to set the imperial crown on his head. The holy father seemed even to glory in this dear son, as if he had been another Elijah, who had restored the true religion, after it had been subverted by the Jezebel goddess of reason. But the father did not foresee the future perversity of this son; and that the dignity and power, to which he had contributed to raise him, would be employed against himself. Such, however, turned out to be the case. Buonaparte was as great an oppressor of the holy see, as the king of the Lombards had been. It does not, however, appear, that the present Pope had so much interest in heaven as his predecessor Stephen had; or, that the virgin Mary and St Peter interposed on his behalf, either by word or writing. Indeed, so far as appears, he might have been calling upon these for help till this

day, and with as much earnestness as the priests of Baal called upon their god, and he would have called in vain, had it not been for the persevering and successful exertions of a government and people, whom he curses and excommunicates every year on Holy Thursday.

The Pope could not bring any thunder from heaven, to bear upon his relentless oppressor, but he made the best use he could of that which he professed to have on the earth, as the reader will see from the following authentic document. I shall give it entire, for the sake of preserving it for the use of future historians, and writers on the Popish controversy. It is a great deal too long; and it will occupy the remainder of this, and half of the next Number. Like the writings of almost all Papists, from the head of their church downwards, it is remarkable for its profuse *wordiness*, which arises, I suppose, from the want of distinct conception; for when a writer has an idea distinctly in his own head, he will easily be able to convey it to others in few words. It would be impossible to do justice to this document, in the way of abridging it; and, therefore, I hope, the reader will bear with it, though it should try his patience, for the sake of the historical and other curious matter which it contains.

The Excommunication of the French Emperor and his adherents, by the Pope.

The following curious Paper is translated from the Latin original, which was sent over by Mr Hill, the British Minister, in Sardinia. A translation in French has been circulated by the British Government, for the information of the Catholic world.—We copy the present translation, which we believe to be correct, from the Literary Panorama for March.

Apostolic Letters, in Form of Brief,

"Whereby are declared excommunicated, and *de novo* are excommunicated, the authors, the active agents, and the partisans of the usurpation on the state of Rome, and on the other states appertaining to the holy see.

PIUS PP. VII.—*Ad perpetuam rei Memoriam:*

"WHEN, on the memorable 2d of February, 1808, the French troops, after having invaded the other and the richest provinces of the Pontifical state, with a sudden and hostile *impetus* entered Rome itself, it was impossible that we could bring our mind to attribute that outrage simply to political or to military reasons, reported among the people by the invaders; that is to say, to defend themselves in this city, and to exclude their enemies from the territories of the holy Roman church; neither did we see in it merely the desire of the chief of the French nation to take vengeance on our firmness and constancy, in refusing to acquiesce in his requests. We saw instantly, that this proceeding had a much more extensive view than a temporary occupation, a military precaution, or a simple demonstration of anger against ourselves. We saw revive, and again glow, and again burst out on all sides, those fraudulent and impious plots, which appeared to be, if not subdued, at least repressed; which originated among those men deceived and deceiving 'by philosophy and vain deceit, introducing damnable heresies,' and who had long planned, and formed parties to accomplish, the destruction of our holy religion. We saw that, in our humble personage, they insulted, they circumvented, they attacked the holy see of the most blessed prince of the apostles, in order that they might by any means overthrow it, from its very foundation; and with it the Catholic church, although established on the most solid rock, by its divine Founder, in this holy see.

"We had thought, we had also hoped, that the French government, taught by experience the evils in which that most powerful nation had involved itself by unreined impiety and schism, and convinced by the unanimous declarations of by far the greater part of its citizens, was truly and heartily persuaded, that its own security, as well as the public happiness, was deeply interested in the free and sincere restoration of the exercise of the Catholic religion, and in its defence against all assailants. Moved by this opinion, and excited by this hope, we, unworthy as we are, who upon earth represent the God of Peace, scarcely perceived any prospect of repairing the disasters of the Gallican church, when—the whole world is our witness! with what alacrity we listened to proposals of peace, and how much it cost us, and the church itself, to conduct those treaties to such a conclusion as it was possible to obtain: but, immortal God! in what did our hopes terminate! What has been the fruit of our so great indulgence and liberality! From the very promulgation of that agreement, we have been constrained to complain, with the prophet, 'Behold, in peace my bitterness becomes most bitter.' This bitterness we have not concealed from the church, nor from our brethren the cardinals of the holy Roman church, in our allocution to them in consistory, May 24, 1802. We then informed them, that, to the convention we had made, were added several articles *unknown to us, and disapproved by us the instant we knew them.* In reality, by these articles, not only was the free exercise of the Catholic religion withheld, in points of the greatest consequence and interest to the liberty which had been verbally assured, stipulated, and solemnly promised, as introductory to the convention, and as its basis; but also, in several of these articles, the doctrine of the gospel was closely attacked.

"Nearly the same was the result of the con-

vention concluded by us with the government of the Italian Republic. Those very articles were interpreted in a manner altogether arbitrary, with highly perverse and peculiar fraud, as well as injury; against which arbitrary and perverse interpretation we had guarded with the utmost solicitude.

"Both these conventions being violated in this manner, and disfigured in whatever had been stipulated in favour of the church,—the spiritual power also being subjected to the will of the *laic;* so far were the salutary effects that we had proposed to ourselves following these conventions, that other, and still greater evils and injuries to the church of Jesus Christ, we saw growing and spreading daily.

"We shall not here enumerate particularly those evils, because they are sufficiently known in the world, and deplored with tears by all good men: they are besides sufficiently declared in the two consistorial allocutions, which we made March 16, and July 11, 1808; which we caused to be made public as much as our state of restraint admitted. From those all may know, and all posterity will see, what at that time were our sentiments on so many and great injuries suffered from the government of France, in things appertaining to the church: they will know with what long-suffering and patience we were so long silent,—with what constancy we maintained the love of peace; and how firmly we retained the hope, that a remedy adequate to such great evils might be found, and that an end might be put to them; for which cause we have deferred from day to day the lifting up of our apostolic voice. They will see what were our labours and anxieties,—what our endeavours, deprecations, protestations, sighings (incessant have they been!) that the wounds of the church might be healed,—while we have intreated that new sufferings might not be inflicted upon her: but, in vain have been exhausted all the powers of humility, of moderation, of mildness, by which hitherto we have studied to shield the rights and interests of the church from him, who had associated himself with the devices of the impious to destroy it utterly; who with that spirit had affected friendship for her, that he might more readily betray her,—who had feigned to protect her that he might more securely oppress her.

"Much and often, even daily, have we been bid to hope, especially when our journey into France was wished for and solicited; but from that period our expostulations have been eluded by bold tergiversations and cavillings; and by answers given purposely to prolong the matter, or to mislead by fallacy. At length they could obtain no attention. As the time appointed for maturing the councils already taken against this holy see, and the Church of Christ, approached, we were assailed, we were harassed perpetually, and perpetually were demands, either exorbitant or captious, made; the nature of which showed clearly enough, and more than enough, that two objects, equally destructive and ruinous to this holy see and church, were kept in view; that is to say, either that by assenting to them we should be guilty of betraying our office, or that if we refused, occasion might from thence be taken of declaring against us an open war.

"As we could in no wise comply with those demands made upon us, they being contrary to conscience, from thence a pretext was formed to send, in a hostile manner, military forces into this holy city: they seized Fort Saint Angelo; they occupied stations in the streets, in the squares; the palace itself, in which we resided, the Quirinal palace, was threatened with all the horrors of war and siege, by a great body of infantry and cavalry: but we, being strengthened by God, through whom we can do all things, and sustained by a conscientious sense of our duty, were nothing alarmed, nor dejected in our mind by this sudden terror, and this display of the apparatus of war. With a peaceful, an equable mind, as we ought, we performed the sacred ceremonies, and the divine mysteries appropriated to that most holy day, with all becoming solemnity; and neither through fear, nor through forgetfulness, nor by negligence, were any of them omitted, which were appointed as our duty in such a situation of things.

"We recollected, with Saint Ambrose, (de Basilic. tradend. No. 17.) that the holy man Naboth, the possessor of his vineyard, when called by demand of the king to surrender his vineyard, in which the king, after having rooted up the vines, might plant a vile garden of herbs, he answered him, 'The Lord forbid that I should give the inheritance of my fathers to thee!' Much less could we suppose it was lawful for us to deliver up so ancient and sacred a heritage (*i. e.* the temporal sovereignty of this holy see, not without the evident appointment of Divine Providence, possessed by the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, for so long a series of ages,) or even by silence to seem to consent, that any should obtain this city, the metropolis of the Catholic world, where, after disturbing and destroying the most holy form of discipline, which was left by Jesus Christ to his holy church, and ordained by the sacred canons under the guidance of the Spirit of God, he should in its stead substitute a code, not only contrary to the holy canons, but in opposition and even repugnant to the precepts of the Gospels, according to his custom, and to the new order of things of the present day, which manifestly tends to confound by consociation all superstitions, and every sect with the Catholic church.

"Naboth defended his vineyard, even with his own blood, (St Amb. *ibid.*) Could we,

therefore, (whatever in the issue might befall us) decline from defending the rights and possessions of the holy Roman church, which, to promote as far as in us lay, we had bound ourselves by the most solemn of religious obligations? or, Could we refrain from vindicating the liberty of the apostolic see, which is so intimately combined with the liberty and utility of the universal church?

"How extremely fit, and even necessary these temporal principalities are to secure to the supreme head of the church the safe and free exercise of his spiritual functions, which, by the divine will, are committed to him over all the world, may be from the present occurrences (were other arguments wanting) already too clearly demonstrated. On this account, although we affected not this temporal sovereignty, either for grandeur, or for wealth, or for dominion,—an unwarrantable desire, equally distant from our natural disposition and our most holy character, which from our earliest years we have always regarded,—yet we have strongly felt that it was due to the indispensable duty of our office, from the very day of the 2d of February, 1808, to the utmost of our power amidst such constraints, to issue by our cardinal, secretary of state, a solemn protestation, by which to render public the cause of the tribulation under which we suffered, and to declare our resolution to maintain whole and entire the rights of the apostolic see.

"When, in the mean while, the invaders obtained no advantage by threats, they determined to act towards us on another system. By a certain slow, but most vexatious and even most cruel kind of persecution, they attacked, with intention to weaken, by little and little, our constancy, which they had not been able to shake by sudden terror. Therefore, while they held us in custody in our palace, there passed scarcely a single day from the said second day of February, which was not marked by some new injury to this holy see, or by some new vexation to our very soul. All the troops which had been employed by us to preserve civil order and discipline, were taken from us, and mixed with the French bands. Our very body guards, men the most select and most noble, were imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo; there they were detained many days, then they were dispersed, and their companies dissolved. At the gates, and in other places of this most celebrated city, *corps de garde* were posted. The post-office, and all printing-offices, especially that of our Apostolic Chamber, and that of the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, were subjected to military force and orders; by which we were deprived of the liberty of printing, or of directing others to print what we desired. The regulations for administering public justice were disturbed and hindered. Solicited by fraud, by deceit, by every kind of evil artifice, to swell the mass of what they called national guards, our subjects became rebels against their lawful prince. The most audacious and most abandoned of them accepting the tricoloured French and Italian cockade, and protected by that as by a shield, with impunity spread themselves every where,—now in bodies, now single; and, either by command or by permission, broke out into every enormity against the ministers of the church, against the government, against good men. Journals, or, as they call them, *Feuilles Periodiques*, in defiance of our complaints, were printed at Rome, and circulated among the populace and in foreign parts, filled with injuries, sarcasms, and calumnies, decrying either the pontifical power or dignity. Sundry of our declarations, which were of great moment, and signed with our own hand, or by that of our first minister, and by our order affixed in the customary places,—these by the hands of the vilest satellites (amid the greatest indignation and lamentation of all good men) were torn down, torn in pieces, and trod under foot. Ill-advised youth, and other citizens, were invited, elected, and inscribed in suspicious conventicles, although such were most strictly prohibited, under the penalty even of anathema, by laws, both civil and ecclesiastic, enacted by our predecessors, Clement VII. and Benedict XIV. Many of our administrators and official agents, as well of the city as of the provinces, men of the greatest integrity and fidelity, were insulted, were thrown into prison, were exiled to great distances. Searches after papers and writings of every kind, in the private repositories of the magistrates of the pontificate, not even excepting those of the first minister of our cabinet, were made with violence. Three of our first ministers, secretaries of state, whom we had been obliged to employ one after the other, were carried off from our own residence; and at last, the majority of the most holy cardinals of the sacred Roman church, our fellows and fellow-labourers, were torn from our side, and transported afar off by military force.

"These facts, and others not less contrary to every right, human and divine, wickedly attempted and hardily perpetrated, are so well known by the public, that there is no necessity to recount them numerically, or to expatiate on them at large. Neither have we omitted (that we might not so much as seem to connive at them, or in any manner to assent to them) to expostulate sharply and strongly according to the duty of our place.

"Despoiled in such a manner, as it were, of all the ornaments of dignity and supports of authority,—deprived of all the accessaries to the fulfilment of our office, and especially of those in which all the churches were interested,—suffering injuries of every description,—

vexed by all kinds of terrors and excruciations,—oppressed so extremely, that even the exercise of both our powers was daily further impeded,—after the singular and evident providence of God, the best and greatest which has supported our fortitude, we are beholden to the prudence of such of our ministers as remained, to the fidelity of our subjects, and to the piety of the faithful, that any semblance of those powers is yet remaining.

"But, if our temporal power were reduced to a vain and empty appearance, in this city and in the adjoining provinces, it was in the most flourishing province of Urbino, of March, and of Camerini, at the same time absolutely taken away. Wherefore, we did not fail to issue a solemn protest against this manifest and sacrilegious usurpation of so many states of the church; as also to admonish our beloved against the seductions of an unjust and illegitimate government; nor did we omit to address an instruction to our venerable brethren, the bishops of those provinces.

"That government, however, was not slow! How speedily did it prove by facts, and furnish decisive evidence, that in that instruction we had foretold what religion had to expect from it! The occupation, the plunder of the patrimony of Jesus Christ, the abolition of religious houses, the expulsion of the holy virgins from their cloisters, the profanation of churches, the allowance of unbridled licentiousness, the contempt of ecclesiastical discipline and of the holy canons; the promulgation of a code, and of other laws, contrary not only to those holy canons, but also to the precepts of the gospels and to the divine rights; the abasement and oppression of the clergy; the subjection of the sacred power of the bishops to the power of laymen; the force in many ways put upon their consciences; the violent displacing of them from their cathedrals, and sending them away, with other equally nefarious, equally sacrilegious atrocities against the liberty, the immunity, and the doctrine of the church in those our provinces, committed instantly, as before in all those other places which had fallen under the power of that government,—these, these, are the wonderful rewards!—these the illustrious monuments of that astonishing attachment to the Catholic religion, which, even at this day, is incessantly boasted of and promised!

"For us, who experience so many bitternesses on the part of those from whom we could least expect them, already filled with them, and afflicted by them on every side, we grieve not so much for the present as for the future state of our persecutors:—'for if the living Lord be angry with us a little [*while*, Eng. tr.] for our chastening and correction, yet shall he be at one again with his servants: but thou, who hast been the author of all mischiefs against the church [the Hebrews] how shalt thou escape the hand of God? God will not forgive any, neither will he respect the greatness of any: for he made both the small and great; and to the most powerful he has reserved the most powerful punishment'. * Moreover, we desire, that by whatever means, even by our own life, the eternal perdition of our persecutors might be prevented, and their salvation ensured!—for still we love them; and never have we ceased to love them! We desire never to depart from that spirit of charity, that spirit of meekness † which nature has imparted to us, which our will has exercised, and that we might in future, as we have hitherto, *spare the rod*, which has been given to us, together with the charge of the whole flock of the Lord, in the person of the most blessed Peter, from the prince of pastors, for the correction and the punishment of wanderers, and of obdurate sheep, and for making them an example and a salutary terror to others."

No. CVII.

SATURDAY, JULY 29TH, 1820.

Excommunication of Buonaparte, &c. continued from preceding Number.

"BUT this is not the moment for lenity. Every one who beholds cannot but see, unless he be wilfully blind, to what such atrocities tend, if they be not opposed in some manner, while it may be done. On the other hand, there is none who does not see, that there remains no hope, in any shape, that their authors, either by admonitions, or by councils, or by entreaties, or by expostulations, may be rendered friendly to the church. To those means they have left no access: they neither hear them, nor answer them, but by accumulating injuries upon injuries;—nor can it be pretended that they submit to the church as sons to a mother, or as disciples to their mistress,—by those who devise nothing, who do nothing, who attempt nothing, but with intention to subject her as a servant to her master, and by subjecting her to overturn her very foundations.

"What then remains for us to do, unless we would incur the reproach of negligence or slothfulness, or perhaps even that of having wickedly deserted the cause of God!—except to lay aside all reference to terrestrial things, to renounce all fleshly prudence, and to follow the precept of the gospel, 'If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen man, and a publican.' ‡ Let them once again understand that, 'by the law of Christ, their sovereignty is subjected to our throne:

---

* 2 Macc. vii. 33, 34. † 1 Cor. iv. 21. ‡ Mat. xviii.

for we also exercise a sovereignty; we add also, a more noble sovereignty, unless it were just that the spirit should yield to the flesh, and celestial things to terrestrial.' * Many great Pontiffs, illustrious by their doctrine and holiness, by one or other of those crimes which are subjected to anathema by the sacred canons, have been reduced to equal extremities in behalf of the church, against kings and contumacious princes. Shall we fear to follow their example even in this, after so many crimes, so nefarious, so atrocious, so sacrilegious, so universally known, so openly manifest to all? Should not our fear be greater, rather to have justly deserved the accusation of having so done too late, rather than too early; especially, when by this last crime, the most wicked of all that have hitherto been perpetrated against our temporal sovereignty, we are warned, that from henceforth we shall not be more free to discharge those so weighty and necessary duties of our Apostolic Ministry?

"Wherefore, by the authority of Almighty God, and of the most holy apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, we declare all those who after the invasion of this holy city, and the ecclesiastical dominions, and the sacrilegious violation of the patrimony of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, by the Gallic troops (outrages complained of by us in the aforesaid two consistorial allocutions, and in many protests and reclamations published by our order in the said city, and states of the church), against the immunity of the church, against the church itself, and the rights of this holy see, and its temporal authority, perpetrated either by themselves or by others, together with all their abettors, advisers, adherents, or others in any manner concerned in the furthering of the aforesaid violences, we decree that they have incurred the GREATER EXCOMMUNICATION, with the other censures and penalties inflicted by the sacred canons, by the apostolic constitutions, and by the general councils; especially by that of the Council of Trent, (Sess. xxii. cap. xi. de Reform.); and if need be, we do anew excommunicate and anathematize them; we declare that they have incurred, as penalties, the loss of all and every kind of privilege, grace and indulgence, in whatsoever manner granted to them, whether by us, or by the Roman Pontiffs our predecessors; neither from this censure can they be liberated or absolved by any, unless by us, or by the Roman Pontiff for the time being, unless in the article of death; and then falling again under the same censures in case of recovery: and further they are incompetent and incapable to obtain the benefit attending on absolution, until they have publicly retracted, revoked, annulled, and abolished, to the utmost possible, all and every kind of outrage; and have effectually reinstated all things, or otherwise have made condign satisfaction to the church, and to us, and to this holy see, in the premises aforesaid.

"Wherefore we decree and declare by these presents, that all those, and likewise all others, deserving of the most special mention, together with their successors in office, shall never, under any pretence, be in any degree relieved from the retraction, revocation, annulling, and abolition of all the outrages above-mentioned; but shall be bound to make adequate, real, and effectual satisfaction to the church, to us, and to the said holy see, according to these presents; yea, they are always bound under these obligations, and shall so continue, in order to the validity of whatever benefits they may obtain from absolution.

"But, while we are constrained to draw from its scabbard the sword of church severity, we do not in the least forget, that, unworthy though we be, we hold the place of him who, when he exercises his justice, does not forget mercy. Therefore, we direct and command, first our own subjects, and also all Christian people, in virtue of holy obedience, that none of them on occasion of these letters, or by any pretext derived from them, should presume to hurt, injure, prejudice, or damage in any manner whatever, the said parties, their property, rights, or prerogatives. Even while inflicting those punishments which God has put in our power, for so many and so great injuries to God, and to his holy church, we propose to ourselves, above all, 'that those who now trouble us should be converted, and be troubled with us (St Aug. Ps. liv. 1.), if haply it might prove that 'God should give them repentance to the acknowledgement of the truth.' †

"For these causes, lifting up our hands to heaven in the humility of our heart, we do again remit and commend to God, whose, rather than ours, is that most just cause which we support; and again by his grace assisting us, we profess our readiness to drink to the very dregs, on the behalf of his church, that cup which he himself first of all condescended to drink for her. We beseech and entreat him by the bowels of his mercy, that he would not despise nor reject the prayers and deprecations addressed to him by us, day and night, for their recovery. Certainly, no day so bright or equally joyful, could shine for us, as that on which it were granted us by the Divine mercy to see our sons, now the cause of so much tribulation and grief to us, again taking refuge in our paternal bosom, and speedily returning to the sheepfold.

"We decree that the present letters, and every thing in them contained, or deducible from them, may not at any time (even under

* St Greg. Naz. Orat. xviii. ad Maur.

† 2 Tim. ii. 25.

the parties before-mentioned, or any others interested in the premises, in whatever manner, or of whatever state, degree, order, pre-eminence, or dignity they may be, or otherwise; or who ought to be mentioned individually, or specially, by any other expression or term of dignity, by pleading that they have not consented, or that having been called, cited, and heard, that they have not been sufficiently convinced of the verity and justice of the occasion of these presents, or for any other cause, colour, or pretext whatever) we say, may not at any time be impeached of subreption or obreption, or nullity, or want of intention on our part, or want of consent of the parties interested, nor of any other defect whatever: neither shall they be held, impugned, infringed, refracted, questioned, or reduced to terms of right; neither shall any remedy lie against them by special pleading, or by restitution to the import of the whole, or by other evasion of right, of fact, or of grace; neither shall this remedy, having been solicited, granted, and issued of our knowledge and plenitude of power, be questioned in judgment, or out of judgment; but the present letters shall always continue firm, valid, and efficacious, and shall maintain and obtain their full and entire effect; and by those whom they concern, and for so long as they concern them, they shall be held inviolable and unshaken: so, and not otherwise, shall they be taken by all judges, ordinary, or delegate; also by the auditors of causes of the apostolic palace, and by the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, also by the legates *a latere*, and by the Nuncios of the said see, and by all others enjoying or to enjoy whatsoever pre-eminence, or power; depriving them and each of them, whoever he be, of the power, faculty, and authority of otherwise judging of them, and interpreting them: declaring null and void whatever may be attempted against them by any one, whether by authority, and of knowledge, or by ignorance.

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, and so far as need be, our rule, and that of the apostolic chancery, *de jure quæsito non tollendo*, and the other apostolic constitutions and appointments, and whatever other statutes and customs established by oath, or by apostolic confirmation, or by any other corroboration and establishment,—notwithstanding all usages and styles from time immemorial, all previous privileges, indulgences, and apostolic letters;—notwithstanding all other, or whatsoever persons, and with whatever dignity resplendent, whether ecclesiastical or worldly, and however qualified, and requiring specially to be expressed, under whatever tenor and form of words,—notwithstanding, also, whatever clause derogatory of derogatories, or other efficacious of most efficacious, or insolite, or irritating, and all other decrees, purporting to be of motion, of knowledge, and of full power, whether consistorial, or otherwise, in whatever manner, contrary to these premises granted, yielded, made, and often repeated, and however often they may have been seen, approved, confirmed, and renewed,—from all and singular of them in the present instance, we derogate;—from their whole tenor general and special, specific, express, and individual, word by word, and not only by general clauses, under whatever form expressed,—according to the tenor of these presents, as if they were here inserted and explained word for word, formally, and nothing of them omitted; taking them as if they were wholly and sufficiently expressed and inserted in these presents; which, notwithstanding, shall still continue in their full strength and primary effect for this special purpose; and we do expressly derogate from whatever is contrary to them; and our will is that such be derogated from.

"And whereas these present letters cannot be safely published, especially in those places where there is the greatest need, as is a notorious fact, our will is that they, or copies of them, be affixed and published at the doors of the church of the Lateran, of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, also of the Apostolic Chancery, of the General Court of the *Monte Citorio*, and in the Square of the *Campo di Fiore* in this city; and that, being so affixed and published, they should be binding on all and singular who are concerned in them, as if they had been served on each of them nominally and personally.

"And further our will is, that to the same letters, or otherwise printed copies of them, subscribed by the hand of some notary public, and furnished with the seal of some person of ecclesiastical dignity, faith be given, in every place, and among every people, as well in judgment as out of judgment, wherever they may be exhibited, as if these presents themselves were here exhibited and shown.

"Given at Rome, at the Church of Santa Maria the Major, under the Fisherman's Ring, the 10th day of July, 1809, in the Tenth Year of our Pontificate.

PIUS, PP. VII."

"This curious paper, which will be memorable in the annals of ecclesiastical history, needs no comment. We may, however, readily suppose, from the well-known disposition of the French Emperor, that this bold act of his Holiness would be warmly resented. We are informed, by the public papers, that the Pope had been escorted, under a strict guard, to Savona, where he had been kept in close confinement several days. He was then removed to Grenoble, with a design, as it was supposed, of be-

ing taken farther into France; but the people flocked with such eagerness from all parts to pay homage to the unfortunate Pontiff, increasing in numbers in proportion to his progress, that the French general deemed it prudent to return with him to Savona, till further orders were received from Paris. No person is permitted to see him, but those to whose care he is entrusted.

"It is also added, That before he left Rome, aware of the dreadful measures to which the French ruler might have recourse, in order to extort from him what measures his policy might require, he had, in conjunction with the body of cardinals, chosen his coadjutor and successor to the Pontificate, who is said to be the Archbishop of Palermo." *Religious Monitor for Aug.* 1810.

I have inserted this document rather for preservation, than with a view to the exposure of its impieties. Yet there are some things in it that show the cloven foot as distinctly as if it had been the work of the Alexanders and the Innocents, of a period before the Reformation. With some remarks on these I shall occupy the remaining pages of this Number.

The holy father is pleased to proclaim, in one short sentence, both his littleness and his greatness—"We, *unworthy as we are*, who upon earth *represent the God of peace*,"—(see No. CVI. page 445.) It is difficult to imagine greater impiety and presumption, than for one who is *unworthy*, to give himself out as God's *representative!* God never had a representative in the world but one, and he was infinitely worthy. God was represented, or to speak more properly, manifested in the person of Jesus Christ, who in his life and doctrine gave a true representation of the divine character. And Christ, as Mediator, has received from the Father sovereign authority over all persons and things in earth, and also in heaven. In the exercise of this authority, he may be called the representative of the Father. He received the kingdom from him, and will deliver it up to him again, (1 Cor. xv. 24.) But for a sinful creature to usurp the authority, and assume the title of representative of God on earth, is such shocking impiety, that we can scarcely suppose the idea to have originated with man, depraved as he is. It must have proceeded from the angel of the bottomless pit.

Nothing can more plainly point out the Man of sin, spoken of by the apostle Paul, (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.) than this assumption of the style of representative of God. It implies, not merely a claim to be regarded as *a* God; but to be regarded, obeyed, and worshipped as the *substitute* of the only living and true God. Thus the inspired apostle expounds it. He "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;" and the application of this to the Pope of Rome is proved by the fact, that he is, on certain occasions, especially on his being raised to the Pontificate, the object of humble and prostrate adoration by the cardinals, inferior clergy, and all whom he is pleased to admit to the "august ceremony of the adoration."

I am not speaking of the Popes who reigned five hundred years ago, and who gave laws to the world during the dark ages. I am speaking of the Sovereign Pontiff, who reigns in Rome at this very day. He claims to be the representative of God on the earth; and as such he virtually gives himself out, as the God whom all men on earth ought to worship. The true God hath declared that he will not give his glory to another. There is nothing of which he is so jealous as of the worship that is due to him. Let our modern Papists think of this; and let them consider how they will be able to answer at the last day, when the great idol who deceived the nations of the world, and all who were deceived by him, and who fell down to worship him, shall be called to give an account of their idolatries, and other abominations.

Intimately connected with this, is the claim which his Holiness asserts over all temporal and earthly thrones. He refers immediately to that of France, but, as his language is general, and in the plural, it is evidently meant to apply to all the kingdoms in the world. "Let them once again understand," says he, "that by the law of Christ, their sovereignty *is subjected to our throne;* for we also exercise a sovereignty; we add also, a more noble sovereignty, unless it were just that the spirit should yield to the flesh, and celestial things to terrestrial." We know one, and only one, who can say with truth, "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, yea all the judges of the earth." (Prov. viii. 15, 16.) We know no other "throne" or power to which the princes of this world are subject: but there is a silly priest in Rome, called the Pope, who modestly gives himself out as occupying the throne of the King eternal, immortal, and invisible; and who therefore claims to have authority over the princes of this world. I again request my readers to remember, that this is not the language of a monk of the dark ages. It is the language of the man, who, at this moment, presides over what is called the Catholic Church,—of the man, to whom every Popish priest in Britain and Ireland, has sworn implicit obedience and subjection. He does not at present mention the British throne by name, as subject to his throne; but it is implied in his general reference to all temporal thrones. He did formerly declare the British throne to be subject to his. He has never yet withdrawn the claim; and the army of priests who

have sworn allegiance to him, are watching their opportunity of again asserting the sovereignty of their spiritual head, who was never yet known to relinquish a claim of power and authority which he or his predecessors had made.

Let us reflect then for a moment, what would be the consequence, if we had one or two hundred Papists in our houses of Parliament, and, perhaps, a dozen of them in the Privy Council. Every one of them would be the humble servant of his priest and confessor, and every priest is the sworn vassal of Pope Pius the VII., who publicly declares, that he has a throne that is above all earthly thrones, and therefore, above that of Great Britain; whose predecessors excommunicated and deposed our sovereigns at their pleasure, and gave the kingdom to others; the right and authority of doing which, has never, by the Popes, been relinquished; but by the present Pope, re-asserted in the deed which I have under consideration. Then surely, every Papist who should have power, would feel it to be his bounden duty to re-establish the glory of his church, and of the head of his church, in this kingdom, which he must, and really does consider, as having been unjustly and most wickedly separated from the dominion of the holy see of St Peter.

It will be replied, that our English Papists declare upon oath, that the Pope of Rome hath no civil power or authority in Great Britain or Ireland; but this declaration is of no value, seeing the Pope himself has not made it. Innocent III. excommunicated and deposed King John, and laid England under an interdict. Both Clement VII. and Paul III. excommunicated Henry VIII. Pius V. excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and commanded her subjects to rebel against her; and there is scarcely a kingdom in Europe whose sovereign did not at one time or other suffer the same indignity. Now the Pope has never yet said, that the throne of Britain is not subject to his throne. He has never condemned the deeds of his predecessors, who excommunicated and deposed our sovereigns. He is just as ready to urge his claim of sovereignty over Britain as over France, when he shall see a favourable opportunity: and let his subjects swear what they will, there is a prior and more sacred oath, which at least every priest has sworn, which binds him above all earthly things, to obey, and promote the interest of the holy see. The binding obligation of this oath cannot be set aside by an oath of allegiance to any secular prince, or by any declaratory oath with regard to the authority which the Pope has or ought to have in this kingdom. It binds him to support every measure that shall promote the honour of the Pope, and the interest of Popery, if it should even be the setting up of a Popish Pretender to the crown. I do not say that this is likely to happen in our day; but let Papists get into power, and it will not be their fault if it do not happen: nay, they are under the most solemn obligations to bring it about if they can; and from a speech by Dr Dromgoole, one of their Irish demagogues, we learn that they are not without the hope of seeing it at no very distant period. See PROT. p. 135.

No. CVIII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 5TH, 1820.

IT was not because Buonaparte was a usurper, and a wholesale and retail murderer, that the Pope denounced against him the dreadful sentence of Excommunication which occupies the greater part of my last two Numbers. He might have gone on plundering and massacring the nations of Europe one after another, and yet have enjoyed full communion with the holy see, in all the spiritual privileges which belong to it. It was his invasion of the holy see itself, and of the city of Rome, that was the heinous offence that brought upon his head the thunder of the Vatican. "Therefore," says the Pope, "by the authority of Almighty God, and of the most holy apostles Peter and Paul, and by *our own*, we declare all those who, after the invasion of this *holy city*, and the ecclesiastical dominions, and the sacrilegious violation of the patrimony of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles," &c. &c., "We decree, that they have incurred the GREATER EXCOMMUNICATION, &c."

I need not inquire what Peter or Paul had to do with such paltry patrimony as a few thousand acres of Italian ground, after they had obtained the crown of life, and an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away: but it is worth while to point out the gross impiety of his *Holiness*, in interposing the authority of the Almighty in the manner he has done. He seems to have the same notions of the true God as the Syrians had; "He is the god of the hills, but not the god of the valleys." He is the god of Italy and of the ecclesiastical dominions, but not the god of Holland, or of Prussia; else why not be called upon to interpose on behalf of these kingdoms, when they were invaded and plundered by the French troops? The Almighty is the God of the whole earth; and Buonaparte's depredations upon the Netherlands must have been as offensive to Him, as the invasion of the Ecclesiastical dominions; but the *unworthy* representative of God on the earth, as the Pope modestly styles himself, took no interest in the misery of other countries; he did not think of applying his spiritual power for the correction of the invader, until

his ambition began to affect himself, and his dominions. Then, indeed, it was a different matter. He could "*spare the rod*" no longer. The rod, he says, was given to him "with the charge of the whole flock of the Lord, in the person of the most blessed Peter, from the prince of pastors, for the correction and the punishment of wanderers, and of obdurate sheep." But it appears that Buonaparte was not looked upon by his Holiness as a wanderer from the right path, or an obdurate sheep, notwithstanding his manifold crimes, till he invaded the dominions of the holy see. From that day, he was unworthy of the communion of the faithful; and he fell of course to be excommunicated.

As it is time to be drawing the subject of the Pope and his supremacy to a close, I shall endeavour to comprise what I have farther to say within the present Number. It would be easy to show from the mode of electing men to be Popes, and from the conduct of the greater part of them after they were elected, that there is nothing heavenly or divine in the system; but that the whole is tainted by the most disgusting of this world's politics. I refer to the Life of Pope Sixtus V., written in Italian by Gregorio Leti, and translated into English by Ellis Farneworth, as affording a full view of the mode of electing to the holy chair; and such a scene of caballing and deceit will not readily be witnessed in those who conduct the affairs of the worst secular government in the world. The moral character of Sixtus was superior to that of most of his predecessors; yet he acquired the Pontificate by means of a system of cunning and falsehood, practised for many years. By his talents and address he raised himself from being a swineherd, to the dignity of a cardinal; and then, by seeming to renounce all the cares of this world, by affecting the feebleness of an old man, with one foot in the grave, and the other lifted up to follow, he succeeded in procuring himself to be elected to the Pontificate. He had long foreseen, that when the chair should become vacant, it would be difficult to fill it, as the cardinals were divided into different parties almost equally balanced. He saw that none of the parties were sufficiently confident of their own strength, and that they would probably unite in the choice of some crazy old man, merely to keep the chair occupied for a few months, each party expecting to gather more strength before the old man should die. Such a crazy subject appeared the Cardinal Montalto, for that was the name he bore in the conclave.

"During the ten days that the funeral ceremonies of the deceased Pope lasted," says the biographer of Sixtus V., "they that had any pretensions to the papacy were carrying on their schemes and intrigues, running about to solicit the suffrages and interest of their friends; whilst Montalto did not seem to give himself the least trouble or concern. He took so uncommon a road to it, that nobody suspected he had any design at all of the kind. Some of the cardinals out of contempt called him the Ass of La Marca, (which he pretended not to hear, or take notice of,) looking upon his faculties and intellects as entirely gone; and others seeing him bent down with disease and old age, did not in the least dream of his ever being elected. But we must take notice, by the by, that he was the youngest of all those who aspired to the pontificate; and though he often used to say, that an old fellow of seventy was fit for nothing in this world; it is certain, that at that time, he was only in his sixty-fourth year. Indeed, hardly any one could have imagined, that the cardinals would turn their eyes upon a person that could scarcely stand upon his legs, whom they thought little better than a dotard and a driveller; as the government of the holy see requires a man of sound and strong faculties, both of body and mind. Yet it was to these very failings that Montalto owed his exaltation," p. 172. When he was incidentally mentioned as having as good a chance as any other, he replied, "The cardinals would be very wrong-headed, indeed, to think of such a poor object as him, who had it not in his power to do any one thing but wish well to his patrons and friends." When the thing was more seriously proposed to him, he fell into such a violent fit of coughing, that his friends thought he would have died upon the spot, and he said, as soon as he could speak, "that his reign would be but of a few days; that, besides the continual difficulty with which he drew his breath, he had not strength enough to support such a weight; and that his small experience in affairs, made him altogether unfit for a charge of so important a nature, except he could depend upon the assistance of others." They answered, that God would give him strength sufficient to govern his church; to which he replied, "that he never would accept of it upon any terms whatsoever, except they would all three promise not to abandon him, but take the greatest part of the weight off his shoulders, as he was neither able, nor could in conscience pretend, to take the whole of it upon himself." The other cardinals (three in number), assuring him that they would, he said, "If you are resolved to make me Pope, it will only be placing yourselves upon the throne; we must share the pontificate; for my part I shall be content with the bare title; let them call me Pope, and you are heartily welcome to the power and authority." Afterwards he told his brother cardinals, "Let me conjure you not to think of choosing me, except you will be content to bear the whole burden of the government yourselves." This was just what

these cardinals wanted, and they determined to support him in the election.

The election of a Pope is performed in one of three ways; by *scrutiny*, which resembles what we call ballot; by *access*, which is thus explained:—When one of the cardinals proposes a name, those who are for the same person rise from their seats, and go to the place where the proposer sits. The third way is by *adoration*, and is thus performed: "That cardinal who is the candidate's chief friend, goes up to him, and making a low reverence, cries out, a Pope, a Pope! when it happens that two-thirds of them do the same, he is then acknowledged as such; but if there wants only one of that number, the election is void." Thus after a Pope elect has been adored, it is sometimes necessary to make a scrutiny, to ascertain whether he has had the requisite number of adorers. "Whilst they were crowding towards Montalto to congratulate him, he sat coughing and weeping, as if some great misfortune had befallen him. But when the Cardinal Dean ordered them to retire to their respective places, that they might proceed to a regular scrutiny, he drew near to St Sixtus, and whispered in his ear, "Pray take care that the scrutiny is of no prejudice to the adoration;" which was the first discovery he made of his ambition. It was observed, that after the scrutiny was begun, Montalto walked backwards and forwards, and seemed to be in great agitation of spirit; but when he perceived there was a sufficient number of votes to secure his election, he threw the staff with which he used to support himself, into the middle of the chapel, stretched himself up, and appeared taller, by almost a foot, than he had done for several years, hawking and spitting with as much strength as a man of thirty years old. The cardinals, astonished at so sudden an alteration, looked at him with amazement, and Farnese, observing by some signs that St Sixtus and Alexandrino already began to repent of their forwardness in this election, said aloud, "Stay a little, softly, there is a mistake in the scrutiny." But Montalto, with a stern look, boldly answered, "there is no mistake, the scrutiny is good, and in due form;" and immediately thundered out the *Te Deum* himself, in a voice that made the chapel shake.

The first master of the ceremonies came to him, as is usual, and said, "My Lord Cardinal Montalto, your eminence is duly elected Pope; the holy college desires to know whether you please to accept the papacy;" to which he replied, somewhat sharply, "It is trifling and impertinent to ask, whether I will accept that which I have already accepted, as I have sufficiently shown by singing the *Te Deum*. However, to satisfy any scruple that may arise, I tell you that I accept it with great pleasure, and would accept another, if I could get it; for I find myself strong enough, by the divine assistance, to manage two papacies.

Farnese who stood near him, hearing this, said to St Saverino, "The gentlemen that took upon them to conduct this election, thought to have engrossed the whole administration of affairs to themselves, by choosing a fool and idiot; but I plainly see, we have got a Pope that will make fools and idiots both of them and us." St Severino only shrugged up his shoulders, and said, "Lord have mercy on us all." Thus the poor frogs had chosen a serpent for their king, and they were not able to shake him off.

When he was asked what name he would take, he answered, Sixtus V., which he did in honour of Pope Sixtus IV., who had been a monk of the same order. It was observed, that whilst the cardinals were putting on his pontifical robes, he stretched out his arms with great vigour and activity; upon which, Rusticucci, who was surprised by such a metamorphosis, said to him in a familiar way, "I perceive, holy father, the pontificate is a sovereign panacea, since it can restore youth and health to old sick cardinals;" to which he replied, in a grave and majestic manner, "So I find it." The very moment the scrutiny was ended, he laid aside that appearance of humility he had so long worn; and instead of his former civility and complaisance, he behaved with great state and reserve to every body; but, more particularly to them to whom he had been most obliged for his exaltation.

Dressed in his robes, and seated on the pontifical throne, the cardinals advanced two and two to adore him. His Holiness gave them, separately, the kiss of charity, on both cheeks; and then admitted every body who was in the conclave, to the honour of kissing his feet. It is said, when Farnese came among the rest, to perform that ceremony, he did it with great reluctance, and showed particular signs of disgust, at prostrating himself before a person of his mean birth. Some people thought he said in his heart, "*Non tibi, sed Petro*," "Not to thee, but St Peter." Be that as it will, when he beheld him sitting so erect, and with so much majesty upon the throne, he said to him, "Your Holiness seems a quite different sort of a man from what you were a few hours ago." "Yes," said he, "I was then looking for the keys of paradise, which obliged me to stoop a little; but now I have found them, it is time to look upwards, as I am arrived at the summit of all human glory, and can rise no higher in this world."

After the adoration was finished, and other customary ceremonies performed, the Cardinal Deacon caused a window to be broken open, and then proclaimed to the people, "Behold, I bring you glad tidings of great joy, the most illustrious Cardinal Montalto is chosen Pope, and has taken the name of

Sixtus V." See book iv. Life of Sixtus V.; in which are many things interesting, impious, and ludicrous, which I am obliged to omit. Sixtus ruled both the cardinals and the people for several years, with a rod of iron; but as the cardinals could not deny that he had been chosen by the Holy Ghost, and them, the moment the election was declared, they were irrevocably bound to him as their holy father. There was no possibility of getting quit of him in a lawful way; but it was suspected that he died by poison, as many other Popes are supposed to have done.

I have been thus particular in describing an individual case, and that of a Pope of comparatively good moral character, that the reader may be able to judge what title these holy fathers have to be called the successors of Peter, the vicars of Christ, and the representatives on earth of the God of peace.

Cardinal Joyeuse, writing to King Henry IV., May 19th, 1605, gives the following character of a cardinal, whose election to the Papacy he found it necessary to promote. "The Cardinal Aldobrandini, and the Cardinal Montalto, (nephew, I believe, of Sixtus V.) came to us, desiring us to join with them to make Cardinal Tosco Pope. After we had discoursed a great while on this affair, we had much ado to resolve upon it; because the said cardinal was looked upon as a man who had lived a life not too exemplary, very apt to be choleric and angry, who had always in his mouth unchaste and immodest words, and who was given to other customs, unbecoming not only the head of the church, but any person whatever, who had but the least advantage of an honest education. In short, he was a man from whom the world could expect no good to the church; the election of whom would go against the consciences of many pious persons of the college, and might perhaps gain us nothing but disgrace and reproach from all the assembly of cardinals. Nevertheless, the little hopes that we had of having a Pope to our mind, the fear of falling on one of those who were excluded by your Majesty, the desire of not displeasing the Cardinal Aldobrandini, and the opinion which we had, that this man would be inclined to favour the affairs of your Majesty, made us resolve to assure Aldobrandini that we gave our full consent to this election."—*Clarendon's Religion and Policy, or Papal Usurpations*, chap. ii. This requires no comment.

It is usual for the cardinal, who is raised to the Papacy, to assume a new name. This is said to have originated in the year 844, with one whose name was *Bocco di Porco*, that is, hogs-face, or swine-snout. When he came to the dignity of Pope, being ashamed of it, he assumed the name of Sergius. It has ever since been the custom, though there have been some exceptions, for him who is raised to the Papacy to assume a new name. For this, the following reasons are given by Popish writers: First, because Christ, when he called his apostles, changed some of their names. Secondly, to signify, that as they changed their names, they should change also their nature. Lastly, that he who is chosen to so excellent an estate, should not be disgraced by a vile name.

Polydore Virgil, in his 4th book *De Inventione Rerum*, cap. 10, thus writes: "The bishop of Rome hath one peculiar prerogative or privilege, which is, that when once he is created bishop of that see, he may alter and change his name at his pleasure. As, for example, if perchance he hath been heretofore an evil-doer, he may call his name Bonifacius, that is to say, well-doer. If he have been a coward, or timorous sheep's-head, he may call himself Leo (that is, lion). If he be a clown, he may call himself Urbanus (a polite gentleman). Instead of lewd, or wicked, he may call himself Pius, or Innocent. If he have been a scandalous fellow, he may assume the appellation of Benedictus, that is, well spoken of: to the end, that the sovereign bishop, at least in name, may be an ornament and honour to the dignity of the Papacy."—See this, and a great deal more to the same purpose, in *The Weekly Packet of Advice from Rome*, vol. ii. pp. 309, 310.

In this work we have the following summary of the personal character of a number of Popes, which I adduce in opposition to Bishop Hay's assertion, that only a few of them were bad men in their own practice. "Some Popes have been excessively covetous; as Boniface VIII., Calixtus III., John XXIII. and Boniface IX. Some puft up with Luciferian pride; as Bennet XII., Adrian IV., Celestine III., Innocent IV., Alexander III., Gregory XIII., Clement V., VI., and VII., Boniface VIII., Paul II., John XXIII., and many others; indeed, who not that ever wore the triple crown? Divers Popes have been conjurers, as Silvester III., and all his successors, for nine or ten Popes together; others sold themselves by league to the devil; as Sylvester II. and Alexander VI. So many notorious whoremongers have filled the chair, that it would be too tedious to name them. Famous cheats have been Popes;—Alexander III., Boniface VIII., Celestine V., and Benedict X. Murderers were Pius IV., Gregory VII., Stephen VIII., Sixtus V., Gregory XIV., and Honorius II. Poisoners of one another;—Damasus II., Victor II. and III., Celestine IV., and Paul III., &c. &c.," vol. ii. pp. 251, 252. By sorcerers we may understand their being, at least, pretenders to the art of magic; and by having sold themselves to the devil, we may infer that such was the popular belief, and perhaps the belief of the author, founded upon the monstrous and diabolical wickedness of

these *holy* fathers, who are called by the title of *holiness* itself. Perhaps the idea of men's selling themselves to the devil may have originated in the words of Elijah to Ahab, (1 Kings xxi. 20.) "Thou hast *sold thyself* to work evil in the sight of the Lord." But, in order to this, it is not necessary that there be a personal contract, or league, between the devil and them.

In the above summary, I find Sixtus V. classed among the Popes who were murderers; but I do not recollect any incident in his history that entitles him to this, except what was common to him with all tyrants in power. He made very little account of human life, and ordered men to be destroyed at his pleasure. The following incident affords a view of his cruel decision of character, though it did not extend to actual murder: Pasquin (the statue so called, on which what were called pasquinades, were stuck), was dressed, one morning, in a very dirty shirt; and being asked by Marforio, "Why he wore such dirty linen?" answered, "He could get no other, for the Pope had made his washer-woman a princess." Meaning Donna Camilla, the Pope's sister, who had formerly been a laundress. This stinging piece of raillery was carried to his Holiness, who ordered strict search for the author, but to no purpose. He issued a proclamation, offering the author 1000 pistoles, and promising to spare his life, if he would discover himself; and threatening to hang him if he was found out by any body else. The poor author was so tempted by the offer, as to go, and make full confession to the Pope, who ordered the 1000 pistoles to be immediately paid. "We promised you your life, and 1000 pistoles," said his Holiness, "you have received both, and say you are satisfied: but we reserved to ourselves the power of cutting off your hands, and boring your tongue through, to prevent your being so witty for the future." Which was directly executed: Sixtus declaring, "that he did not deserve the punishment so much for the pasquinade, as for being so audacious as to avow it."—*Life of Pope Sixtus V.*, p. 395.

On the wickedness of the Popes there is matter for many volumes, but it is time that I take up another subject. To those who wish to read in detail what I have given in the gross, I recommend the following works, some of which I have not seen, but they are recommended by a learned correspondent, who has been long engaged in the same warfare. Walch's Compendious History of Popes, London, 1759. The History of Popery, 2 vols. 4to., London, 1735. Another History of Popery, 2 vols., London, 1679; entitled also, Weekly Packet from Rome. This is a work of both arguments and facts, and it contains a great deal of curious matter. Bower's History of the Popes, 7 vols. 4to., London, 1750-66. Lord Clarendon's Papal Usurpations, or Religion and Policy, 2 vols. 8vo., Oxford, 1791. Foulis's History of Romish Treachery and Usurpations; and the Romish Horse Leech; besides such histories as Mosheim, Milner, &c., which are known to all.

No. CIX.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 12TH, 1820.

AT the conclusion of my 107th Number, I requested the reader to consider what would be the consequence, if we had one or two hundred Papists in our houses of parliament. It has been said, that this is putting a case that could not be realized, even supposing "Catholic Emancipation" were granted in all the extent that is demanded; because, it is said, there are not so many Papists qualified, or eligible to seats in parliament, though they were laid open to them. This, I am persuaded, is a mistake; and I have not a doubt, that if they were made eligible, upwards of a hundred would be found in the first parliament that should meet after the privilege was extended to them.

Ireland sends just a hundred members to the house of commons. Papists boast that their number there is to that of Protestants, as five to one; but I will take it as only four to one; and taking this as proper data by which to calculate the number of representatives, the Papist would return eighty of the hundred. And then there are the popish peers in both England and Ireland who would claim seats in the upper house; besides the English commoners whose return might be effected by the Papists in England. That Papists would elect none but men of their own faith cannot be doubted; and such is the influence of the priests over the people, that the ghostly fathers would be virtually the electors. This indeed I am informed on good authority, is, in some measure, the case already. Since the Papists in Ireland obtained the privilege of electing members of parliament, though they can elect none but Protestants, the priests have risen amazingly in importance; because the Protestant candidates must pay court to them, in order to secure the votes of the people; and we may easily imagine, that few will be found hardy enough to give a vote contrary to the mind of the priest, seeing he is believed to hold the fate of every soul in his hand. We cannot be surprised that many of the Irish members are advocates of what is called "Emancipation," seeing their election may have depended upon their declaring themselves on that side; but if they were not very short-sighted they might see, that the parliament that shall concede what is demanded with so

much clamour, will be the last parliament for them. In vain would they apply to the people, or to the priests to be returned again, unless they should become Papists; for no Papist would vote for a Protestant, if there remained a qualified Papist in the three kingdoms. If Ireland should not contain a sufficient number of persons so qualified, there are great plenty to be found among the sons of Popish peers, and the inferior gentry of the same communion in England and Scotland, who would be as eligible to be returned for Ireland, as if they belonged to that kingdom.

For the information of the reader, I insert the following statement of the number and condition of the adherents of Rome, in England, in the year 1813. It is given, on the authority of the Dublin Evening Post, in the Orthodox Journal for January 1814. It is said to have been obtained through the channel of a Liverpool gentleman "of eminent character and intelligence;" but as it is evident that the writer belongs to the body about which he writes, and to which he may be supposed a little partial, we ought to receive his account of the respectability, and superior morality of his brethren, with some grains of allowance.

ENGLISH CATHOLICS.

(From the Dublin Evening Post.)

The extraordinary progress which the cause of the Catholics of Ireland has made within the last few years, through the talent and prudence of its leaders, has incidentally brought forth the Catholics of England to public notice. This body of men has not yet thoroughly recovered from the languor and depression inflicted by the penal laws; and their apparent *inertia* may be accounted for by the habits of despondency, which frequent insults and aggressions had wrought upon them.

Events, however, are now dissipating this gloom: and the approaching Session is likely to render their movements a subject of general attention.

Our anxiety to procure useful and authentic information for our readers, upon every subject connected with the cause of Religious Freedom, has led us to a diligent inquiry into the present condition of the English Catholic body, and we have been fortunate enough to obtain, through the channel of a correspondent in Liverpool, of eminent character and intelligence, the following statement, upon which we can perfectly rely.

The subject is somewhat new and original—the ground hitherto unbroken—and the matter various and detailed.

The total number of Catholics in England and Wales is computed to exceed 300,000. The principal Catholic counties are Lancashire, Yorkshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and Northumberland. These, with Durham, Cheshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Kent, and Worcestershire, (the next in number) contain about 200,000. London and its suburbs, with Surrey and Middlesex, are rated at 50,000. The remaining 50,000 are thinly scattered throughout the other counties and cities—but chiefly in Bristol, Bath, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Southampton, Exeter, Gloucester, and a few watering places.

Some compute the total number at 400,000, and this we cannot positively contradict; but we rely with more confidence upon the proportionate population of the respective districts, as above given, than upon our computation of the aggregate amount.

Their classes are three—Clergy, Nobility, and Commoners—and each forms a venerable, though decayed, monument of ancient worth and respectability!

I. CLERGY—They have ceased, during upwards of two centuries, to possess any regular hierarchy. There are no bishops or priests, as in Ireland, officiating in appropriate dioceses or parishes. They are governed, in spirituals, by four superiors, called vicars apostolic; these vicars are deputed by the Pope, and exercise vicarial powers revocable at pleasure. They are, indeed, bishops in the Catholic Church, but do not enjoy episcopal authority in Britain; their sees are little more than nominal, or "*in partibus*," as it is termed—as *Centurien, Castaballa. &c.* Each vicar has a district, therefore, assigned to him, not a see.

Thus, Dr Gibson in the northern; Dr Milner in the Midland; Dr Poynter in the London; and Dr Collingridge in the Western district.

In like manner each priest has a separate district; not, however, any particular parish, but a "Mission," and he is termed a "Missionary!" He acts by virtue of a faculty, granted by the apostolic vicar of the district, and is removable at his pleasure.

In Ireland, on the contrary, where the regular succession has been preserved, no bishop is removable at the mere will of the Pope—nor is any parish priest removable at the mere will of his bishop. To effect such removal, there must exist a canonical cause, an accuser, a regular trial, sentence, and ratification.

It will be recollected, that Lord Redesdale (in his speech in the Lords, in May, 1803) took upon him to state roundly, that the Catholic clergy in Ireland were wholly dependent upon the Pope; and in England, quite independent; a proof, amongst many, of his Lordship's incaution and want of knowledge.

In every county of England there are Catholic chapels and congregations. Altogether there are about 900 chapels, mostly erected within the last twenty-five years; and generally clean, commodious, and well built. Lancashire alone counts upwards of one hundred Catholic chapels. Moreover, most of the Catholic country gentlemen of fortune main-

tain chapels in their houses. Service is performed daily in the private chapel, and the traveller is freely admitted to assist at the office.

In the summer 1813, Dr Smith (the Vicar-Assistant to the venerable Dr Gibson), in the Northern district, confirmed the following numbers of Catholic children, in three towns alone:

In Manchester	800
— Liverpool	1000
— Preston	1200

Hence some estimate may be formed of the Catholic population of England.

II. PEERS.—The Catholic peers are seven in number, viz.

	Created.
1. Earl of Shrewsbury, Premier and Earl of Waterford and Wexford in Ireland	1442
2. Viscount Fauconberg	1643
3. Baron Stourton	1448
4. Baron Petre	1603
5. Baron Arundel	1605
6. Baron Dormer	1615
7. Baron Clifford	1672

The presumptive heir to the dukedom of Norfolk * is also a Catholic. In Scotland there are two Catholic earls—Traquair and Newburgh.

The Catholic baronets of England are seventeen in number: namely—

	Created.
Sir Wm. Gerard, Lancashire	1611
Sir Edward Hales, Kent	1611
Sir Henry Englefield, Berks	1612
Sir G. Jerningham, Norfolk	1621
Sir Henry Tichborne, Hants	1628
Sir John Throckmorton, Berks	1641
Sir Edward Blount, Shropshire	1642
Sir Windsor Hunloke, Derbyshire	1643
Sir Carn. Haggerston, Lincolnshire	1643
Sir Thos. Webbe, Wiltshire	1644
Sir R. Smythe, Warwickshire	1669
Sir Rich. Bedingfield, Norfolk	1661
Sir T. Massey Stanley, Cheshire	1661
Sir Thos. Gage, Suffolk	1662
Sir John Lawson, Yorkshire	
Sir H. Maire Lawson, Yorkshire	1665
Sir Piere Mertyn, Flintshire	1670

The principal names which have dropped off lately, either by deaths or conformity, have been those of Howard, Duke of Norfolk; Browne, Lord Montague; Roper, Lord Teynham; Vavasour, Curzon, Acton, Mannock, Gascoigne, Fleetwood, Swinburne—all Peers or Baronets.

Amongst the English Catholics are many ancient families, of name and renown in English history. Their present heads are mostly country gentlemen, retired, reserved; of sedentary, and nearly secluded habits of life. Such are the names of Constable, Clifford, Weld, Howard, Plowden, Townley, Jones, Stapleton, Carey, Stonor, Eyre, Heneage, Stanley, Turberville, Selby, Browne, Tunstall, Eyston, Errington, Chichester, Chomley, Giffard, Tasborough, Biddulph, Eccleston, Huddleston, Berrington, Charlton, Dalton, Sheldon, Perrers, Canning, Berkely, Manby, Riddall, Darell, Fermor, Trafford, Weston, &c. &c. &c.

There are about five hundred of these Catholic families, not inferior to many in the British Peerage in ancient, pure, and noble lineage—some, who can boast the legitimate Plantagenet blood—several who enjoy landed estates, lineally transmitted since the Norman days, and even the Saxon era. These, though not now titled, may be classed by the herald amongst nobility. The heads of these families mostly live retired upon patrimonial incomes, varying in annual value from £1500 to £25,000.

It may appear curious to those who know the name of Giffard in Ireland only, that the parent stock in England is wholly Catholic. The Giffards of Chillington, in Staffordshire, possess landed estates of £8000 a year, and upwards; and of this family is Sir John Throckmorton's lady, the elegant and accomplished correspondent of the pathetic poet, Cowper.

III. COMMONERS.—We have spoken of the clergy, nobility, and higher classes of the English Catholic body. The inferior orders are little distinguishable from the corresponding classes of their Protestant neighbours (or *Churchmen*, as they are termed).

Here the broad features of distinction almost disappear—Industry, association, necessity, obliterate the characteristic traits. Generally speaking, they are little farmers, shopkeepers, artists, and labourers—decent, humble, timid, shy, and careful. It is supposed that they are rather more moral, regular, submissive, and inoffensive, than their neighbours; and also of a more sedate and stationary habit of life. Emigrations from their parishes, pauperism, and crimes, are said to be rare amongst them.

There may be some foundation for this eulogium; but, whether it is due to the control of vigilant censors, to a guarded purity of deportment, to a more moral system of education, to the virtuous precepts of their religion, or to accident, we do not venture to determine.

Wales affords but few Catholics—a singular fact of a race, in lesser points, obstinately wedded to ancient usage.

Wales, separated from England only by hedges and streams, remains profoundly ignorant of the English language, and clings to her own, with all the jealousy of national pride.

Yet, Wales ceded her ancient religion, (without scruple or hesitation) to a people, whose language she still disdains to understand. She drinks, with delicious rapture, of every stream that flows from English eccentricity; and neither the mummery of the Jumpers, nor the frenzy of the Ezekielites,

* The present duke.

renders the spiritual potion too muddy for the ardent and enthusiastic Welchman.

The author of the above statement considers it "a singular fact," that "Wales affords but few Catholics," while the Welch are said to be "a race, in lesser points, obstinately wedded to ancient usage." Now, perhaps, this is the very circumstance that accounts for the fact. The "ancient usage," with regard to religious worship, in Wales, was certainly not Popish worship, or any thing like Popery. The religion of Rome was a mere novelty in that ancient principality. It could not have existed there many centuries before the Reformation; and, therefore, when the Reformation delivered the Welch from the thraldom of the ghostly intruders, in the form of Romish priests, they would gladly return to their more ancient usages.

Britain, there is reason to think, was favoured with the light of Christianity as early as the first century. I do not state this as a matter of absolute certainty; but as one of great probability; and I have never seen any thing that renders it incredible. There is extant a writing ascribed to Clemens, the fellow-labourer of the apostle Paul, in which he says that Paul, in preaching the gospel, went to the *utmost bounds of the west*: (Το τερμα της δυσεως, *terminum, finem occidentis*, the extremity of the west) which may very properly apply to the British isles, which were the western extremity of the Roman empire. The expression does not necessarily mean the most western part in point of longitude; but the most remote part in a western direction. Eusebius, in the fourth century, says, that the gospel was preached in the British isles by some of the apostles. He, of course, could not speak from his own knowledge; but he must have had such evidence as satisfied him of the fact. Tertullian, in the second century, says, that before his time Christianity had extended itself to parts of Britain inaccessible to the Roman arms. These must have been the mountainous parts of Wales and Scotland, into which the Romans were not able to penetrate. Gildas says, that the gospel was preached in Britain *before the defeat of Boadicea*, which took place in the year 61; and the British Triads state, that the knowledge of Christianity was brought to Britain by the father of Caractacus, who was liberated from his detention at Rome seven years after the defeat of Caractacus, that is, A. D. 58 or 59, the time in which (according to Eusebius, Jerome, Petavius, Scaliger, &c.) Paul was set at liberty from his first confinement at Rome. See the Bishop of St David's Protestant Catechism, Section viii.

These things are not asserted as divine truths. They are not so certain, as that we can build an article of faith upon them, as the Church of Rome builds her monstrous fabric upon the assertion that Peter was the first bishop of that city, of which there is much less evidence than that Paul preached the gospel in England. But though we cannot assert the above as matters of divine record, they are credible articles of history, and sufficiently authentic for my present purpose, which is to show that Popery was not the religion of the ancient Britons from whom the Welch are descended.

Assuming the above facts as matter of credible history (and they have never been shown to be fabulous), the learned prelate above mentioned, in a letter to Lord Kenyon, 1819, writes as follows:—"To the labours and preaching of the great apostle of the Gentiles, we are indebted for the first introduction of the gospel. Of its existence to the beginning of the fourth century, we have the testimony of Tertullian, Origen, and Gildas. Public councils and synods, and religious institutions, attest its continuance in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries.—The rejection of the Pope's authority (by the Church of England) in the seventh century, stamps the first feature of its *Protestant* character. Its observance of Easter, its aversion to image worship, and its vernacular version of the scriptures, show its independence on the Church of Rome during the Saxon government, down to the Norman conquest." Pp. 2, 3.

Now, long before this period, the ancient British had been driven by their Saxon invaders, to take refuge among the mountains of Wales. They carried their language and their religion with them. Considering their many disadvantages, it is not to be supposed that they preserved, or professed Christianity, in every point, pure as it was received from the apostles; but it was long ere they submitted to Rome. Popery was a novelty to them; and though forced upon them for a time, they readily threw it off when they were favoured by the light of the Reformation. This is what our Popish eulogist calls ceding their ancient religion, without scruple or hesitation, to a people whose language they still disdain to understand. It was rather throwing their idols to the moles and to the bats, and returning to the religion of their remote ancestors.

If it shall be replied, that St Wenefride is a Welch saint of great antiquity, and that she belonged to the Church of Rome; I answer, we have no credible evidence of this. That which we have as her life, was written hundreds of years after the period in which she is said to have lived; and when nothing of her character or history could be known with certainty. I will not deny, that there may have lived a noble lady of that name, distinguished for piety and benevolence; and that her memory may have been held in veneration for ages. Some idle monk taking advantage of this, would collect all the stories that were

current among the people; and, with the aid of a lively imagination, he could easily dress up such a legend as that which we have under the title of the Life and Miracles of St Winefride. Scott of Dunse, commonly called Duns Scotus, was, no doubt, a learned and great man in his day; but among the common people in the south of Scotland, he is known only as Michael Scott the *warlock (wizard)*, and as such is the subject of many silly and absurd stories, which are as remote from real history as the miracles of Winefride *the saint*.

It may be true, that some extravagance is exhibited in the worship of certain sects in Wales, which every sober Protestant will lament and condemn; but I venture to affirm, that the folly of the Jumpers and Ezekielites, be they who they may, is not greater than that of many in the Church of Rome, who have been canonized, and who are at this day worshipped as saints.

If we may judge of the morality of Papists, from that which comes under our own eye in this city and neighbourhood, we should be very far indeed from supposing, like the writer of the foregoing statement, "that they are rather more moral, submissive, and inoffensive, than their neighbours; and also of a more sedate and stationary habit of life." In every point, the very reverse of this is the truth, except, perhaps, in the article of being submissive, in which so far as regards submission to their priests, we must yield to them the superiority. Candour, however, requires me to admit, that Glasgow does not afford a specimen, by which we can fairly judge of the morality of Papists in the southern part of the island, or even of the north. We have few, if any, of native growth. Where men are born, and grow up, and settle in life, there are certain ties of neighbourhood, and acquaintanceship, and friendship, which form a kind of check upon their conduct. No one can become notoriously wicked, without danger of being cast off by his more respectable neighbours, and of being obliged to leave the place. Perhaps not one in ten of our Popish population has this advantage of old local acquaintanceship. The increase of our manufactures, and the demand for labour in building, during the rapid enlargement of our city, attracted thousands from the sister island. These were generally of the poorest class, without the knowledge of any thing, beyond a few articles of their wretched superstition; who had the fewest inducements to remain at home, and who have the fewest motives to distinguish themselves by superior good conduct. By the influx of such, our poor's rates have been grievously augmented; and the morality of the lower orders, the very reverse of being improved.

No. CX.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 19TH, 1820.

REMARKING upon the statement in my last Number, relating to "English Catholics," and the allegation, that they are, in respect of morals, superior to their neighbours, I observed it was otherwise in this part of the kingdom; but I admitted that it was not quite fair to judge of the English stock, by the Irish sample which is exhibited to our view in this city and its neighbourhood. Where families have been long settled, and where circumstances are more favourable, we reasonably expect to find a more respectable body: but even, where circumstances are most favourable for insuring good conduct, and where the adherents of Rome have the advantage of good education, and of intercourse with enlightened society, I will not admit that they are more moral than Christians of any denomination whatever. It is customary to call those who have no religion at all, of the established religion, whatever it may be. Thus a great proportion of our population are called Protestants who have no right to the appellation; it is not even thought worth while to deny it to the most sensual and profligate part of the community, though *heathens* would be a more appropriate term; for they are idolaters in the grossest sense of the word—"whose god is their belly." It may be admitted, that the morality of Papists in England, like that of every other sect whose numbers are comparatively small, in the midst of an enlightened population, will be superior to that of persons whom no Christian sect would acknowledge. If we would make a fair estimate of the moral effects of the two systems, we must look at the mass of the people where each predominates; and, I am sure, Britain, with all its faults, will not shrink from a comparison with France or Italy, or any Popish country in the world:—not even with "Catholic Ireland," "the island of saints."

An inclination to magnify their numbers is a vice of which Papists are notoriously guilty. Thus a writer in Glasgow, who took the signature of Julius, and who writes very much like Amicus Veritatis, in a letter in the Orthodox Journal, for March last, made an indecent attack on Mr Cleland, for giving, as he said, an unfair statement of the number belonging to his communion in this city and suburbs. Mr Cleland published first the census of the city alone, in which he gave the number of "Roman Catholics," (for he was polite enough not to call them Papists,) at 3997. This was avowedly given as the number within the royalty only: but Julius published it as the number given for both city and suburbs; and triumphantly boasted, that instead of between 3 and 4000, there were near 15,000 Catholics in Glasgow and its vicinity. This was answered,

in the Newspapers, by one of the Committee, under whose direction the census had been taken, who stated, that after the enumeration of the suburbs had been completed, the total number in both city and suburbs was found to be 8245. This was far from satisfying Julius; for he soon after published a letter in the Glasgow Courier, in which he asserted the number to be 20,000; and referred to the Rev. Mr Scott, by name, whom, he said, he had often heard, both in public and private, declare this to be the number; and, moreover, referred to lists of names in Mr Scott's possession, as a proof of the fact. The reverend gentleman, however, authorized the editor to contradict this assertion, which was done in the Courier, for May 11th, and to declare, that if ever he used the expression 20,000, in reference to persons of his communion, he must have included Lanarkshire, Renfrewshire, Dumbartonshire, Stirlingshire, and Linlithgowshire; and that the list of names in his possession, of persons belonging to all these counties, never exceeded from 2 to 3000. Julius was silent, for he had not the grace to acknowledge his error, though exposed by his own priest.

But, contrary to usual practice, the writer of the statement in my last Number, I think, estimates the number of his communion in England and Wales sufficiently low, in 1813, at 300,000; and as there were 900 chapels, there must have been an average of only 333 souls, or about 200 grown persons to each, according to Mr Cleland's Tables of the population here, which exhibit about one person under 12 years to every three and a fraction. There must, therefore, have been little occasion for building more chapels; and yet we know that several large ones have been built since the above date, among which are those in Glasgow, and Moorfields, London; which two would contain the 50th part of the adult Popish population of England and Wales, according to the above statement.

After all that I have written against the Church of Rome, I find there are but few of the children of that holy communion, who are willing to stand forward in her defence. If she were the only true church, or even the mother and mistress of all churches, for she gives herself out under both characters, it might be expected, that some of her beneficed and well qualified sons would endeavour to defend her from the attacks of an arch heretic of the nineteenth century. She is plainly and explicitly by him held up to the world as the mother of abominations; and yet her consecrated sons, who have the greatest interest in throwing a veil over her bloated countenance and in representing her as all fair, without one spot or blemish, are quietly sitting still, without so much as making an attempt to wipe off the stain that is every week thrown upon the character of their holy mother. A priest was once interrogated on this subject, and asked why he did not write an answer to THE PROTESTANT? he replied, with great *humility*, that he did not consider that gentleman (who has the misfortune to be only a layman), as his equal; and that, therefore, it would not be honourable in him to enter the lists with him; but, if any clergyman were to write against the "Catholic faith," he would perhaps write a reply. It so happened, that soon after, a minister of the established church preached in this city, and afterwards published, an admirable discourse, which struck at the very foundation of the Romish faith, by proving it to be the right and the duty of all to read the word of God. I refer to a sermon by the Rev. Dr Hodgson of Blantyre, of which the Popish priest did not think it becoming his rank or dignity, at least not convenient, to take any public notice. Now I do wish, with all my heart, that some of our clergymen would take up the controversy upon a broader scale; not because I wish to lay it down; but that our Popish priests might have no apology for their silence. They, it seems, in the true spirit of knight-errantry, will fight with none but knights like themselves. Forty years ago there was not a Protestant minister in Scotland, Episcopal or Presbyterian, whose heart was not interested in the subject, and who did not make it his business, by preaching or writing, or both, to expose to his people the wickedness of Popery and the danger that would attend its increase; but now, when Popery is making a more imposing appearance than it did forty years ago; and when nothing less will satisfy the subjects of the Pope, than *admission* into our houses of Parliament, and *admissibility* to the throne itself, most of our clergy show, by their silence, that they feel no great interest in the subject. This is not because they are more Popishly inclined than their predecessors. It is not because they are less hostile to what is idolatrous, and superstitious, and subversive of our civil and religious liberties. It is because they have a vague imagination that Popery is not so bad as it was; at least, that Papists are not such deceivers and persecutors as they were two hundred years ago. But let them expose the errors and the wickedness of Rome, as their fathers did; and if any Popish priest shall make a reply, they will find the very same spirit of lying, and misrepresentation, and the same persecuting malevolence, as were exhibited in the practice of Papists when they had power in their hands. Seeing the priests will not write against me, because I am not their equal, I must be content to contend with mere laymen like myself. I have a suspicion, indeed, that my Galloway "Friend to Fair Dealing" is a priest, though I am not certain of the fact; and therefore I am not entitled to boast of the honour of having a consecrated antago-

nist. My London lay opponent is disavowed by his own ghostly fathers, some of whom forbid their people to read his writings; because, to use a vulgar expression, he *blabs out*, from time to time, the real principles and the real spirit of Popery, in language too plain to be misunderstood; and thus makes disclosures which are extremely prejudicial to the cause of "emancipation." He has indeed written nothing against THE PROTESTANT since the month of December; and as I have promised him the honour of a chapter to himself, when I have done with every thing else, I must again pass him over, and attend to the communications of meaner men, of which I have received only two from popish correspondents since my last notice. The first is, *verbatim et literatim*, as follows:

GREENOCK, *March* 27.

Dear
Sir you no When Mar Andreus was vindicating the Catholic relugon of wich you are writing a Ganast you promest to a tak him as soon as you ar done With the important Matter that you are at i hope you will be as good as your word to perfrom it in due tim hover if Eney man of Jugment At all wold serch eney of your nombers they Woold not find ane worb of troch in eney of them you may say What Ever you chouse but i Woold not bleve one word that you Wold say becas you are lare and a inventar of laes i wonder that you ar not affirad that tho Ground on Witch you Stand dos Not open and Swlio you up rate ono More a Ganst the Catholic Church for she is the pillirs and Ground of truth for Cursed is he that denietit thou May Throw as Much Durt, at hir as you Chuse but thou ar oneley Ading more Sin to your Self i Wold wich you to Stop as sone as you ar done with mars Andreus - - - - Rit a Anser to this if you can

I am your humbile Servint
a liover of truth.

I dare say the writer of the above learned epistle, has long ago concluded in his own mind, that I really was not able to answer it, seeing I have allowed nearly five months to elapse without taking any notice of it. He must have derived great pleasure from the idea of having written a letter which THE PROTESTANT could not answer; and as I have no wish to deprive him of the happiness which he enjoys, I shall leave it unanswered, and proceed to insert a letter from my old Edinburgh Correspondent, W. D. I give it also *verbatim*, but not *literatim*, as I do not choose to impose upon myself or my compositors the hardship of copying any more of such orthographical eccentricities. Justice, however, requires me to say, that W. D. is not quite so eccentric as the "liover of truth." From the rank which his letter will be esteemed to hold, as a literary composition, I might, perhaps, be excused from inserting it; but it is my wish to give my opponents every fair opportunity of being heard in their own defence, and therefore I insert it at length, though it contains a good deal of irrelevant matter, especially mutilated extracts from the writings of Luther, which have no relation to the present subjects of controversy.

LETTER II. TO THE PROTESTANT.

Edinburgh, 15th July, 1820.

SIR,—In writing a second epistle, I deem it reasonable to adopt a subject of some importance, in order, if possible, to throw some light upon a point which it appears you have treated with a good deal of abuse and falsehood, in that ever memorable work, entitled, THE PROTESTANT, in the LXXXVII. No. page 369. Speaking of the degrees of sin, we are led to believe that those very crimes, the thought of which ought to make a Christian shudder with horror, are only venial in the eyes of poor stupid Papists. After the seven deadly sins, comes the six sins against the Holy Ghost, to wit: despair of salvation—presumption of God's mercy—to impugn the known truth—envy at another's spiritual good—obstinacy in sin—final impenitence; after those, follow the four sins that cry to heaven for vengeance; these are, wilful murder—sin of Sodom—oppression of the poor—to defraud servants of their wages; these ten species of sin are, as I believe, greater sins than those which are denominated deadly sins; or to speak more proper, the six sins against the Holy Ghost are more heinous than the seven deadly sins, and the four sins which cry to heaven for vengeance, are more grievous than the other thirteen; but you have the kindness to tell us that they are only venial, because they are not classed along with the deadly sins: really, Sir, I believe you were the first man that ever discovered this mystery; yet suppose you made this foolish statement, I humbly trust that none of your readers will ever see these sins in the same light as you hold them forth. But this is only one statement which shows the venomous spirit with which you treat the Roman Catholic religion, out of thousands of other ridiculous nonsense with which you amuse your readers. Had I as much time and leisure, I would devote some of my very limited talents to show that you mistake Catholics as much as any reformer that went before you; nor can I say that you are excusable, because you have of late quoted some of the principal Catholic Works that are common among us; but miserable must the state of that religion be, that is obliged to throw out such abuse and slander, lies, and misrepresentations of every description, to keep its ground. But Papists need not be surprised at such deal-

ing, for it seems to be a peculiar principle of all the reformers, together with their successors, since the beginning of Protestantism, to make use of the same kind of scurrilous abusive language; if such practice be a sin, I am afraid, Sir, that you will have a heavy account against you at the last day. You tell us plainly, that every sin deserves God's wrath and curse; pray Sir, what part of the Bible do you find this doctrine? Look your New Testament, Sir, and you will find there is a sin unto death, and a sin not unto death. If you would take the trouble of reading, with some attention, the 5th, the 7th, and 12th chapters of St Matthew's Gospel, you will find the degree of sin and the punishment due to them, laid down very plainly. By your late exposition of the doctrine of sin and transubstantiation, I am inclined to think that you have studied the Scriptures much the same as the renowned Martin Luther. I shall give you a few of his words concerning the interpretation of the Scripture:—"If," says the Reverend Doctor, "If God foresaw that Judas would be a traitor, Judas of necessity became a traitor, neither was it in the power of Judas, or of any other man, to do otherwise, or to change his will." De Servo Arb. tom. 2. fol. 460. 2.—"This is the highest degree of faith, to believe God to be just, though by his own will he lays us under the necessity of being damned, and in such a manner too, as if he took delight in tormenting the miserable," fol. 434. 1.—"Man's will is in the nature of a horse, if God sits upon it, it tends and goes as God would have it go; if the devil rides it, it tends and goes as the devil would have it; nor can it choose which of the riders it will run to, or seek, but the riders themselves strive who shall gain and possess it." De Servo Arb. tom. 2. fol. 342. 2.—"A person that is baptized cannot, though he would, lose his salvation by any sins how grievous soever, unless he refuses to believe. For no sin can damn him but unbelief alone." Cap. Bap. Tom. 2. fol. 74. 1.—"Let this be your rule, where the Scripture commands the doing a good work, understand it in this sense, that it forbids thee to do a good work because thou canst not do it." Tom. 3. fol. 171. 2.—This is no doubt a most excellent rule to interpret the sacred Scriptures, and I suppose Dr Martin was the first inventor of it. You seem to think by a letter you got from a "Friend to Fair-dealing," and Mr Andrews likewise, and all others, I suppose, that has said any thing against your own opinion, wishes to divert you off your plan, and turn your attention to something else, for THE PROTESTANT has a plan laid down which he intends to follow without interruption; pray Sir, when did you form this plan? At the beginning of your publication you promised to follow them (the Papists) through all their windings and turnings, but lo! when THE VINDICATOR came forth, behold THE PROTESTANT has got a plan which he must follow; for my own part, and I dare say I may say in the name of others, I would not wish, by any means, to take you off your plan; take up any point of Catholic faith, and I shall be ready to contest it with you to the last, if you keep within the bounds of reason. I am really surprised, Sir, that you would make use of such fabulous nonsensical stories as you generally do. Only look back to the beginning of the subject of Purgatory, and look at the fable about Purgatory Bridge being broken; really, Sir, if this story be true, I am very sorry for it, and as I am informed that you are a man of charity, I trust you will contribute your mite to have the bridge repaired again; or if it were rather dear, perhaps a good steam boat would answer the purpose equally well, if the renowned Wallace or the celebrated Rob Roy could be conveyed over, it would be doing a good and charitable turn for poor papists, to get them over dry shod; perhaps you will think my remark foolish, but truly, I can think of none better to answer the admirable statement. Now, Sir, I wish to have an earnest word with you, and then I will close; in your remarks upon my last letter, you mentioned so far, as that you "expected some good of this person," (myself). I most cordially thank you Sir, and I hope you will not be disappointed; but you have not as yet brought me sufficient proof, that the Church of Rome was guilty of all these bloody tricks of which you accuse her; nor have you ever told me who invented the doctrines she holds, or when she ceased from being true and genuine; this, Sir, I am afraid you cannot answer; you seem to question, if ever I saw the writings of the fathers which I quoted in my last, or if I could even read them; indeed, Sir, I never did see their writings, and I am sure I could not read them, although I did see them, and I question if you could read them either, that is to say, the manuscripts which they wrote with their own hands; I might question you the same, when you quote the Bible or the Ten Commandments, I might ask if you ever saw the parchment upon which the Prophets and Patriarchs wrote them, and even suppose you saw them, how could you demonstrate that they wrote them? You believe the Ten Commandments to be given to Moses upon two tables of stone by Almighty God himself, but did you ever see these tables, or did you see God write them? I suppose not, but tell me, are they less true, suppose you nor I never saw them; I have seen what is said to be wrote by them, in print, and I believe any thing of that kind when I have good authority for it: but yet I do not put any writings whatever on a level with the Bible, I believe every word of it, from the first of

Genesis to the end of the Revelations, to be the infallible word of God; you was good enough to give me your good advice to return to the Church of Scotland; but why to the Church of Scotland more than any other? More than the church to which you belong yourself? If you be in the right, the Church of Scotland must be wrong, for if there be a word of truth in the Holy Scriptures, there can only be one true church on earth among the thousands that are spread among us; for it is merely impossible that Almighty God should reveal one religion to one people, and a contrary one to another: that is a mystery I shall never be able to swallow, suppose I hear it very often from men of good education, and even from the pulpits. I hope, Sir, if you give any notice to what I have said, that you will be so good as to give me your advice which church to adopt as my guide, in which I am to serve my Maker here on earth, as the most certain foundation, and likewise your reasons for advising me to follow one more than another. It appears that you discovered in my last, that I did not possess a quiet conscience in the Church of Rome; I cannot understand how you could discover this to be the case, for I only said, that "if you can prove the Church of Rome to be in an error in any one point of faith, I shall leave her as soon as I see any proof," and you may rely upon it I shall keep my word, but I cannot say that I have seen that proof as yet, nor do I expect to see it, but if I shall, I will keep my promise good. I presume that I discovered an error in one of your numbers sometime ago, in giving us some of the regulations of a certain Society in Ireland, about praying for the dead; there was a passage quoted from St John, which I suppose was misquoted by the composers of the Rules, it was as follows:— "let us not love in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth;" these words was not given from the right chapter and verse, indeed, but you made a note in the margin to contradict this passage, saying, "in vain shall the reader look for such a passage in the common English Bible," look your New Testament, Sir, which is of equal authority, and you will find it in the 3d chapter, and 18th verse, of the first Epistle of St John the Divine. If you publish this letter, I wish to correct a word which was wrong in my last, speaking of predestination in the 70th No. of PROT. instead of "why are we in the esteem," *read* "why are we denied the esteem." I am sorry want of room prevents me from saying any more at present.—Farewell. WM. D.

No. CXI.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 26TH, 1820.

I HAD not room, in the last Number, for any remarks on the communication of W. D.; but, in the present, I hope to be able to answer every thing that requires particular notice. Though he be only a recent convert from the Church of Scotland, as he told us in his former letter, he can misquote and misrepresent as expertly as if he had been born a Papist. In my 80th Number, page 344, I inserted a Popish advertisement, with this motto, "Let us love not in word or in tongue, but in deed and in truth, 1 John 10 ch. 18 v." and inserted as a note, "The reader will look in vain for such a *chapter and verse* in the common English Bible;" that is, he will look in vain for the 18th verse of the 10th chapter of 1 John. But W. D. gives as my words, "in vain shall we look for *such a passage* in the common English Bible." He says, I "made a note in the margin *to contradict this passage*;" and he gravely tells me where to find it, supposing I did not know that there were such words in the New Testament. Now I appeal to W. D. himself, whether this be not barefaced imposition? and if he has the effrontery to misquote my own words to my own face, what dependence can we have upon the accuracy of his quotations from so scarce a book as the works of Luther? This book, I am persuaded, he never saw. The few extracts which he gives must have been taken from some Popish writer, who had taken them from some other, so that they may have come through twenty hands since they were taken from the original; and no dependence can be placed upon the veracity of any one of the reporters. In my 2d Number I showed how Amicus Veritatis had garbled the words of the same Reformer, so as completely to misrepresent his meaning; and I have since found, that what Amicus Veritatis gave as a discovery of his own, was a mere copy from other books. His very words are to be found in a book published in England, about ten years ago;* and I find the very same misquotation of Luther's words in a book published in the reign of James I. Yes, the very "*adveniat ancilla*," with a period instead of a comma, and the entire omission of that part of the sentence which explains the author's meaning, may be seen not only in the above modern publication, but also in the work of one Francis Walsingham, printed 1609, in which the garbled half sentence is given in English, as the entire and fully expressed doctrine of the Reformer. Perhaps fifty later Popish authors have taken it upon the authority of the said Walsingham;

* A Vindication of the Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham, page 45.

and so the lie has passed from one to another, till it fell to the lot of THE PROTESTANT to detect it, by reference to the authentic publication of Luther, in the library of our University. The same detection may, indeed, have been made by other authors whose writings I have not seen.

But we need not be surprised that such writers as W. D. should misquote and misrepresent the words of other people, for he actually does the same injustice to his own, in order that he may disengage himself from a dilemma into which he had fallen, by an expression in his former letter. He says, at the conclusion of his second:—"It appears that you discovered, in my last, that I did not possess a quiet conscience in the Church of Rome. I cannot understand how you could discover this to be the case, for I *only* said, if you can prove the Church of Rome to be in error in any point, I shall leave her as soon as I see any proof."—Here he breaks off in the middle of a sentence of his own, and leaves out that part of it on which my remark was founded, which was this:—"for I am but a late convert from the Church of Scotland, in which I was educated from my youth, and if I thought *it possible to obtain salvation in any other*, (*i. e.* than the Church of Rome) *I would not be another day in her communion*," &c. It was upon his words, which I have here printed in Italics, that I founded the remark, that W. D. was heartily tired of the communion of his church, seeing he would not remain in her another day, if it *were possible* to obtain salvation in any other. If any man were to say, I would not lodge another day in this house, if it were possible to obtain another to accommodate my family, who would not infer that he was heartily tired of his present residence?

There are several things in my correspondent's letter too trifling to require an answer; such as, when did I form the plan of my Work? It is of more importance to attend to his promise; or what, perhaps, he means as a threat, in these words, "Take up any point of Catholic faith, and I shall be ready to contest it with you to the last, if you keep within the bounds of reason." Now I must give my correspondent a piece of information which will surprise him:—It never was my intention to contest with him, or any body else, any point of "*catholic* faith;" that is, any doctrine which the universal church of Christ,—the whole body of real Christians, in all ages, have derived from the word of God. This is what is properly called catholic faith; and so far from contesting, it is my purpose to maintain it to the last. It requires no small degree of effrontery in the vassals of Rome, to call themselves Catholics, and their sect the Catholic Church: yet, through mere indifference, this has been conceded to them by most Protestants, in writing and conversation, for half a century. This has given them a vast advantage in their endeavours to corrupt ignorant persons, with whom names have often more weight than things. It is one of their tricks to turn up what is called the Apostles' Creed, which is acknowledged to be a composition of great antiquity, to quote the words, "holy catholic church," in which Protestants profess to believe; and triumphantly to appeal to the language of our own profession, as an admission that the Church of Rome is the true Church. Ignorant people, who never hear the word *catholic* applied to any church but that of Rome, are very apt to stumble and be deceived by this inconsistency in the language of Protestants, and the advantage which Papists take of it. I hope this most teazing and tormenting work of mine, to give it no worse name, will have this among other important effects, to restore the legitimate word *Papist* to its place in our vocabulary. It was used by Popish writers themselves, without scruple, a hundred and fifty years ago; and it would be so still, if they did not wish to conceal from Protestants the real nature of their dependence upon the Pope.

I am aware, however, that W. D. means the faith of Rome; but then, what becomes of his promise, or threat, to contest every point with me? He speaks as if I had not yet entered upon the controversy; as if he were waiting till I should begin, that he might begin his defence. Now he certainly knows, that I have taken up, and at least endeavoured to refute, many a point of Romish faith. Under the heads of Transubstantiation, and Purgatory, the Supremacy of Peter, and of the Pope, &c. &c. I have endeavoured to expose some fundamental articles of the faith of Rome, as no better than the invention of the devil. Why is it that he has not entered upon the contest, as he says he is ready to do? He makes a condition, indeed, by which, perhaps, he will justify himself; that is, if I "keep within the bounds of reason;" but he must prove that I have exceeded these bounds, before he can lawfully declare off. This he has not done, nor even attempted to do. I insist, therefore, upon his fulfilling his engagement, to "contest every point with me to the last;" and he must do something more than merely assert that I misrepresent the faith of his church; and that misrepresenting has been the practice of all the Reformers. I know that it has been the practice of all Papists to say so; but if it really were so, nothing could be easier than to prove it. It is sometimes difficult to expose a quibble or a sophism, in intelligible language; but a misrepresentation may be exposed in a moment, by any person who understands the subject of it. If, for instance, it were a misrepresentation to say that a Papist worships, as his God, that which his eyes and other senses tell him is but a piece

of bread, in the form of a wafer, it could instantly be corrected by giving the real doctrine of the church as laid down by her authorized standards; and so with regard to any other point: but neither W. D. nor any other writer has yet shown, by a single example, that I have so misrepresented the faith of Rome. I hold it then as good as admitted that I have given a true representation of it.

He objects to my statement and remarks upon the different degrees of sin, as taught in the Douay Catechism; but does little more than state an objection. He adduces neither argument nor fact to prove that I had mistaken the meaning of the Catechism, in which we have a list of seven sins which are called deadly, and two classes of other sins which are distinguished from those that are deadly. What could I infer from this, but that those which are distinguished from deadly sins are not deadly ones? W. D. tells me that it is not so understood by him and his brethren; but then I must tell him that he does not understand the meaning of words. I might as well say that when Papists are spoken of as distinguished from Protestants, it is not understood that the one class of persons is different from the other. He tells us, indeed, that the sins which are distinguished from the deadly, are more heinous and more grievous than the deadly ones. I did not know before that there was any thing worse than deadly; any thing beyond the eternal death which sin deserves. I have seen no such doctrine in any of the authorized standards of his Church; and must suppose it is merely a private opinion of W. D., which is of no authority whatever.

I do certainly maintain that every sin is deadly in its own nature, and by the righteous judgment of God. The smallest deviation from the divine law is disobedience as really as the greatest. Yet I believe there is no sin so deadly as that the mercy of God cannot pardon it, or that the blood of Christ cannot cleanse from it. Without pretending to speak peremptorily on a difficult subject, I am inclined to think, that our Lord's words, with regard to the sin against the Holy Ghost, had a special reference to the malignant rejection of the Saviour, by the Jews, after they had seen his miracles, and witnessed the effects of the descent of the Holy Spirit after his resurrection. Be this as it may, we are warranted from the whole tenor of the gospel to say, that no sin which any man has committed shall not be forgiven, if he shall come to Christ for forgiveness. Final impenitence is a deadly sin, in every sense of the expression, though the Church of Rome has not put it into that list; for he that is guilty of it, shuts himself up, absolutely and for ever, out of the reach of mercy. W. D. cites the words of the apostle John, (1 Epist. v. 17,) "There is a sin unto death, and a sin *not* unto death," to defend the Popish distinction between venial and mortal sins. If the apostle had said there is a sin that does not deserve death, or is not in its nature deadly, he would have given countenance to the Popish doctrine; but this was impossible, for it would have been contrary to the whole tenor of the word of God, which cannot contradict itself. What the apostle says, is true of every sin for which a sinner obtains repentance,—it is not unto death; but sin unrepented of, is unto death; and as such, is not to be prayed for, according to the words of the same apostle, in the immediately preceding verse. Final impenitence, or impenitence to death, is, I suppose, the only thing which fellow-creatures are warranted to call sin unto death: and the apostle's injunction not to pray for it, is a strong testimony against the Popish doctrine of purgatory and prayers for the dead, which perhaps he may have had in his eye, for that was one of the errors that appeared in the church at a very early period. Though impenitence, in the case of any individual, should not be final, it effectually bars forgiveness while it continues; and we have no warrant to pray for the pardon of the sins of an unbeliever, or impenitent person, but in the way of his being first brought to faith and repentance. I hope W. D. will not take it amiss, that I recommend to him the serious consideration of these things. He may rest assured that he is more likely to profit by the contemplation of every sin, as deserving God's wrath and curse, than by endeavouring to impose upon the words of an inspired apostle a meaning that would countenance the error, that some sins are so trifling as not to deserve punishment in the next, as well as in the present world.

I advised W. D. to return to the Church of Scotland, because, by his own account, he had left it under an erroneous impression of the doctrine held by that Church. I did not hold up the Church of Scotland as the only true church, or as the best of all possible churches, as Papists foolishly hold up theirs; but I maintain it as a principle of equity and common sense, that if a man leaves any church from a mistake with regard to any of its principles, he ought to return and confess his mistake, as soon as it is pointed out to him, unless he had found a better, which, it is very evident W. D. has not done.

My correspondent, by an indefinite use of the word church, bewilders himself, as all other Papists do. They hold it as a first principle, that the universal church of Christ is a visible organized body; and that it must be under one visible head, such as the Pope. But nothing can be more unlike the pattern exhibited in the New Testament. When apostles speak of *the* church of Christ, in the singular number, they mean the whole com-

pany of believers, gathered together as one body in Christ, who is their only Head, Lord, and Lawgiver. In this sense, I admit that there can be only one true church; but then it is not a church exclusively on the earth; the greater part of it is in heaven. When the word church is used in reference to the associations of Christians in this world, so far from its being true that there can be only one true church on earth, there may be a thousand of them,—all true churches, and all living by faith in their divine Head, as separate members, but all belonging to the general body, and united to him of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. Thus we read, in the New Testament, of the church in Jerusalem, the church in Antioch, the seven churches in Asia, and the churches in Galatia, of which the number is not mentioned. It never occurred to inspired writers, when speaking of organized bodies of Christians, that there was only one true church in the world. This folly was reserved for the Pope of Rome and his blinded adherents in later times; and it is worthy of remark, that the apostle Paul, when addressing the Christians in Rome, does not call them a church. Addressing those in Corinth, once and again, he speaks to them in their collective capacity, as "the church of God which is at Corinth." In like manner, several other churches are addressed; but his epistle to the Romans is addressed "to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints," (chap. i. v. 7,) as if they had been so many unconnected individuals; and then, from the 16th chapter, we are led to infer that there were at least three churches in that city. In v. 3—5, speaking of Priscilla and Aquila, it is said, there was a church in their house. In the 14th verse salutations are sent to Asyncritus, and others, "and *the brethren which are with them*;" and in the 15th verse, Philologus, and two or three more are mentioned, "and *all the saints which are with them*." These small bodies of Christians, meeting in different places, perhaps compelled to meet in private houses, not being allowed greater publicity, would no doubt have a bond of union among themselves, so as to acknowledge, and have fellowship with one another, as they had opportunity; but it is a fact, that they are nowhere in Scripture called the Church of Rome. Yet, without the shadow of a foundation in the New Testament, a monster has arisen under this title, boasting itself to be the only true church on earth, and the mother and mistress of all churches.

If I could get my correspondent to understand what a visible organized church is, he would see that it does not necessarily follow, from the circumstance of one church being right, that another must be wrong. Every church is in the right that holds the faith once delivered to the saints; and every church is wrong that corrupts or denies this faith, of which the church of Rome has been notoriously, and above all others, guilty, for fifteen hundred years: and as for differences in government, discipline, and forms of worship among Protestant churches, though it would be foolish to say they are all alike agreeable to the word of God, yet the difference between the most opposite extremes is not equal in importance to many doctrinal differences in the Church of Rome. I admit, that it is "impossible that God should reveal one religion to one people, and a contrary one to another;" and when W. D. says that he hears this "very often from men of good education, and even from the pulpits," I must tell him, in plain English, that I do not believe it. Unless he is content to sit down under the odious imputation which this implies, he will tell me from what pulpits he heard such a sentiment expressed, and who were the speakers.

Though there is much to be deplored in the divisions which exist among Protestants, their separation into different communions is a proof of their honesty and sincerity; but the pretended union of doctrine in the Church of Rome proves her insincerity and falsehood. The former are so ingenuous and candid, that they cannot profess to be all of one mind, when they are not; hence their separation into different communities, each holding what they understand and believe to be the truth; in general, agreeing in the profession of those fundamental truths by which sinners are saved, and therefore acknowledged by one another as true churches; and differing chiefly with regard to government and modes of worship, which do not so affect the vitals of Christianity as to justify the members of one communion in withholding the appellation of Christian from another.

The Dominicans and Franciscans, the Jansenists and the Jesuits, and many others, were as directly opposed to one another, as any Protestant sects can possibly be, not on matters of form and discipline merely, but upon the most fundamental points of doctrine; yet the holy and infallible "Head of Catholic Unity" acknowledged them all as branches of his family, and bestowed upon them extensive privileges. The Franciscans stoutly maintained that the Virgin Mary was born immaculate, while the Dominicans asserted that she came into the world under original sin, though its effects were soon removed. Thus the two great parties were not agreed about the original character of one principal object of their worship; and by their quarrel, the peace of Europe was disturbed for many a day. In later times the Jesuits and the Dominicans had a furious contest, on the subjects of fate and free will; the latter "contending as stoutly, and at as great length in favour of God's eternal unconditional decrees, and the absence of all moral ability on the part of

man, as the rankest predestinarian, at whose heresy" W. D. and other modern Papists "affect to sneer." Other subjects of dispute between the Jesuits and other orders were, "the extent of the jurisdiction and power of the Pope,—the Jesuits maintaining his infallibility, the others opposing it; the extent and prerogatives of the Church; the natural powers of man, and God's eternal decrees; the nature, efficacy, and necessity of divine grace; the doctrines of morality, and rules of practice," &c. See a well written pamphlet, just published, at Cork, entitled, Six Letters to the Right Honourable Charles Grant, &c. By SIMPLICIUS.

"Before I conclude," says this able writer, "this notice of the parties which have met and fought in the very bosom of that Church which alone possesses *unity*, I would slightly allude to the Jansenists, the most upright and useful body of its day as connected with Rome. Their contentions with the Jesuits, on the old topic of grace and free will, continued from 1642 to 1705. The press aided both parties, producing at one time, "The torch of St Augustine," and at another, "Snuffers for St Augustine's torch," and finally, "A gag for the Jansenists;" which gag, through the Jesuitical influence at Rome, was so effectually applied by the bull "unigenitus," as to effect the demolition of the most pure and practical body of Christians (notwithstanding some superstitions) that belonged to the Church of Rome, since it became Papal."

So much for the unity of the holy and infallible church. Different sects within its bosom teach the most opposite doctrines; and they hate one another with a perfect hatred. Nothing can exceed the abhorrence with which the Jesuits speak of Jansenists, to this very day, of which see an example in the Orthodox Journal for July, 1820. The Editor takes the part of the Jesuits; the more moderate and respectable of his brethren in England he calls Jansenists, and as such he abuses them, as if they were no better than the most detestable heretics.

No. CXII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2D, 1820.

NOT being able to finish my remarks on W. D.'s letter in my last Number, I am obliged to continue the subject in the present one. The reader will have seen that my correspondent charges me pretty freely with lying, slander, and misrepresentation; and he thinks the Protestant religion must be in a miserable state, seeing its advocates have recourse to such means of defence. If it were worth while to retort upon this writer, it would be easy to show, that the accusations which he brings against Protestants, and against THE PROTESTANT in particular, more truly belong to himself and to his sect. In the very letter on which I am remarking, he misquotes my words, misrepresents my meaning, and falsely asserts that I had written a note to contradict a passage in the New Testament. (See the latter part of his letter, No. 110, and the first paragraph of No. 111.) This is a glaring instance of his being guilty of the very thing of which he accuses me; but he has not pointed out a single instance of the kind on my part. He admits that I have of late "quoted some of the principal Catholic works that are common among" them; but he does not say that I have misquoted a single word, or misrepresented the meaning of a single sentence. In his charges of slander, lying, and misrepresentation, he fixes upon nothing definite; he adduces no instance to support his general accusation, unless it be the story of purgatory bridge, which he calls a fable, as it really is, but I did not give it as a fact, but as a fable of priestly invention; and many such lies the priests have invented in order to raise money. The story of the bridge is not more absurd and ridiculous than the fable of purgatory itself, which, no doubt, W. D. believes with all his heart; and doing this, he ought to have no difficulty in swallowing the story of the bridge.

I cannot but reflect with great satisfaction on such a communication from such a correspondent. He has been searching every one of the preceding pages, with the eye and the mind of an adversary, in order to find something against me, and he has discovered nothing that he can refer to, as an example of departure from the straight rule of truth and sincerity; and therefore he has recourse to a mere general charge of the venomous spirit with which I treat his religion, and the thousands of other ridiculous nonsense with which I amuse my readers. I could desire no greater testimony in my favour, than the silence of an adversary as to any specific charge, while his hostility leads him to deal in general and undefined accusations.

He has read many a plain and scriptural exposure of the errors of his church, on the subjects of transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, auricular confession, purgatory, &c., and to all this he does not reply a single word. His holy mother must sit down under all the accusations which I have brought against her; and he has nothing to say in her behalf; except to assail her antagonist with scolding and hard words; and to assert that he has not yet seen any proof that she is in error in any one point of faith. It would have been more to the purpose, had he attempted to show that the things which I have exposed are not errors, but truths founded upon the divine word.

This he has not thought proper to do; and it may be presumed, that few beside himself will be satisfied with his bare assertion, that he has not yet seen what any man who does not shut his eyes may see.

W. D. seems, at first view, to be in earnest when he requests my advice, which church to adopt as his guide, in which he may serve his Maker here on earth, as the most certain foundation, and likewise my reasons for advising him to follow one more than another. I have already advised him to return to the Church of Scotland, and have given my reason for doing so; but it seems very evident from the tenor of his letter, that he does not really want any advice on the subject. He has made up his mind already. He not only has not seen any proof that his church is in error, but he tells us plainly that he does not expect to see it. He has shut his eyes, and he is determined to keep them shut. He has adopted that fundamental principle of Popery, "I believe as the church believes." This leaves no room for inquiry, or the exercise of private judgment. W. D. therefore, cannot be really in earnest in asking advice what church to adopt as his guide, seeing he has already adopted an infallible one. But he would gladly get me to engage in a discussion of the merits and demerits of different Protestant churches; and thus draw me away from the weekly exposure of the deformity of that of Rome, which it appears he can neither defend nor conceal. He has thrown out a bait, once and again, to hook me away from my purpose. In his first letter, by an attack upon the Shorter Catechism; and in his second, by extracts, real or pretended, from the works of Luther, he throws out a sort of challenge to engage in a discussion of the doctrine of the divine decrees, which I am sure is beyond both his depth and mine; and is, I suppose, chosen by him on this very account, knowing that if we were to begin, we would "find no end, in wandering mazes lost."

But whether he be really desirous of advice or not, I shall take the liberty of telling him, and my other readers of his communion, that they ought not to adopt any church as their *guide*. Every Christian church itself is subject to a guide that is above it. This is the word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, which is the only infallible guide of churches collectively, and of Christians individually; and I request them to consider farther, that it will be of little avail for persons to belong to any church, unless they belong to the Saviour, and be united to him as his members, which is the blessed condition of all who believe his gospel and submit to his authority, and of no others, though they should belong to the purest church in the world. To belong to Christ, in the sense of being his members, it is necessary to accept of salvation, as the gift of free grace, upon the footing of his righteousness alone, to the entire exclusion of self-righteousness, as well as the merits of any saint, or of all the saints put together. To belong to Christ, it is also necessary to be born again by the influence of the Holy Spirit, to become a new creature, and to live a new life; that is, a life of devotion and obedience to the will of God.

To such submission to the righteousness of God, and such obedience to the will of God, the principal Protestant churches present no obstruction; at least, nothing to hinder any individual from living by faith in Christ alone as his Saviour and Intercessor, and from practising all the duties of a holy life. Some churches may afford greater helps than others for promoting a life of faith and obedience; but I know of none that holds the true Protestant faith, in which a Christian would be authoritatively prevented from living the life of a Christian. But it is otherwise in the Church of Rome. The errors which she teaches by authority, strike at the root of the true faith and of holy practice. It is impossible for a member of this church to profess the faith of the gospel in its divine simplicity and purity, without incurring the punishment of heresy. Yet to profess the faith of Christ, is as really a duty binding upon a Christian as to believe in him. "As with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, so with the mouth confession is made to salvation," Rom. x. 10. Now suppose a member of the Church of Rome to confess Christ, and say that he trusts in him alone for salvation from first to last, without regard to his own works and deservings; that he has not, and never has had any merit to plead in the sight of God; and that all the merit of the saints in heaven could not serve the purpose of his salvation, or contribute to it in the smallest degree, he would be in danger, if within reach of the Inquisition, of being burnt to death for his heresy. Thus the very first principle of the Christian life meets with positive, powerful obstruction in the Church of Rome; and the confession of the truth, which is the first duty of one who believes it, is authoritatively interdicted.

Should a man set his heart to worship God alone, in the name of the *one* Mediator, he would meet with a thousand obstacles in the Church of Rome. The priests would be incessantly thrusting themselves between him and the object of his worship, and diverting his mind from every devout contemplation. Should he express gratitude to God for the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit, the priest would command him to think of the virtues of his holy water. Should he confide in the intercession of Christ in heaven, as sufficient to maintain his cause before God, the priest would command him, under pain of *anathema*, to apply to the Virgin Mary, and fifty other

intercessors, before he should venture to go to the Saviour himself. Should he express humble confidence in approaching the throne of divine mercy, with confession of his sins, and the hope of forgiveness, the priest would let him know, that he must confess his sins to him, and look to him for absolution. Should he endeavour to regulate his life according to the precepts of the divine law, his ghostly guide would enjoin upon him a course of austerities, and pilgrimages, and fastings, on certain days of the week, and at certain times of the year, for which there is no precept in the word of God, but attention to which would effectually divert his mind from the divine commandments. And if he should think of worshipping God as a Spirit, in spirit and in truth, he would be distracted by the exhibition of images of Christ, and of the Virgin Mary, and other saints, presented as helps to his devotion, though he knew them to be no better than vain idols.

I shall make one other supposition, which might be realized at any time in the Church of Rome. Suppose one of her members, deeply affected by Christ's sufferings and death, and professing to view this as a complete atonement for sin, should express his gratitude to God for this all-perfect sacrifice, and his confidence in that Saviour, whom the heavens have received, whom therefore he does not see with his bodily eyes, or expect ever to see in this world, agreeably to the words of the apostle Peter, "whom having not seen ye love, in whom though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory;"—suppose, I say, one making these professions, and about to express his gratitude to God accordingly, a priest steps forward, and tells him that there was nothing particular in the sufferings and death of Christ, but what he exhibits every day in the sacrifice of the mass; and that he is mistaken in supposing that Christ is not now to be seen in this world, for he takes out of a box a consecrated wafer, and assures him that that is the very Christ that was born of the Virgin, that was crucified, rose from the dead, and sat down at the right hand of God. Who, on receiving such information from his priest, whom he is taught to consider his divinely-appointed instructor in the faith, would not feel his devotion effectually marred, by such a representation of Christ and his atoning sacrifice? Yet, without the least exaggeration, this is the true import of what the Church of Rome teaches; and a genuine Papist will give up every article of divine revelation, sooner than he will part with the dogma, that the consecrated wafer is the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; and that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Where this is constantly maintained, as it is in the Church of Rome, there must be an insurmountable obstacle to every act of divine worship, that can be called a reasonable service.

W. D. expresses a wish to be informed in what church he may serve his Maker here on earth, as the most certain foundation. From what I have said above, I hope every enlightened reader will perceive, whether W. D. does so or not, that he cannot serve his Maker in the Church of Rome; that supposing him to receive the truth of the gospel in purity, he would not be permitted to honour his Maker by publicly professing it; because that church has authoritatively condemned the gospel of the grace of God, which brings salvation to the guilty, solely upon the footing of Christ's perfect obedience and atoning sacrifice; has set up the merits of saints and the mass sacrifice to be trusted in; has commanded all her members, under pain of anathema, to regard the mass as the very sacrifice of Christ, and to believe that the bread and wine in the mass are the very Christ himself, and to worship them as such. Obedience to the Church of Rome, in this article alone, is absolutely incompatible with that undivided worship which the Almighty claims for himself, and with that trust in Christ alone for salvation, without which no sinner can serve his Maker here on earth, or hope for happiness in the world to come. Whether, therefore, other churches serve God or not, I tell my correspondent plainly, it is impossible for him to serve his Maker in the Church of Rome, without renouncing her fundamental doctrines, which would virtually be renouncing the church, and becoming Protestant.

The sum of the matter is this:—The Church of Rome establishes iniquity by law. She makes it imperative upon her members to believe error and to practise idolatry. To obey her is to disobey God. Protestant churches condemn such blasphemous tenets, and such idolatrous practices. They make it imperative upon no man to believe error, or to worship a creature, but recommend the word of God to all. In them, therefore, men may serve their Maker; in the Church of Rome they cannot. I shall be told again, that Papists disavow all idolatry, and that they curse all idol worshippers; but they do not deny the fact, that they render divine worship to the consecrated host, which every man who trusts his senses knows to be nothing but a bit of bread. I must therefore repeat my reply to the often repeated disavowal; if this be not idolatry, there never was such a thing in the world, and the words "idol worshipper" have no meaning.

I am afraid my readers will think I have wasted more time and paper in my reply to W. D. than his letter is entitled to; and indeed I have gone beyond what I at first intended; but as it is my wish to meet fully and fairly every objection to the Protestant religion that is of any importance, or that has a plausible ap-

pearance, I could not avoid going into detail upon some points on which Papists lay great stress, and by which they attempt to justify their obstinate adherence to such an antichristian communion. In order to set the matter as broadly before their eyes as possible, I have made some repetitions, which the intelligent reader will excuse, for the sake of those who require line upon line.

I shall conclude the present Number with an extract from the Life of our countryman, Mr Craig, who was some time colleague of John Knox in the ministry, in Edinburgh, which will illustrate what I have said in this Number with regard to the impossibility of making a profession of the truth, and serving God in the Church of Rome. I quote from the Christian Instructor, for July 1811.

"Mr Craig, in early life, had some scruples about certain articles of the Romish faith, which made him suspected of heresy; but these were removed by conversation with the famous Cardinal Pole, who was one of the most popular Romish ecclesiastics of the day. Mr Craig, captivated by his affability, and admiring him for his learning and good moral conduct, so entirely yielded himself to his arguments and instructions, that he became, in his own opinion, and in the opinion of all others, a confirmed Papist. He was a friar of the order of St Dominick. He was recommended by the Cardinal to the convent of that order in Bononia (now Bologne), where he so distinguished himself, that he was appointed Rector of the Great School in that city, by which he became connected with the University, which was then one of the most considerable in Europe.

"Being one day, in the year 1557, turning over some books in the library of the Inquisition, he observed amongst them a copy of Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion. He never had read that book, though the first edition of it was printed in the year 1536. Perhaps he had hitherto been afraid to read it, lest it should revive in his mind those scruples from which he had been relieved by Cardinal Pole. But his curiosity now prompted him to look into it, perhaps thinking that he was so well established in the Popish religion, as to be secure against any change. He first noticed that the diction was elegant Latin. This attracted him to read some parts, and these he found so interesting, that he resolved to take home the book, and to give the whole of it a serious perusal. Every paragraph, as he went on in his reading, and compared it with the sacred Scriptures, flashed conviction on his mind. He beheld the errors of the Church of Rome exposed, and the sure grounds pointed out, on which the doctrines of the Reformers were founded. It is sufficient to say, that, by the time he had finished his serious reading, he was become, through the blessing of God, a sincere and well-enlightened convert from Popery.

"But he was presently at a loss how to regulate his after-conduct, so as to satisfy his conscience on the one hand, and on the other to avoid the danger of persecution. He knew no Protestant in Bononia to whom he could open his mind. But there was an old friar, with whom he had loved to converse, and who was greatly respected for his sanctity, and his humble behaviour. In this good man, he thought he could place some confidence. He therefore engaged him in a long and serious conversation, in the course of which the doctrines of the Reformers were mentioned. But Mr Craig spoke of them so favourably, and with so much feeling, that the friar immediately suspected he had changed his principles, and charged him with it. He could not deny the charge; and then, to his utter astonishment, the friar, instead of upbraiding him, said, 'Brother, it is now many years since I embraced these opinions, but *I have kept the belief of them secret in my own breast; and my advice to you is to do the same, for you know that the times are perilous.*' If Mr Craig had followed the advice given him by the old man, he would have avoided the persecution which he afterwards met with. But he was a sincere and zealous convert, and felt a strong desire that others should be brought, as he had been, to the knowledge of the truth.

"Mr Row, in his manuscript history, which was written a long time before the publication of Spottiswood's History, tells us, that the following words of our blessed Saviour were powerful in Mr Craig's mind, (Mat. x. 32, 33.) 'Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven; and whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven.' He understood these words in a more extensive meaning than the friar seems to have done. He considered them as connected with a similar declaration, (Mark viii. 38.) 'Whoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels.' He therefore thought himself bound, not only to profess himself a Christian in general, but also, to whatever danger he might thereby be exposed, explicitly to confess, and to assert in his character of a public teacher, every doctrine and precept which he believed to be contained in the gospel of our Saviour. He urged his new principles in his conferences with the friars, and seems also to have stated them favourably in his sermons. The Romish zealots in the convent were highly offended. They failed in bringing him back to his former persuasion; and at last loudly complained of him as an

obstinate heretic. He was thereupon seized and cast into prison. But as he had many friends in Bononia who loved him, it was thought most expedient that he should be sent to the Inquisition at Rome, where he would meet with a more impartial judgment. Accordingly, Nov. 18th, 1558, he was conveyed as a prisoner to Rome; and Archbishop Spottiswood tells us, that at Rome he lay in great misery, in the prison of the Inquisition, nine months. In all the rigorous examinations to which he was subjected, he was enabled to be constant in his profession. At last, August 18th, 1559, he was brought before his judges, to hear sentence pronounced upon him. The sentence was, that the next day, viz. August 19th, he should be publicly burnt as a heretic. Mr Row informs us that there were some other persons condemned to suffer along with him.

"While he and his companions, expecting to be executed the next day, were spending the night in prayer, in godly conference, and in singing of psalms, the door of the prison was suddenly opened, and a man whom they did not know, entered, and told them that they were free. They were astonished, and at first dreaded that some snare was laid to increase their sufferings. But the man told them that the Pope had died that night, and that all the prisons in Rome were laid open. It was indeed the case, for Paul IV. had died that night. Mr Row says, it was customary at the death of a Pope to liberate all prisoners. Such as were confined for debt were not recalled; but such as had been guilty of heresy, or of offences committed against the church, were quickly pursued, and forcibly brought back."

Mr Craig, however, escaped, and by a series of singular interpositions of Providence, he at last got safe to his native country; and though not an originator, he was singularly useful in helping forward the happy Reformation, of which we at this day are enjoying the benefit. Not to speak of the crown of righteousness which such a faithful servant of Christ, and a martyr in purpose, though saved from a violent death, is now honoured to wear, how noble does he appear even in the esteem of his fellow-men, in comparison with the poor cowardly friar, who, though convinced of the truth, was afraid to confess it, and who had not the courage "to serve his Maker here on earth!"

No. CXIII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 9TH, 1820.

I FEEL strongly inclined to favour my readers with one or two Numbers more of light and miscellaneous reading, before I enter upon the discussion of any of the more grave subjects which I have proposed for consideration. I did not know till of late, that a smart controversy took place about a dozen of years ago, in the North of England, in consequence of a charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Durham, by the truly venerable bishop of that see, entitled "The grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome." This charge, though intended chiefly for the instruction and warning of the clergy under his lordship's immediate inspection, happened to touch upon some points, on which Papists always feel extremely sore. Some of them, priests I presume, from their pedantic show of learning, began to attack, or rather to nibble at this said charge, though it does not appear that they could have any higher object in view, than the little fame that they hoped to acquire among their fellow Papists, by entering the lists with a person of his lordship's rank and character. Their puny efforts to commend the Popish, and malign the Protestant faith, were powerfully opposed by different writers, whose names are not given. The pieces on both sides were collected, and they form two neat volumes.

In one of the Protestant pieces, I find the following very striking observations, which are given as the words of a divine of the Church of England, of a former century:—"The grand enemy of mankind hath, by various ways and means, all along, contrived and endeavoured to defeat the designs of heaven for the good and happiness of men; and, as the divine wisdom hath, in several ages of the world, manifested itself for the encouraging and promoting of true righteousness and holiness; so hath the devil always been at work, to bring forward, in opposition, what he could find most proper, for the hindering of the good effects of God's kindness towards us. When the fulness of time came, by the appearance of the Son of God in the world, he was, in a great measure, dethroned; his kingdom was overthrown; and the last and most effectual means were used, for the recovery of men out of his snare and power. When, therefore, he perceived, that, by all the grievous persecutions he raised against the church, it spread only so much the faster; that, at last, the whole heathen world fell down before the cross of Christ; when he was expelled with shame out of his temples, and from his altars, when his oracles were silenced, and the religion of Jesus prevailed every where;—he then betook himself to his old serpentine arts of dissimulation. Since he could no longer oppose Christ's kingdom by open war, he resolved to *turn Christian*, and to set up for Christ's *deputy* and *substitute* here on earth; to fight against Christianity under Christ's banner; and by adulterating and corrupting the Christian doc-

trine, to spoil it of all its efficacy; and to introduce his old heathen rites, and idolatrous ceremonies, as unwritten traditions from Christ himself, or his apostles;—and so under *his* name, and pretended authority, to exercise all that cruelty, oppression, and fraud, which is so pleasant to his own infernal nature; hoping to burn, destroy, and root out, all true Christians from the face of the earth, under colour of propagating the Catholic faith, and enlarging Christ's kingdom in the world.

"When Christendom had long groaned under this miserable tyranny, it pleased God, in many places of Europe, but especially here in England, to set on foot a *Reformation* of religion; which was happily and peaceably accomplished among us, by the favour and countenance of public authority, and the wise counsel and advice of our reverend bishops and other ministers. To nip this in the bud, the devil raised that sharp persecution in Queen Mary's days, in which our first Reformers gloriously sealed what they had done with their blood. But this proving altogether ineffectual, that he might the better frustrate the ends of our Reformation, *himself would turn Reformer too.*"

The author proceeds to show how the devil effected his purpose, by exciting the extravagance of certain sects in England; but his diabolical efforts were not confined to that kingdom. They were at least equally successful in other places, especially on the continent, and almost under the eye of the great German Reformer, where certain zealots did more injury to the cause of reformation, by their ridiculous caricature of it, than the Pope, with all his army of priests was able to do. This, as our author justly observes, was the work of the devil in his new character of a Reformer.

For centuries before the Reformation, and ever since, till within these few years, the devil found means to keep the great part of what is called Christendom, in gross ignorance. He succeeded so far, as to establish it as a maxim that "ignorance is the mother of devotion;" and his blinded adherents, I mean the devoted vassals of the Pope of Rome, never seem to have thought, that education would be of any use to the common people. They rather considered it as a dangerous thing; and used every effort in their power to prevent them from acquiring any more knowledge of religion, than they themselves were pleased to communicate. Of late years, however, the subject of extending the benefits of education has occupied so much of the public attention; it has appeared, to all classes of the community, a matter of so much importance to teach the poor the art of reading; and the establishment of schools for the purpose, particularly in Ireland, has received so much public support, and has in fact become so popular, that it would not do to appear to oppose the work of education any longer. The devil, therefore, must now have recourse to some other shift; and as of old he professed to become Christian, with the view of destroying Christianity; and Reformer, with the view of discrediting the Reformation, so now, in order to obstruct and hinder the work of education, he has determined *to become Schoolmaster.*

The fact of this is clearly proved by the noise that the Pope of Rome, and the popish Archbishop of Tuam, have lately made about the establishment of schools, in order to instruct the *innocent* youth of their communion. There was not a whisper of any thing of the kind while the people of Ireland were sitting in gross darkness, and while no effort was made to impart to them the light of knowledge. But since the establishment of the Hibernian and other Societies; and since it became very probable that all the youth in Ireland would soon be taught to read the word of God, then the Pope and his ghostly agents appear like men awaked out of sleep; they are all at once upon the alert; they will have schools of their own; and they are determined that the youth of their communion shall not be allowed to acquire the art of reading from any but teachers of their own appointment, and of their own faith.

Some persons may suppose that this is nothing but a commendable emulation, excited by their Protestant neighbours; and a tacit acknowledgment that they have been guilty of culpable inattention to the education of their people; but it is in fact neither the one nor the other. The "cloven foot" is not so artfully concealed as it has often been in other cases; for the education commanded by the Pope, and provided by his clergy, for the poor in Ireland, is avowedly such an education as shall exclude the reading of the word of God, and withdraw the children from the schools in which they are in danger of being taught to read it: and whatever sort of men the priests may appoint to superintend such schools, I have no hesitation in putting them on a footing with other inventions of the devil, intended to oppose the truth, and to perpetuate error.

It appears from the Reports of different societies, that many of the schools in Ireland are disturbed, from time to time, by the impertinent interference of popish priests, who insult the teachers, and terrify the children, and even drive out of the school such as they conceive to belong to their communion. I shall give here a recent instance of this, with a most reverend archbishop's approbation of the fact; and then I shall show what sort of education the priests have prepared for the poor children, of whom they claim the exclusive oversight.

Letter from the Secretaries of the Dublin Sunday School Union, to the Most Rev. Dr Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.

No. 16, Upper Sackville-street, 7th Sept., 1819.

My Lord,

It is with very great pain we feel ourselves obliged to call your Lordship's attention to a transaction which occurred on Sunday the 2nd ulto.—the circumstances attending which are shortly as follows:

One of the objects aimed at by the Society of which we have the honour of being Secretaries, is to establish Sunday Schools throughout the city, in such situations as may seem to be most in need of them; and among other similar institutions, our Committee were enabled, by the kindness of friends, to begin a small Sunday School on the 28th of March last, in Sampson's lane, off Moore street. Since that period this school has been carried on with considerable diligence, and with some prospect of success; the only endeavour of the teachers being to make their pupils able to read the Sacred Scriptures, and to understand the meaning of what they read. But on the day already mentioned, the Rev. Mr Salmon, of Liffey-street Chapel, entered the School, took the books from the hands of several of the children, and in an authoritative manner, ordered all that were Catholics peremptorily to leave the place; he in effect forcibly turned the children out of the School, and accompanied his conduct with such observations, as showed that his hostility to such institutions was of the most decided description.

Convinced, as we all are, of the feelings that such a procedure must excite, not only in the breast of your lordship, but of every well-wisher to the good morals and peace of society, we consider it an imperative duty laid upon us, to state to you the occurrence explicitly as it happened. We are constrained to do so, not only from the circumstance of its affording your lordship an opportunity of expressing your sentiments on the subject, but as the gentleman of whom we complain stated that he was a curate in your lordship's diocese, and that he was determined in future to oppose all Sunday Schools. For himself, we can only regret the mistaken views which could lead him to such a determination; but for our own sakes, we have most respectfully to solicit, that your lordship will take such precautionary measures, as will prevent him on any future occasion from molesting our Schools.

It will always be with extreme reluctance that our Committee will appeal to the constituted authorities of the country for protection, but if the restraints of professional character, of civil decorum, or of superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction, should be found insufficient to hinder this individual, or any other, from rudely disturbing these peaceful seminaries of knowledge, which we have under our care, your lordship must perceive that such an appeal is unavoidable.

Our Committee will hold a meeting at No. 16, Upper Sackville-street, on Tuesday evening next, the 14th instant, for the purpose of receiving your lordship's answer on the subject, and in the mean time, we are, with great respect, my Lord, your lordship's very obedient and humble servants,

(Signed,) W. Smith, Jun. } *Secs.*
M. Pollock }

Most Rev. Dr Troy, &c. &c.

P. S. In addition to the above, it should also be stated, that the attendance of the children was perfectly free and voluntary, not only on their own part, but that of their parents; as may be confirmed by their parents' declarations, both before this transaction and since. Indeed, many of the children were specially given in charge to the teachers, by their parents and other guardians. No inquiry as to particular religious profession was ever made by the teachers; nor, until the Rev. Mr Salmon divided the School in the unpleasant manner we mention, did they know to what distinctive communion their scholars belonged.

(Signed,) W. S. Jun.
M. P.

Letter from the Most Rev. Dr Troy, to the Secretaries of the Sunday School Union.

3, Cavendish-Row, Dublin, 13th Sept., 1819.

Gentlemen,

The Catholic Church sanctions no other English version of the Sacred Scriptures but the Doway edition, translated from the Latin Vulgate of St Jerome, in the fourth century; and which, when accompanied with appropriate notes and comments, is permitted to be read by the learned and the lettered: she does not, however, approve of the Holy Bible being degraded to the level of a common school book, or capriciously explained by unauthorized commentators. Histories of the Bible, historical and moral extracts from it, and Catechisms, are generally used in Catholic schools.

The present learned bishops of Lincoln and Peterborough, and other eminent divines of the Established Church in England and Ireland, have proved the inexpediency and danger to religion, from reading the Bible without note or comment; and of submitting it to the interpretation of every reader's private judgment, which experience has proved to be a prolific hive, from which have issued countless swarms of sectaries, distracting Christendom, each clamorously appealing to the Bible, the Bible, and however disunited amongst themselves, all arrayed in hostility to the Catholic Parent Church, which they most uncharitably continue to misrepresent and calumniate.

Christianity was preached before the gospels were written and published; were the Bible alone sufficient for the knowledge of religion, the ministry of the word would be superfluous and the sacred ministry itself rendered useless.

The Catholic Church does therefore prohibit the youth of her communion to frequent schools in these kingdoms, where a different version of the Scriptures from that of Doway is used, or where unauthorized persons assume a right to expound the divine oracles; in which saint Peter says in his 2nd Epistle, *That there are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own perdition, and that no prophecy of the Scripture is made by private interpretation.*

Conformably, therefore, to those maxims, and to the uniform discipline of the Catholic Church, Rev. Mr Salmon went to your School, to withdraw the Catholic children from it, at the very time when religious and moral instructions were given—particularly to children, in Liffey-street parish Chapel. He cannot on this account be justly accused of opposition to the constituted authorities, which allow the free exercise of the Catholic religion, and the authority of its ministers to instruct the ignorant of their communion.

Protestants and Catholics may zealously concur in promoting a general education of the poor, and still maintain the faith and discipline of their respective churches. If this be not permitted, no system of general education can succeed; why then are Catholic poor children invited to schools where their catechism is not taught, and a prohibited version of the Bible without note or comment is used, and explained by incompetent unauthorized persons?

As to the particular conduct of Rev. Mr Salmon, I should be sorry indeed that he would act on any occasion in a manner unbecoming the meekness of a clergyman, or the manners of a gentleman. I this moment receive his inclosed explanatory letter, and have the honour to be with great respect, and in the spirit of perfect charity, Gentlemen, your very humble servant,

(Signed,) J. T. TROY.

W. Smith, Jun. & M. Pollock. Esqrs. &c.

I shall now proceed to show what sort of an education it is which the priests have provided for the youth of their communion, whom they are now willing to instruct in the art of reading. Archbishop Troy says, that "Histories of the Bible, historical and moral extracts from it, and Catechisms, are generally used in Catholic schools." Now I happen to have in my possession a great number of these catechisms, and also some of their histories of the Bible, with historical and moral extracts from it, and I do not hesitate to say, that all of them are just what we might expect from the devil, professing to be Christian. The Christian vocabulary is used to a certain extent; language that savours of the love of God is introduced; but the tendency of the whole is to alienate the mind from the knowledge of God as he is revealed to us in the scriptures, and to lead the deluded worshipper to dependence on himself, or on some other creature.

I shall, at present, confine myself to the celebrated school book, edited by W. E. Andrews, which Dr Milner, Vicar Apostolic of the midland district, England, declares to be "the most complete and valuable work of its kind in our language, and eminently entitled to the patronage of the Catholic public;" and the right reverend prelate promises to recommend it in those places of education over which he has any authority or influence. Nay, as I showed in my first volume, this work is praised by a correspondent of the author, as a much better book than the Bible, because from it one will acquire a better knowledge of religion at one reading, than he will learn from the Bible in a whole life. I shall now favour the reader with a sample of the doctrine which is taught by this, which some of our English Papists consider the best of all books.

"The souls of some, who have not been very good during their life-time, and yet have had pardon of their sins, will go into a prison, called purgatory, for a while;" page 67, 4th ed. The reader will observe, that the pardon of their sins here spoken of, is that which a priest can grant for money; and having obtained this, they need not be very anxious about the future, though they have not been very good persons; as they will only go to prison "for a while."

To a child, the author thus addresses himself: "By Baptism which you have received, you are washed from original sin, by the application of the merits of the blood of Jesus Christ; delivered from the universal curse of mankind incurred by sin, and freed from the power of the devil. You have been made a child of God; the disciple of Jesus Christ our Saviour. You have acquired God for your father, Jesus Christ for your master, your instructor, your example, and for the rule of your life; the holy church for your mother and guardian; the angels for your protectors, the saints for your intercessors. You have been made the temple of God, who dwells in you by his grace. The heir of his eternal kingdom, from the title and hope of which you were fallen for ever; and you are brought back into the secure way that leads to it, being made a member of Jesus Christ and his church, out of which all those who obstinately remain cannot be saved, and wherein you are now illuminated with the light of the faith of Jesus Christ, instructed by his doctrine, nourished by his precious

body and blood, assisted by his grace, and furnished with all the necessary means for your salvation," page 116. All these blessed things are said to belong to the young Papist, not as having received the Holy Spirit, for in that case the statement would be partly true, but merely because he has received a sprinkling of holy water from the hand of a priest. I do not know any thing that can have a more pernicious effect upon the youthful mind than this.

In perfect consistence with the well known character of Popery, this best of all school books teaches, page 177, that a lie is not a mortal sin, when it is not in a matter of consequence. It is admited, indeed, that "a lie is always a sin, because it is always against the truth, known to be such by him that speaks;" and that "the habit of lying, although lightly, is not a light thing, nor of small consequence." There is here an attempt to guard the error, because it would not be creditable to teach the venial nature of a lie without some such qualifying expressions; but when it is plainly taught that a lie in any sense is not a mortal sin, every Christian must hold it as a doctrine of the devil, who was a liar from the beginning, and who, since he has become schoolmaster, will, no doubt, endeavour to persuade the Popish youth to believe in the purity of his own character, and the innocence of his own practice.

In the account which this writer gives of the feasts and fasts of the church, there is such a mass of superstition and will-worship, that it is impossible for a person to perceive any traces of real Christianity. The virgin Mary and the saints appear to be every thing; and the Saviour, in comparison, appears as nothing. The virgin Mary is declared to be "the Mother of purity itself;" and speaking of her child-birth, when she brought forth Jesus, it is called that "to which, out of her great *humility*, *she submitted*."

Such is the instruction provided for our Popish youth, in what is called by a bishop of their church, the most valuable work of its kind in our language. I appeal now to the Christian reader, whether I have not made good the assertion with which I set out, that the devil himself has become schoolmaster.

No. CXIV.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16TH, 1820.

IN consequence of the very extensive circulation of my Work in Ireland, I have lately acquired some more valuable correspondents belonging to that country; and from them a great deal of information, which will be interesting to my readers. Without farther preface, I shall proceed to give the substance of a letter which I received about two months ago.

"SIR,—I have just read, with much pleasure and interest, your first volume of THE PROTESTANT.* It only came into my hands last week, or I should have communicated with you sooner. I have long desired to see such a publication as yours, and I trust it will get into circulation in this benighted country.—I could not read your publication without desiring to give you any information that I think may be useful to you in conducting a Work that is calculated to excite so much attention. My first communication shall be to give you a fuller account of Dr Lanigan's business than you seem to possess; (see No. XXXIX., page 130, in which this reverend Doctor is introduced as giving five reasons why a promise may be broken), as it is one of the extraordinary instances of the character of modern Popery, where it has power, that it discovers the high sense of the rights of honour, conscience and citizenship, for which Vindicator would make it stand remarkable. I must preface my story, in order to give it to you at large.

"In the beginning of 1808, there appeared an infamous paragraph in one of the Dublin papers, saying, that Mr R., of Kilkenny, preached a violent Orange sermon in the church there, on the Sunday preceding; and some strong expressions were quoted, as if used by him. It was a day on which some soldiers of an Orange lodge went to church in some procession, which made Mr R. preach a sermon determinately opposite to what was said in the paragraph, in which he besought the congregation to live, as far as possible, at peace with all men. Mr R. got his attorney to write to the printer, to say that he purposed to prosecute him for the libel. The printer gave up a priest of that town, as the writer of the paragraph. Mr R. consulted with a friend on the occasion, wishing to preserve peace as much as he could. It was agreed that this friend should call on the priest, inform him that they had his letter, ask him to make a private apology, and contradict, by another anonymous paragraph, what he had written on the ground of misinformation. He accordingly went with another friend, spoke to him as mildly as he could, and mentioned the only thing he required. He listened with surprise for some time, without answering, affected great astonishment at such a charge, and denied it flatly. When told that the information was positive, he dropt down on one knee, put his hand to his heart, and protested before God, by his priesthood, and by the mass which he had just celebrated, that he never sent

* The first edition was issued in four volumes.

such a paragraph to the printer. Greatly shocked by such a mode of asseveration, the gentleman who was in possession of the letter, produced it, and left him to read it. He went from him to Dr Lanigan, his bishop, for he was one of Lanigan's curates, mentioned to him the circumstance, without fully repeating his protest, but told him that he had made a solemn appeal to heaven. Dr Lanigan *seemed* very indignant; said in a pompous way, that he would not suffer such a man to remain longer in the town than it was possible to get him removed, and that he would show him his displeasure in a most marked manner. In a little time he did remove him, but it was from a curacy of £25 a year, with scarce any perquisites, to a situation in the country of five times the value. So much for Popish honour and conscience. Jesuitism need not be revived by a Bull, or by colleges; it exists in full power and action.

"Immediately after this, Dr Milner, having said and unsaid to Mr Ponsonby on the veto business; having published and contradicted, and published and contradicted again; found it necessary not to commit himself any more by writing, but come over to Ireland, to stop, by personal communication with the bishops, &c. the growing inclination to grant the veto. Already the primate and his diocese, by public resolutions, had granted it. This diocese was proceeding to follow him, the resolutions were drawn up, which Dr Lanigan promised to sign. Dr Milner had the same week invited a number of bishops or legates to meet him at Cork, at the consecration of a splendid new chapel, which was an excellent opportunity and excuse for meeting. After all the abominations of the consecration, which lasted several hours, with all the forms, charms, and spells, by which superstition is fascinated and fed, they had a private convocation. Dr Milner declared his abhorrence of the intended concession, which originated with himself, and was kept up as long as he thought it could impose; but now it must be put down by all means. The bishops and legates hastened home; all their agents were set at work; and immediately that which was ready to be cheerfully granted, was denounced as a greater abomination than the penal laws in the fullest letter of the old statutes. Milner set off to Kilkenny. Dr Lanigan, who was not at Cork, had his eyes opened immediately, as if by the very clergy and inhabitants that one week before publicly voted for the resolutions, and ordered them to be prepared for signature: so quickly does darkness become light; and light darkness in popish minds! The two chairmen of the meeting were independent men, Major B. a man of large fortune, the other Mr. L. a banker in the town. These men refused to retract their signature; and Major B. hurt at Dr Lanigan's message, put in the advertisement which provoked the five reasons for breaking a promise, and they required all the reasons of all the angelic doctors of the calendar. The bishop was determined to punish the chairmen and oblige them to retract. The priest already mentioned, had proved himself a fit instrument for such work. He went round the country, sent in the farmers to run upon, and break L.'s bank, they came in thousands, the Protestant noblemen and gentlemen of the country came forward to assist L. brought in their national paper, published an advertisement to say that they would take his notes for all rents, &c. and threatening tenants who should join in such a conspiracy; but Popery in this country is not so easily overcome. The people crowded in,—they threatened the banker's life, to consume his houses, destroy his cattle, and had actually houghed some of them. He held out for a week;—at length terrified, he sent one of the most respectable gentlemen of the place to the bishop, with his written recantation; craved pardon for his offence in daring to follow his conscience in opposition to a bishop's mandate, and requested the bishop to come and disperse the mob. The bishop came, and before the city, standing in a place where he could be seen, he raised his hand, and simply said, "My friends, begone," and the people instantly went off with a shout; and in the evening had an immense bonfire to celebrate the triumph of Popery over all the rights of conscience, citizenship, and protection of a British subject.

"The triumph did not end here. Major B. still was obstinate. His military pride would not allow him to yield so soon. But he must be subdued. While such a Mordecai was at the gate, the power of the bishop would not be supreme. The same priest was set to work. He denounced the Major under the name of a fox, whom he called the people to hunt out of the country. The Major made great threats; —said he would go and live in England, and rear his children Protestants; but he knew not the power of the spells of Popery. They are not to be broken by the resolutions of pride. The priest created such a spirit against him in the country, that he, at length, getting terrified, or rather overpowered by superstition, yielded; and, in order to reconcile himself, appointed with a farmer, who had a daughter about to be married, to ask him to the wedding, that he might meet the priest, and make friends. He did so: the Major met him, and they were reconciled. The Major has been since the champion of antivetoism; and sat in the chair when certain resolutions were carried, that the printer prosecuted for them, was sentenced to two years' imprisonment, and to pay a large fine.

"Such was Popery, in 1808, and such it is now. In Glasgow those things could not take place; but they may where the Papists are 19

to 1. Of all those things I was an eye witness. I saw Popery in this day what it was in the days of Henry IV. In case you should mention any of these circumstances in your publication, you have hundreds of witnesses on the spot to prove them. I am, &c."

As the above are not matters of private anecdote, it is not necessary that I give the name of the writer. My Kilkenny readers may satisfy themselves of their truth; and any person who has a correspondent in that quarter, may do the same. These few facts are worth fifty arguments, to show the true character of Popery. The mystery is, that men entitled to the privileges of free-born British subjects, should submit to such intolerable tyranny; especially that a people so acute, and so high-minded as the Irish, should submit to it. We have here presented, in a striking light, the power which the priests have over the bodies, and minds, and the property of the people; and, if the object of their dictation were the election of a member of Parliament, what freeholder would dare to refuse his vote to any candidate whom a bishop should set up, though he knew him to be a man who would use his influence to bring the kingdom under subjection to the see and the court of Rome?

The following narrative of a recent conversion from Popery, by means of reading the New Testament, was received lately by a gentleman of this city, from a friend in Ireland, who says, "you may rely on the account being true." "I send you a full account of the Harts, and the miraculous leadings of Providence in the course of their lives.—This venerable old man is now aged ninety, a strong man, of delightful countenance, sound judgment, and in good circumstances. He was religious in his way. His wife and he thought, as God was blessing them in temporals, they should earn their everlasting salvation; and so to work they went. And as they were both just; liable to no penance by station; so then they concluded they had wrought out their salvation to all intents and purposes, overlooking the Lord in the matter. But over and above, they must do something for their friends, or to bequeath to whoever had most need. Called at the eleventh hour, I sat up almost all night to hear his account, and, O the depths! &c. This man had a large family of sons and daughters. Bartly, the oldest, was of a weak constitution; so he was educated for a priest. He obstinately refused the priesthood, which much displeased his father; but he gave him £30 to buy yarn, which sum did not last above two years. He then gave him £10 for hardware. Bartly from his youth was esteemed a little saint, and was up to all the orders and superstitions of Popery, which caused the father in a measure to overlook his disappointments. But to crown all, he married one of the lowest of the people, without his consent and without portion. They were soon in the depths of poverty. He lived two years in a hut, in a wild mountain; and none of his friends heard of him. At length poverty drove him to his father's house, where he was very coolly received. The father, however, gave him a small division of land; but he was so overloaded with superstition, that he got under seven orders, by which he fasted on one bad meal, for three days in a week, for a year, and, at some seasons, for twenty-four hours. He would travel from ten to twenty miles to perform a station. In these stations, they leave their skin and flesh upon the stones. The first station is fifteen miles off; they must travel bare-footed to the place, and then ascend the rocks, though a very ready passage otherwise, and at every marked place down upon their bare knees, till the top is gained; and though their feet and knees are much bruised, yet this is but an amusement to what follows.

"Upon the top of the mountain there is a round mount, of the circumference of about a hundred perches, of rough stone and gravel. Round this upon their bare knees they must go, until they are exhausted; and the descent, upon their return, is much more severe than the ascent; and for a great part of the way, they must creep on their hands and feet. O, said Bartly, if you had been there the day after me, you would have seen my flesh and blood upon the stones. But, said another brother, I saw him at B—l, where he had a great distance to go on his knees; and lest his whole weight would not be sufficient, he clasped his hand upon the crown of his head, to press himself with greater weight upon the stones. (The poor man, it seems, had not studied the laws of gravity.) Another brother declared, he was twelve months before he recovered the pains of his knees. He did penance at Lough Derg, and many other stations after this, and yet obtained no peace of mind, and he often cried bitterly. In this state of mind he continued, until happening to read the lives of the saints (a most superstitious book), O, said he, I have done nothing! So he concluded he would leave wife and family, and starve himself to death. He got a coarse sack, and stitched it up to his chin, determining to wear it all his days instead of a shirt. In this state he continued many days. Distress was pressing hard upon him on the one hand, and agitation of mind on the other, for he neglected all business. But he determined to sell the little place that his father had given him, and commence pedlar again. Accordingly he sold it for £7. He and the family travelled until they entered the barony of Tyrnagh. Upon his arrival there, he heard of a Mr Carlan (a man who was designed for a priest, but recanted, of whom you might have heard much), and a very bad report he

every where heard of him;—that he was termed swaddler, and had done very much harm. Thinks Bartly, if I could see him, I would soon confound his heresy, &c. He rambled on till he came to where Carlan was; and he saw an Irish Testament with one of his scholars, and thought if he had £100, he would give it to be able to read it. He soon got into argument with Carlan; and after finding, that he could read tolerably well, thinks he, if this book be true, I am wrong. From this he dates his conversion; and, by reading and conversation, the Lord has not only opened his mind, but made him useful to others. The fear of man pressed hard on him, and he dreaded his friends' hearing of the change; so he built a cabin in T———le, about 20 miles from his friends. The wonderful news reached the old father; and the old man told me, it would have been joyful news, in comparison of this, if he had heard that his son had stolen a cow, and been hanged for it. But he still hoped it might be false. At length, says the youngest brother, John, I will go and hear the truth of all. At first, he made a furious charge upon Bartly, which he sustained with great patience; and begged he would sit down and stay all night. Bartly took the Irish Testament. The novelty of it attracted the brother's attention, and he staid the second night; and by the middle of the week, he was as confirmed a Protestant as Bartly himself; and so they continued together fourteen days. By this time, the Lord had so strengthened Bartly, that neither fear nor shame prevented him from declaring the glad tidings of salvation to his fellow-sinners. He ventured even to go to his father; and leaving his brother in his place, he arrived at his father's at night; and a trying scene ensued. There were none within but the old couple; and as soon as the father knew it was Bartly, he leapt up and seized a cudgel, and made a dreadful blow at Bartly, who evaded the blow, and with uplifted hands, prayed him to desist; but the old man repeated his blows, till the poor old woman grasped him, declaring, that she thought some of the blows would have killed his son; and thus she got him a little pacified. He was upon the whole a sober patient man; and when he became a little cool, he began to ask Bartly some questions. He took his Testament, and began to read and explain the way of salvation, showing how God could be just, and the justifier of the ungodly, exclusive of their own merits; and brought the doctrine so closely home, that the old people themselves were fully convinced. They related these matters with praise and joy; and told me also that the other son, Con. was not at home that night; but he being of a solid judgment, and naturally inquisitive after knowledge, when he had the nature of the gospel explained to him by Bartly, embraced the truth; and he is of infinite use in Bartly's absence, being engaged in every public place in defending the truth, and from his peaceable temper and sound judgment, there is attention paid to him, even by the enemies of the truth."

It will occur to the intelligent reader, that there is something uncommon in the conversion of this family. They yield to the power of truth more readily than is usual by decided enemies, whether popish or heathen. This, though uncommon, is by no means incredible. Conversion from sin to holiness is entirely of God; and though, in general, the strong principle of error, which has naturally possession of the human heart, does not yield without a protracted struggle, it yields under the influence of the Divine Spirit, as certainly in a moment as in a year. The story, however, is so respectably authenticated, that I have no doubt of its truth in every particular.

By the kindness of other correspondents, I have been put in possession of a great number of Popish tracts and books of devotion, lately printed in Dublin and Cork, which show, that, in point of doctrine, Popery in Ireland retains all the grossness of the darkest ages; and that the idolatry of saint-worship is inculcated as explicitly as ever it was in Italy or Spain. The following are the titles of some of the books which I refer to:—"Hell opened to Christians;" 1815; with most horrible cuts representing the torments of the damned. "Stations and Devotions on the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ crucified," Cork, 1814. "The Indulgences of the Cord of St Francis," Dublin, 1797. "Rules of the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," Cork, 1815. "A Short Treatise of the antiquity, &c. of the most famous and ancient Confraternity of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel; commonly called the Scapular," Dublin, no date. "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine," &c. called the Catechism of the four Archbishops. "A Net for the Fishers of Men," Dublin, 1799. "Meditations and Prayers, adapted to the Stations of the holy Way of the Cross," Dublin, 1815. "The Path to Paradise: being the Catholic's Companion to the most Adorable Sacrament of the Altar," Dublin, 1820. "Bona Mors; or the Art of Dying Happily in the congregation of Jesus Christ crucified, and of his condoling Mother." "The Life and Death of the most glorious Virgin Mary," Dublin, 1814. "Some Reflections upon the Prerogatives, Power, and Protection of St Joseph, spouse of the blessed and ever immaculate Virgin Mary," Dublin, 1810. The last mentioned represents Joseph as an object of worship, trust, and confidence; in heaven, next to his wife; and gives a number of examples of persons applying to him in their distress, and receiving relief. It contains several hymns to his honour; and forms of prayer addressed to him, of which take the following as a specimen:

—"O holy Joseph, Virgin spouse of the Virgin mother of God; most glorious advocate of all such as are in danger, or in their last agony; and most faithful protector of all the servants of Mary, your dearest spouse. I, N. N. in the presence of Jesus and Mary, do from this moment choose you for my lord and master, for my powerful patron and advocate, for the obtaining a most happy death: and I firmly resolve and purpose never to forsake you, and never to say or do, or ever suffer any under my charge to say or do, any thing against your honour; receive me therefore for your perpetual servant, and recommend me to the constant protection of Mary, your dearest spouse, and to the everlasting mercies of Jesus my Saviour." And a great deal more to the same purpose.

Besides the gross impiety that pervades all these works, they are in point of style and taste deplorably low. They exhibit a beastly prostration of intellect, which compels one to think of Papists as if they were some degrees lower in the scale of being than their Protestant neighbours. Their most popular books are full of the most intolerable nonsense, as well as the most shocking blasphemy. Not to mention those whose titles I have given, I have before me a sermon preached by the present Pope, when he was bishop of Imola, in 1797, which is puffed up by the editor of the Orthodox Journal, in his number for last month, as a piece of extraordinary merit. As a fair specimen of the whole, I shall present the reader with the first sentence:—"The eternal displayed in time his omnipotence *outside himself*, and instantly appeared all created things." I have often said that the God of Papists is not the God of the Bible; and the present head of the Romish church confirms the assertion by letting us know, that his God is such a one as himself, who has an inside and an outside.

No. CXV.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23D, 1820.

I AM now about to enter upon a subject which I cannot look upon without some degree of anxiety, and even dismay, as it will scarcely be possible to do justice to it, without exciting, in the minds of my readers, feelings of abhorrence and disgust. I mean the constrained celibacy of the Romish priests. It is, however, a prominent part of the system of Popery, and one which has, as much as any other, laid the system open to the contempt and detestation of the world; and such a Work as that which I have undertaken, would be incomplete without a discussion of it, and an exposure of the monstrous wickedness which it has occasioned.

He who created man, declared concerning him, while yet in a state of innocency, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." Marriage was accordingly instituted in paradise, before sin entered into the world; and must, therefore, be considered as perfectly consistent with the most entire devotion to the service of God. After sin had entered, neither the man nor the woman was so capable of serving him as before; neither of them, indeed, could serve him at all, till renewed by faith in the promised Saviour, and sanctified by the grace of the Holy Spirit; but being so renewed, they were as capable of serving him while living together as man and wife, as if they had divorced each other, and a great deal more so. This union we find approved and blessed by God from the very beginning. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, seeing it was appointed by himself, for the preservation of the species, until the Messiah should come of the seed of the woman; and thereafter, until all the spiritual seed of the Messiah should be born into his family, which supposes their being first born into the world?

Christ himself honoured the union, by sanctioning the formation of it, on one occasion, by his presence; which we may be sure he would not have done, had there been any thing unlawful, or necessarily unholy in it; his inspired apostle, in the plainest language, asserts the lawfulness of every man having his own wife, and every woman her own husband; and the laws of Christ laid down with regard to the duties of man and wife, clearly imply the lawfulness of the connection.

I know it will be replied, that this is not the question. The Church of Rome, I shall be told, does not deny the lawfulness of marriage in general; but only that of the priests. But I ask, who are those priests on whose behalf such a distinction is made? If they are men, it is lawful for *every* man to have his own wife; and if they are not men, but fiends in human form, let them say so, and the world will know in what light to regard them.

It is not my intention to spend many Numbers on this subject. I feel like one treading on polluted ground, whose senses are assailed by offensive objects, and fetid effluvia; and shall endeavour to get over it as quickly as possible. I proceed, therefore, immediately, to lay down the doctrine of Rome upon this subject, and to expose its error and wickedness.

According to Bishop Hay, there are five things requisite in every one who is going to enter upon the priesthood; the last of which is, that "he be resolved to dedicate himself to the service of God, by perpetual chastity and celibacy." "Quest. Does the church oblige all those in sacred orders to live single and chaste? Ans. This she requires from them

in the strictest manner, so as to decree the severest penalties against those among them who violate this law; having sometimes ordered them to be deposed, sometimes to be excommunicated, sometimes to be imprisoned in monasteries, to spend their whole lives in penance. And the great council of Trent pronounces an anathema upon any one who shall dare to affirm, that, notwithstanding this prohibition of the church, it is lawful for any of them to marry, or that such marriage would be lawful in the sight of God."—*Sess.* xxiv. *can.* 9.

"Quest. On what principles does the church proceed, in so strictly prohibiting marriage to her clergy? Ans. Upon the following grounds laid down in the Holy Scripture: (1.) Because a life of purity and chastity is more excellent, more perfect, and more acceptable to God than the married state." In support of this strange proposition the author cites the words of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 25, 27, 38. But the doctrine is founded upon a most unwarrantable assumption,—that the married state is not, and cannot be a state of purity and chastity. His words must signify this at least, else why place these virtues in contrast with the state of marriage? Had he put them in contrast with their opposite vices, he would have expressed a mere truism, which nobody would have disputed. But where does he find, that marriage is the opposite of purity and chastity? Certainly not in the Word of God; for there it is divinely ordained as the means of promoting and maintaining them; as the reader may see in the very chapter which the bishop refers to as above.

But what has this to do with the celibacy of the clergy as a distinct order? Paul was not addressing clergymen, but the church of God which was in Corinth; and the whole chapter seems to be an answer to a letter which they had addressed to him, requesting his advice on the subject of marriage. This appears from the first verse. Now if the apostle had meant what the bishop would have him to mean, it would not be a prohibition of the clergy from marrying, for he asserts the right of himself to take a wife if he chose, and the practice of other apostles who had wives, in the 9th chap. verse 5th; but it would be a prohibition of all Christians from marrying, which would be contrary to the general tenor of the Bible, and the avowed purpose of God with regard to his church.

Now the fact is, the apostle's answer to the letter which the Christians in Corinth had sent to him, was not meant as a *general* dissuasive from marriage. It does not contain the slightest hint that celibacy was more pleasing to God than matrimony; but merely suggests some prudential considerations, suited to the time, and to the circumstances of those who had applied to him for advice and instruction. In giving his advice to the unmarried, he tells them that he does so in consideration of the "present distress," verse 26. In the distressing circumstances in which they were placed, and the sufferings which he foresaw they would be called to endure, he advised such as could conveniently remain single, rather to do so, than to involve themselves in the additional cares of a family. At the same time he left every individual to judge for himself, whether marrying or remaining single would be most conducive to his own comfort and purity; and if he found it to be the former, his advice was, by all means let him marry; in doing so he sinneth not, which would not be true, were marriage less pleasing to God than celibacy. No man with a pure mind would ever think of honourable marriage as a state of impurity. Bishop Hay's words are a libel upon all the virtuous husbands and wives in the world; and it is only because the minds and consciences of Romish priests are defiled by their own impure imaginations, and wicked practices, that they look upon that union which God has ordained, as less holy than the restrictions which they affect to impose upon themselves; though it is well known that there is more of affectation than reality, in their professed abhorrence of impurity, and admiration of chastity.

Our right reverend prelate proceeds in his argument as follows:—"This is also manifest from the special reward promised by our Saviour, and bestowed in heaven upon those who lead a chaste life: our Saviour says, "Amen, I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or parents, or wife, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, who shall not receive much more in this present time, and in the world to come, life everlasting," Luke xviii. 29. Let the reader remember, that this passage is adduced to support the doctrine, that it is more pleasing to God for a man not to have a wife, than to have one. And I ask every one who can read and understand the terms, whether they do not equally prove, that it is more pleasing to God to be without a house, than to have one; and to be without parents, than to have them? It would, indeed, tend very much to enhance the dignity of the Popish priesthood, if they could prove that they are personally, what was said of Melchisedec officially, that they are without father and mother, and that, like the image which fell from Jupiter, in the temple of Diana, they had dropt from the clouds. I hope they will thank me for this hint, which, if duly improved and followed up, may tend to excite greater veneration for their persons, than any imagination which could have entered into their own heads.

Christ's words in the passage cited, refer to circumstances in which the service of God may render it necessary for a man to forsake his nearest and dearest relatives, and even to lay down his life; but the question occurs

again, What has this to do with the celibacy of the clergy? and the answer must be, Nothing at all.

Again, speaking of those who continue unmarried, the bishop proceeds:—"The singular privileges which shall be bestowed on them in heaven, are described by St John, where he tells us, that they have the name of the Lamb, and the name of his Father, written in their foreheads, to distinguish them in a special manner from all the other saints; that they sing a new song before the throne of God, which no other can sing but themselves; and that they follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, always attending his sacred person, as his chaste and beloved spouses:" and describing those to whom such honours belong, "These are they," says he, "who were not defiled with women, for they are virgins," Rev. xiv. 1, 3, 4. And so, if we will take a Popish bishop's word for it, the "hundred and forty and four thousand," who surround the throne of the Lamb upon mount Sion, having his Father's name written in their foreheads, and who sing a new song, which none can learn but themselves, are to be considered merely as so many men and women who, in this world, chose to live unmarried. They are called the redeemed from the earth, to distinguish them from those who were not so redeemed; and therefore, according to the doctrine of this prelate, married persons can have no part in that redemption.

Such a mean and contracted idea of the church triumphant, could not possibly have place in the mind of any but such as believe the Head of the church to be created by a priest, and exhibited to their view in the form of a wafer. The worshippers of a wafer god may readily believe their idol to have 144,000 spouses, and thus their religion appears to be nearly the same with Hindooism and Mahomedanism. But the plural number is never used in Scripture, when speaking of the spouse of Christ. It is the one company of redeemed sinners; that is, his church, which he purchased with his own blood, and which he sanctifies and cleanses by the washing of water through the Word, that is his spouse. This is the spouse that he will present to himself, a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but holy and without blame before him in love, Eph. v. 26, 27; and so far is marriage from being a state that is not pleasing to God, that it is actually honoured by the Holy Spirit, in this very passage, by being used as a similitude, to represent the union between Christ and his church; as it is in many other passages of the Bible.

The bishop seems to have considered the "hundred and forty four thousand," as a company consisting only of priests and nuns, and such as they, who had lived in celibacy. These, he says, have their Father's name written in their foreheads; and he distinguishes them in a special manner from all the other saints. Now, if the above is to be taken literally as the specific number of persons, so highly favoured, what is to become of all the rest? The number must have been made up many ages ago; and it is vain for nuns and priests of the present day to expect admission into that company. The disciples of his reverence will perhaps reply, that out of the many millions who have lived in celibacy, since Popery became the prevailing religion in Europe, and who shall so live till the end of the world, there will not be found more than 144,000 who have actually kept the monastic vow. This I am by no means disposed to controvert; but then, what becomes of the much-vaunted superior purity and chastity of the monastic state of celibacy?

But the bishop was too wise to commit himself, and the character of his *holy* order, by such an argument as the above; and not knowing, perhaps, any better, he makes use of no argument at all to support his view of the passage; and he takes care not to give the entire unmutilated words of the verses to which he refers, well knowing, that if he had done so, any child who could read, would have seen that they had no relation whatever to the doctrine which he was labouring to establish.

The "hundred and forty four thousand," I take to be a mystical number, meant to represent the church of Christ in a state of glory and perfection. It is mentioned as one feature in the character of these blessed persons, "These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins." The bishop will have this to signify, they were not married persons; whereas, every one acquainted with the phraseology of the Bible, understands it to mean, they were stedfast in the faith of Christ, and devotion to him alone as their Lord and Saviour, and would not consent to give his glory to another. They are therefore distinguished from those who yielded themselves up to the whore who sitteth upon many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication. This meretricious personage is no other than the Church of Rome, which usurped dominion over the nations, which are called many waters; and the wickedness of the kings, or kingdoms of the earth, consisted in yielding themselves up to all her idolatries, and other abominations, (see Rev. xvii. throughout.) In hundreds of passages in the Old Testament, deviation from the worship of the true God is compared to conjugal infidelity. Idolatry is called adultery and fornication; and the apostle, adopting the Hebrew mode of expression, as he does in many other places, represents those who, in times of great temptation and suffering, during the period of antichrist's reign, should refuse

to commit idolatry, or submit to her superstitious rites, as pure persons, as without spot before God; that is, they were uncontaminated by the prevailing apostacy and idol-worship; they maintained their fidelity to their own God to the end of their lives; and many of them suffered the loss of life on that very account. Thus the great company whom the apostle saw before the throne of God, so far from being the monks and nuns of the Romish Church, were those who never submitted to, but protested against the abominable idolatries of that most corrupt communion.

The conclusion which Bishop Hay draws from the foregoing premises, which I have given in his own words, with quotation marks, is as follows:—"Seeing, therefore, that the office of the priesthood requires the most angelical purity, and the most sublime sanctity in those who are admitted to it, therefore the church has judged proper to oblige all who enter into that office, to embrace the more perfect state of chastity." Here again he assumes it as admitted, that marriage and chastity are things opposed to one another; than which nothing can be more opposite to the truth: but if it were true, it would not apply to priests only, but to all Christians without distinction; for there is nothing, in point of holiness, required of persons who hold office in the church, which is not required of every member. It was not to the priests, but to the whole congregation of Israel, that the Lord said, "Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God am holy:" and the apostle Peter takes up the words, and addresses them as a divine command, not to clergymen merely, but to the whole body of the Christians, who were scattered through the provinces of the Lesser Asia, 1 Pet. i. 16. And another apostle tells us plainly, that "without holiness, *no man* (he does not say, *no priest*) shall see the Lord," Heb. xii. 14. The thing is certainly true of every priest; but not more true with regard to him than any other man; and if such holiness be inconsistent with the married state, then it is unlawful for any Christian to marry, and the human species must become extinct as soon as Christianity becomes universal; for then there will be no more heathens, or unbelievers, or heretics, to preserve the race in existence in a lawful way.

I shall forbear answering the bishop's second reason, not because it is unanswerable; but because I do not know how to do it in proper language. His third reason is founded on what the apostle advises the Corinthians to do, in their circumstances of peculiar distress; but which was never meant as a general rule; and if it were, it could not be made to bear upon the clergy in particular. His fourth reason may be touched without the necessity of being polluted; and therefore, I shall give it entire: "(4.) The duties of their state, as pastors of the flock of Jesus Christ, make the married state in a manner incompatible with their vocation; for they are chosen by Jesus Christ, and separated from the rest of mankind, for the service of the gospel of God, Rom. i. 1, that they 'may go and bring forth fruit,' in the conversion of souls to God, and 'that their fruit may remain,' John xv. 16. They are dedicated, by their vocation, to this holy service of God, and his gospel; and are obliged to give their whole attention to the good of their people's souls; to instruct them; to administer the sacraments to them; to comfort them in their distress; to assist them in their sickness, and especially when death approaches; and, for this purpose, to answer their calls at all times, by night or by day, even though at the risk of their own life, when the good of their people's souls requires it. Now, it is evidently incompatible with the cares of a wife and family, to discharge all these duties properly; and therefore St Paul says, 'No man, being a soldier of God, entangleth himself with worldly business, that he may please him to whom he hath engaged himself,' 2 Tim. ii. 4. Now, the church, well knowing that no kind of worldly business entangleth a man so much from the duties of the pastoral charge, as the cares of a wife and family; therefore, on this account also, expressly requires of her pastors to abstain from a state so inconsistent with that charge."

The church is here described as "well knowing" something; but the accompanying remark shows her deplorable ignorance of the very subject under discussion. There is not one of the things mentioned as the duty of a faithful minister, at least not one that his Master imposes upon him, in which, so far from being hindered, he would not be assisted by an affectionate Christian wife. He who is single, must have some worldly care, were it only the cooking of his dinner, the making of his bed, and the washing and mending of his linens; but he who has a wife can devolve all these, and the care of his children too, and fifty other things, upon her; not that she will be able to do all with her own hands; but she can see that all be done, so as to leave her husband absolutely without carefulness about this world, and all things in it, and leave him, if he be so disposed, to devote himself entirely to the spiritual duties of his office. I am not speaking of a mere possibility; I am speaking of what I know to exist; and hundreds of ministers will say, Amen, to what I have here written. Popish priests cannot be judges of this question; for they know nothing of the matter. But the Holy Spirit, by his inspired apostles, has decided it, not by prohibiting ministers of the gospel from marrying; but by describing the character which their wives ought to sustain; which clearly implies, that

it was lawful, and not unprofitable for them to have wives.

The bishop's fifth reason is a virtual concession of the point; for he asserts, what is true, that the apostles did not enjoin celibacy upon the bishops of the primitive church. "In the apostles' time," says he, "when the church began, there was a necessity for taking married people into the priesthood, because for want of hands, there was no room for choice; and, therefore, the apostles did not make any express law against doing so; yet we find the strongest injunctions in their sacred writings, that all who were admitted into that holy state should live chaste and continent lives; thus St Paul affirms, that 'a bishop must be—sober, just, holy, continent,' Tit. i. 8; and writing to Timothy on the virtues proper for his state as a pastor, he says, 'be thou an example to the faithful, in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, in chastity,' 1 Tim. iv. 12; and again, 'I charge thee before God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels—keep thyself chaste,' 1 Tim. v. 21, 23; and giving a catalogue of the virtues belonging to the ministry of Christ, he says, 'In all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God in much patience—in chastity,' 2 Cor. vi. 4, 6. In consequence of this, we find, from the earliest monuments of antiquity, that, even when married people were admitted into the sacred ministry, they generally abstained from all cohabitation with their wives after that; till in process of time, when the number of the faithful increased, so that there was no difficulty of getting plenty of young people trained up to the service of the church, the law was made, for all the above reasons, obliging all who entered into sacred orders, to observe a perpetual chastity,"—vol. 2. chap. 26.

Here it is plainly admitted, that whoever made this iniquitous law, Christ and his apostles had no hand in it. We shall trace its origin, and history, and deplorable consequences, in a future Number. In the meantime, I shall conclude with remarking, that his reverence, in citing the words of Paul to Timothy and Titus, respecting the qualifications of a bishop, takes special care to omit the words, (which must have stared him in the face, while he was passing them over) "the husband of one wife,—having faithful children," &c. He knew that most of those for whom he wrote had not the Bible, and that they would take his word for what was contained in it.

No. CXVI.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30TH, 1820.

AT the conclusion of my last Number, I gave the words of Bishop Hay in which he admits, that "in the apostles' time, when the church began," married men were received into the priesthood. He farther admits, that the apostles did not make any express law against it. Then what is the use of all his reasons for clerical celibacy, which he affects to find in the New Testament? By his own admission the writers of that blessed book ordained no such thing. They imposed no such burden upon either pastors or people. An honest controversialist would therefore have at once acknowledged, that the doctrine which he was maintaining was not to be found in the Bible; but only in the later writings of certain fathers, and in the acts of certain councils. But such was not Bishop Hay. He gave his Work the title of "The Sincere Christian Instructed in the Faith of Christ *from the Written Word;*" and therefore, to keep up the appearance of fulfilling the promise in his title page, he was obliged to make references to, or quotations from the Bible, though they had no relation whatever to the subject under discussion.

This is one of the ways by which the Word of God is notoriously abused and perverted by the writers of the Romish Church; and by this means, when they cannot altogether keep the Bible out of the hands of the people, they succeed in making it void, or rendering it of no effect. This is done when the words of the inspired writers are quoted and applied to a purpose for which they were not originally intended; and when words are detached from their connection, and made to express the very opposite of what the writer meant to express, and what he will be found to express, when the whole passage is read in connection. Thus, as the reader will see in my last Number, Bishop Hay quotes from the apostolic writings, many passages which strongly enjoin the virtue of chastity on the bishops or pastors of churches. But he makes use of the word chastity as a thing that is inconsistent with, and opposed to the marriage relation; whereas the apostles use the word and enjoin the virtue, not only as consistent with marriage, but as a virtue which marriage is eminently calculated to maintain; and for the very purpose of maintaining which, marriage is expressly enjoined. Thus the bishop quotes the apostle's words against the apostle's meaning. To do so even to an uninspired author would be the greatest insult: but this is an insult offered to the Holy Spirit, by whom the apostles were inspired.

The reason which our author gives for admitting married men to office in the primitive churches, is the necessity of the case; because, "for want of hands there was no room for choice." But I ask, how did he come to know this? Were there not twelve unmarried young men in all Judea, whom Jesus could have taken and qualified to be apostles? We know that Peter was a married man, for one of Christ's

first miracles was to cure his wife's mother of a fever, Mat. viii. 14. That others of the apostles, and particularly those who are called the Lord's brethren, were married men, is also certain from 1 Cor. ix. 5. Philip, one of the seven deacons, afterwards called an evangelist, had a family of daughters, Acts xxi. 9; and he did not call them nieces, as our Roman priests do their spurious female offspring, and sometimes their young mistresses. The Rhemish translators, indeed, in their note on the passage in which Peter's wife is mentioned, are pleased to tell us, that he did not cohabit with her after he became an apostle. If so, he began his apostleship with a breach of faith, and that too under the eye of his divine Master, which is not to be supposed without gross impiety. Besides, this is not very consistent with one of their own legends. There is among the Popish saints, one Petronilla, who is said to have been Peter's daughter, and who must have been born many years after her father was an apostle, because in the reign of the emperor Domitian she was asked in marriage by one Flaccus; and had she been born before her father was called to the apostleship, she would then have been about sixty years of age. This argument, though of no value in itself, ought to be of great weight with all Papists. The testimony of the apostle Paul, however, is of more value; and he, writing to the Corinthians, more than twenty years after Christ's ascension, speaks of Cephas then leading about his wife, as well as other apostles.

It is dishonouring to Christ to say that there was any necessity imposed upon him, in ordering the affairs of his kingdom; that from want of materials for doing what was right, he was obliged to do wrong: yet this is the amount of Bishop Hay's argument. Christ had all power in heaven and in earth committed to him; and could have converted and qualified all the unmarried persons in the Roman empire, to be evangelists, if he had seen this proper; or had it been unlawful to employ married men in the work of the ministry. But he did employ married men in the honourable work of preaching the gospel; and if it was lawful then, it is lawful still; for there has been no later authority that could lawfully set aside his appointment.

In this, however, the Church of Rome proves herself to be the very antichrist. A prominent feature of her character is, "Forbidding to marry," 1 Tim. iv. 3; and there is no other church in the world to which the words are so truly applicable. The Rhemists, in their note upon the passage, endeavour to fix the charge upon some ancient heretics, but this cannot serve their purpose; for seeing they do the very thing themselves, it is no justification to say that ancient heretics did the same. The grave doctors seem to have felt extremely sore when touched upon this point; and not having much to say that could be called argument, they had, as usual, recourse to scolding. They ask, "Is it not now intolerable impudency of the Protestants, who, for a small similitude of words in the ears of the simple, apply this text to the fasts of the church, and the chastity of priests and religious?" So, it seems, forbidding to marry, is not forbidding to marry; between the two, there is only a small similitude of words in the ears of the simple; and he is an intolerably impudent man who shall say otherwise!

The same doctors wish to be understood as paying great respect to marriage, though they maintain it is a state not good enough for their priests. "The holy church," say they, "is so far from condemning wedlock, that she honoureth it much more than the Protestants, accounting it a holy sacrament; which they do not, but use it only to lust as the heathen do, and not to religion." And they translate the first clause of Ephesians v. 32;—"This is a great sacrament." Now there is here, no doubt, an affection of great respect for the state of marriage, or rather the ceremony by which the contract of marriage is formed, which may properly enough be called a sacrament; for the proper meaning of the word is, an oath, or sacred pledge. But in the commonly received, or ecclesiastical meaning of the word sacrament, marriage has no more to do with it than any other action of a man's life, or any other event in his history; and it is rather an absurd way of honouring an institution to call it what it is not.

But to return to Bishop Hay:—"We find," says he, "from the earliest monuments of antiquity, that even when married people were admitted into the sacred ministry, they generally abstained from all cohabitation with their wives after that."—The most proper answer to this is a flat contradiction. The "earliest monuments of antiquity" are in the Bible; and there, there is not a word of what the bishop alleges; and if the allegation were true, it would prove nothing but that such entrants into the "sacred ministry," were guilty of great wickedness in forsaking their wives, or putting them away without any just cause. Heretics of different names did, indeed, at a very early period, revile the married state, calling it the invention of the devil. And some of the fathers, who were no better than great senseless children, speak of celibacy as a more holy state than marriage; but the bare unsupported speculations of such men ought to have no weight whatever with persons who have access to the word of God, and their senses exercised to discern good and evil.

But as it may be worth while to show, that "the earliest monuments of antiquity," after closing the canon of Scripture, are against the bishop's assertion, I shall present the reader

with the following short summary: "Sanctioned by the example of the apostles, it is certain, that a vast many of the more distinguished primitive bishops and saints were engaged in the holy state of wedlock. St Chrysostom, showing at large the expediency of marriage, intimates that several holy men were married. To mention a few eminent ones who were so, will be sufficient for my present purpose. The father of St Gregory, bishop of Nazianzem, in Cappadocia, who was bishop of the same see, was married during his episcopacy. The saint tells us that his mother, Nonna, was not only no impediment to her husband, in his ministry, but of great service to him."—"St Gregory Nyssen, brother of St Basil the Great, who lived in the fourth century, was married to Theosebia, and never forsook her. St Basil's father, a bishop, and, by Alban Butler, denominated a saint, was married to Emilia, and had by her ten children; nine of whom survived him, and were all eminent for virtue. The reverend biographer tells us, in his life of St Basil, on the authority of St Gregory Nazianzen, that those among them who were married, and lived in the world, were no way inferior in piety to those who served God in holy virginity. Nicephorus speaks highly of St Basil's married brother, St Gregory Nyssen. Socrates tells us incidentally, that Spiridion, the distinguished bishop of Cyprus, was married; and likewise Eulalius, bishop of Cæsarea. And Dionysius in Eusebius (Hist. 6. 42.) relates that Chœremon, bishop of a city called Nile, fled to the mountain Arabius, with his wife, during one of the persecutions. It would be easy to swell the number of instances of this sort by the addition of those numerous similar ones which Vicelius supplies; but this would evidently be superfluous: inasmuch as the main point to be established is not whether many prominent individuals of the Christian hierarchy were married, after the example of the apostles, but whether, in early, and comparatively pure times; whether, when the instructions of the evangelists and apostles were of permanent authority; whether, before the pastors of the Christian church became rather generally disposed to emulate heresiarchs, and conciliate heathens; and whether, before temporal concerns had become intimately blended with ecclesiastical government, the generality of the clergy were married or not. And that they were so, throughout the Christian world, at least till the beginning of the seventh century, notwithstanding the almost incessant endeavours of the Popes, and the successive dissuasions of the philosophical fathers, to prevent their marriage, is, I maintain, incontrovertible.

"The only attempt which appears to have been made, antecedently to the fourth century, to induce the clergy by the exercise of episcopal authority, to practise celibacy, was that of Pynetus, bishop of Crete, about the year 170. But that attempt was seasonably discountenanced and frustrated by the pious primitive Dionysius, bishop of Corinth; who advised the former, in an epistle which he wrote to him on that subject, 'not to impose the heavy burden of continence upon his brethren, but to have regard to the infirmity of many.' 'Socrates and Nicephorus give us to understand that, in their respective ages, sacerdotal matrimony was common all over the east. And the twelfth canon of the Quinisext council informs us, that in Africa, Lybia, and other regions which belonged to the western, or Latin division of the Christian world, many *most religious* men who presided over the Church (and whose examples were, no doubt, followed by the generality of the clergy) lived in the matrimonial state. It is true, that the bishops of that council disapproved of, and prohibited that practice: the fact, however, is that alone about which I am at present concerned.'—'St Jerome says, that it was customary for deacons to marry before ordination, in order that marriage might not prove an obstacle to their advancement to the higher orders. And, in another place, he acknowledges, that married men were more frequently elected bishops than those who were single. The learned historian, Zonaras, who lived in the twelfth century, commenting on the fifth of the apostolic canons, speaks thus: 'This canon reminds us of the fact of even bishops having wives: for even bishops were not then prohibited from engaging in lawful connection with women.' And the learned Balsamon, who became patriarch of Antioch about the end of the same century, commenting upon the same canon, says, 'Before the sixth synod, which was held in the palace of Trullo, it was lawful for bishops to have wives, even after obtaining the episcopal dignity.'"—*Letters on Constrained Celibacy, Let.* IX.

The writer above quoted, proceeds to show that clerical matrimony was sanctioned by a number of councils. He does not only refer to his authorities; but he gives the very words in the original languages for the satisfaction of his learned readers. I do not know who the writer is; but he is evidently a man of great industry and research; and he writes like one who has no hostile feeling towards the church of Rome as a whole; but on the one point to which he has directed his attention, he certainly does exhibit her as the mother of abominations.

"The monk Augustin," says the author of the letters, *Let.* XVI. "acting on the instructions of Gregory the Great, was the first who attempted to enforce celibacy among the British clergy: and in order to facilitate his attempt, which was made in the year 600, he began, under the expressed permission of the Pope, with limiting it to the higher orders; although Leo had extended it to sub-deacons in all

other parts of Europe, about one hundred and sixty years before. His attempt, however, proved abortive. In the year 975, Dunstan, another of the Pope's agents, followed his example; but his endeavours were equally unavailing: and, moreover, occasioned great disturbances. In the year 1102, Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, a primate, at least as devoted to the will of the Pope as any of his predecessors had been, induced the prelates, who composed the then council of London, to require imperatively the total abstinence of the clergy from their wives; but the consequences of this rigorous requisition were soon found to be shocking in the extreme, as I shall notice hereafter. Shocking, however, as they were, they had no effect whatsoever in dissuading the obsequious creatures of the Pope, from prosecuting their endeavours to substitute his tyrannical obligations in the place of evangelical liberty: for by the council which was assembled in London, in the year 1108, a decree was issued, purporting, that those priests who had not complied with the prohibition of the council of 1102, should either relinquish their wives, or forbear to say mass. The law of celibacy was further enforced by Pope Innocent II. in the year 1138; and at the same time (you will blush, my friend, on the recollection of the fact) those priests who had abandoned their wives, with whom they had become, as our Lord tells us, one flesh, indissolubly connected, in a mysterious manner, as himself to his true church, were tolerated in keeping concubines; and thus was the law of God, as declared by Moses, and by our blessed Saviour, outraged in a two-fold manner. But still, as we learn from Bale, who wrote in the 15th century, many learned and respectable clergymen persevered in their bounden fidelity to their wives. The sons of the married clergy, who officiated in the churches of England, were so numerous, about forty years before, that Pope Paschal II. in a letter to Anselm, giving them a dispensation to admit them to holy orders, assigned as his motive for doing so, that they constituted the greater and *better* part of the clergy."

The Pope, however, prevailed at last, as he did in almost every other scheme which he tried for the advancement of his own power, and the enslaving of the human race. He found that the clergy were never sufficiently devoted to his service; never enough detached from the ties of kindred and country, while they were allowed to form conjugal connections, and enjoy the endearments of a family. When he had prevailed upon them to relinquish all these, they became like men who had no particular interest in one country more than another. They were then the fit agents of his holiness, for promoting the honour and the interest of the see of Rome, in all parts of the world. Hundreds of thousands of them were saddled upon the nations of Europe, having scarcely any common interest with the people of these nations; and whose daily business it was to oppress and impoverish them, under the pretext of promoting the glory of God, and of the holy catholic church. It was not enough that men, in what is called holy orders, were compelled to separate themselves from domestic society; but hundreds of thousands of young women were doomed also to forego the society of parents, sisters, and brothers, and to spend their days in seclusion and celibacy, contrary to the design of their creation, and the express command of God. An inspired apostle teaches;—"I will that the younger women marry, bear children," &c. 1 Tim. v. 14. but partly by compulsion, and partly by allurement, vast multitudes of young women, in Popish countries, are shut up from the world, and obliged to take a vow that they will never marry, while many of them may be scarcely of an age to make a voluntary choice, whether they would prefer a single life or not. And the holy church is incessantly teaching, that celibacy is better, and more pleasing to God than marriage; that, in short, the state has great merit before God; that those who abstain from marriage become the favourites and the spouses of Christ: and thus the church becomes accessary to the everlasting perdition of those who perish through the belief of her lie.

The writer of the Letters on Celibacy, promised to show the shocking consequences that followed the imposition thus imposed upon both sexes; and he fulfils his promise in the most ample manner. I cannot, however, allow myself to follow him, or to quote his disgusting details, though the worst of them are given in Latin, without a translation. There is enough indeed in English, to fill every delicate mind with horror, even, at this day, when, in every newspaper, scenes of licentiousness are laid open to persons of all classes and ages. Certain facts, however, must be mentioned, to show that I am not proceeding upon the ground of vague general accusation.

"The practical libidinousness of the unmarried clergy was, every where, enormous and unbridled. Such was the dread which the people of Switzerland entertained of these reputed representatives of the Holy Ghost, that, as we are informed by Sleiden, they required them, in some of the cantons, to keep concubines, in order to prevent them violating their daughters and wives. (*Com.* l. 3.) The same reason induced the senate of Rome, as we learn from Thuanus, to petition the Pope for the continuation of the brothels, which he had intended to suppress. (*His.* l. 39. chap. 3.) Gualtier Mapes complained that the priests found means to excite in silly women a fear of damnation if they denied their persons to them." There is a host of authorities, almost

entirely of the Church of Rome, and great dignitaries too, who concur in complaining of the unbounded licentiousness of the clergy; and they at last became so hardened in wickedness as to teach, that the greatest crimes were only venial sins, or scarcely any sins at all. "The obsequious divines Coster and Campeggio, held that priests were more criminal in marrying, than in keeping many harlots. (*Cost. de cœl. sacerd. prop.* 9.) And, perhaps, to allay the scruples of some libidinous confessors, adultery was authoritatively ranked among the lesser sins."

"In the remonstrance which certain divines of Germany presented to the Pope, accompanied by letters from the Emperor Ferdinand, and Albert Duke of Bavaria, soliciting permission for the clergy to marry, these divines assert, that 'among fifty catholic priests, hardly one will be found who is not a notorious fornicator.' They observe its having been maintained, by Cardinal Panormitan, that it would conduce to the salvation of souls, to permit the clergy to marry; and consider it a great absurdity (it was indeed much worse than an absurdity) not to admit married clerks; and yet to tolerate fornicators. (*P. Sarp. Hist. Concil. Trent.*, p. 678.) This remonstrance is said to have made such a strong impression on the Pope, that he resolved to assemble pious and learned men at Rome, from all parts of Europe, to discuss the question, but was dissuaded from doing so by Cardinal Simonetta, for reasons of state." (ibid.) *Letters, &c. Let.* xx. It is easy to imagine what the reasons of state were. The priesthood had become so generally, nay, I may say, universally profligate, that to attempt to confine them to matrimony, might have endangered the stability of the papal throne. Fleury relates of Rasfold, Bishop of Munster, "that having received briefs from the pope, requiring him to banish concubines, and having published these orders in his diocese, he was mutinously opposed by all his canons. Disgusted with their scandalous lives, he, at length, voluntarily quitted his bishopric."—(*Letters, &c.* p. 302.) "The learned Aventinus, who lived in the early part of the 16th century, speaking of the clergy, in his life of Gregory VII. says, the greatest part of them, under the honourable name of chastity, committed every where, with impunity, fornication, incest, and adultery. Of the law of celibacy, he says, that law was by no means displeasing to certain clergymen, who, instead of one wife, *sexcentas jam mulierculas licebat inire.*" Ibid. p. 268.

It was as early as the pontificate of Gregory the Great, that six thousand heads of murdered infants, the fruits of illicit sexual intercourse, were found in a fish pond: a discovery which, as Balæus informs us, induced Gregory to revoke the law of celibacy; which was however revived about forty-five years after, by Martin I. *See Letters, &c.* page 278. Now if such horrible effects resulted from the celibacy of priests and nuns, as early as the 7th century, what must not have taken place during the many dark ages that followed, among the thousands of what were called religious houses; but which were in fact brothels of the worst character, upon a large scale? In them was acted such scenes, that Cardinal Damiano published a complaint, in a book which he entitled "Gomorrah," because, I suppose, the wickedness of these *religious* persons reminded him of that of the five cities which God destroyed by fire and brimstone from heaven.

No. CXVII.

SATURDAY, October 7, 1820.

Among the causes that facilitated the Reformation in both England and Scotland, the profligacy of the clergy was none of the least considerable. The satirical poems of Chaucer in the former kingdom, and those of Sir David Lindsay and others in the latter, must have had a powerful effect upon the public mind. Rude as the bulk of the people may have been in point of knowledge, they could not but see the absurdity and the wickedness of men professing to be too holy to live in a state of marriage, while they were well known to keep their concubines, and to indulge themselves in all manner of licentiousness. That such was their conduct there is the concurrent testimony of all historians, even of their own faith, though modern Papists will deny it; and their Scotch oracle, Bishop Hay, labours to persuade his readers, that "nothing is more unjust than the conduct of mankind on this head," that is, the conduct of mankind in asserting that there are many of the clergy who transgress the law of celibacy, notwithstanding their great obligations to observe it. He admits that there have been "some;" that there have been "a few," who have transgressed; and he speaks as if this were no more than what may be expected "while men are men." He compares it to a Judas among the twelve apostles; a Nicholas among the seven deacons; an Ananias and Sapphira among the first Christians; an incestuous person among the disciples in Corinth. "No wonder, then," says he, "that among such great numbers as enter into the ministry of the church, some should be found who are a scandal to their character. But surely nothing can be more unjust and unreasonable, than to condemn that state of itself, because some of its members do not live up to the sanctity of it, or to attribute to the whole, what is only the fault of *a few*; yet such is the judg-

ment of the world." After enlarging a little on the injustice of thus accusing the holy priesthood, in general, the author comforts his brethren with the following words: "But we need not be surprised at this, because our blessed Master himself says to his apostles, and in them to all their successors, 'If the world hate you, know ye that it hated me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hates you.' John xv. 18, 19." *Vol. ii.* p. 141.

These words the bishop considers as addressed to the successors of the apostles, as well as to the apostles themselves. They are addressed therefore to every priest of the Romish church without exception; for they are all successors of the apostles. The grossest wickedness in their practice does not infer the forfeiture of this character, unless they shall be deprived by canonical authority; and there are few crimes that will incur this sentence except matrimony and heresy. All the world knows that heresy is one of the greatest crimes, and one for which many priests have been deprived of their holy orders, and burnt to death; and as for matrimony, this author tells us, that the church has decreed the severest penalties against such priests as shall be guilty of it, "having sometimes ordered them to be deposed, sometimes to be excommunicated, sometimes to be imprisoned in monasteries, to spend their whole life in penance." (See No. CXV.) Add to all this, the great curse which the Council of Trent pronounces against them, and it will appear, that matrimony in a priest is a crime of the first magnitude; but the holy fathers of the church may practise fornication, and even adultery, to any extent, without the least risk of being deprived of their holy orders, or degraded from being successors of the apostles; and when this fact is mentioned, for a fact it is, and when examples are given in detail, the bishop falls a wailing about the injustice that is done to men of his own order, and with unparalleled impudence, he applies for their comfort, the words which Christ addresses to his really holy and persecuted disciples.

Bishop Hay's representation, that lewd priests were only few in number, is a barefaced imposition upon his readers; for he could not but know the truth of the matter. But suppose, for argument's sake, that they were as few in proportion as a Judas among the twelve apostles, or one incestuous person in the church in Corinth, there is no injustice or unreasonableness in charging the wickedness of it upon the whole body, seeing it is tolerated by the whole. Judas separated himself from the company of the apostles. Ananias and Sapphira were by divine interposition separated from the church the moment their crime was discovered. Nothing was known against Nicholas when he was appointed to the deacon's office; and if it be true that he was the father of the sect of Nicholaitans, which is not absolutely certain, we know that the Head of the church condemned their deeds, and censured the churches that gave them any countenance; (see Rev. ii.) so that any church that suffered them to remain among them, would justly be charged with their crimes: and the church in Corinth is actually charged by the apostle Paul with the guilt of the incestuous person until they put him away; and in doing so, they cleared themselves of the matter. But the Church of Rome has never cleared itself of the guilt of suffering an abandoned and lascivious priesthood, and therefore the whole are justly chargeable with it.

Nay, it can be shown that concubinage was publicly allowed to the Romish priests for a small commutation or fine. On this subject a host of authorities might be produced. Among others, the work entitled, "Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery," is a standing evidence that a priest was allowed to keep a concubine for the easy annual charge of half-a-guinea. I gave extracts from this book in an early part of my work; and though Amicus Veritatis was pleased to deny its authenticity, he has not attempted to oppose to it any higher authority than his own word, which, without his real name, is of no value; and I shall not presume to say what it would be worth even with his name. I shall here, however, give a name of real value and weight in the Church of Rome, and repeat some of the words which I gave in page 22:—"Shameful to relate! they gave permission to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots, who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And, in some places, they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying, that they may keep a concubine if they please. *There is a printed book which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, The Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes than from all the books of the summists.* And of these crimes there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." *Claudius Espenceus Com. ad cap.* i. *Epist. ad Titum, digress.* ii.

This Claude D'Espence was a divine of great note in the Romish Church, and one whose word it would not be expedient for Papists to call in question. Let us see then how they evade the force of his testimony. The Catholic Vindicator, on whom Pax and Amicus Veritatis devolved the defence of their church, quotes from my work, and replies as follows:

—"I have proved, (he continues) in the words of a celebrated divine of the Romish church, that of the greatest crimes there were some that persons might have liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them, after they had been committed, might be *bought*. Such were my words and those of D'Espence, as repeated by me. But it so happened, that in the page in which I first quoted D'Espence's words, some inches farther down, I mentioned the name of Dupin. This afforded the Vindicator a loop-hole for escape, of which he took advantage in the following manner: "This celebrated Romish divine is no other than Dupin, whose works were condemned by the Sorbonne in 1693."—And then he gives one of my quotations from Dupin, relating to another part of the subject. See *Cath. Vind.* No. 1. Col. 7. If the reader will take the trouble of comparing this with the passage of THE PROTESTANT above referred to, and also with the 2d page of No. 1. in which I repeated part of the words, with D'Espence's name without Dupin being within sight, which latter is the passage which the Vindicator quotes, he will see, that it was not possible to substitute the one name for the other from mere mistake; but that the Vindicator must have done it purposely to deceive his readers. He dreaded the impression that was likely to be made by the authority of an unimpeachable witness, with regard to the abandoned lives of the Popish clergy, and therefore he ascribes the assertion of the fact to an author whom he considers unworthy of credit, because, it seems, his works had been condemned by the Sorbonne. It does not appear how this could affect his credibility with regard to matters of fact, which are asserted by other historians; but it was quite enough to serve the Vindicator's purpose with his Popish readers. This piece of deceit in the Vindicator's first Number, showed me what I had to expect in the sequel of his work; and my expectations were not disappointed. I could not, however, find a proper opportunity of introducing the subject till now.

Considering the above, and what is contained in my last Number, sufficient to establish the fact of the profligacy of the Popish clergy in general, I shall now proceed to give a more particular account of them, as they appear in the histories of our own country. Dr. Henry, in his history of Britain, cent. xv. makes the following curious statement: "At the king's command, the University of Oxford drew up a catalogue of those abuses in the church that needed reformation, to be laid before the Council of Constance. This catalogue consists of forty-six articles, and (although it was composed by clergymen) gives a most odious picture of the manner of the clergy at this period, particularly of their avarice and debauchery. Of each of these it will be sufficient to give one example. In the 27th article it is said 'It is notorious, that when a Pagan or a Jew, abandoning his former errors, desires to be purified in the holy fount of baptism, all his temporal goods are confiscated to the church; which, it is believed, prevents many Jews from being baptized. It would be pious and meritorious in the council to remedy this abuse. For when Philip baptized the Eunuch, he did not seize his chariot, or other goods he had about him at his baptism.' The 38th article represents, 'That the carnal and debauched lives of the clergy in our days, and their public fornications, which are never punished, (except perhaps with a small fine in private,) set an evil example before others; it would therefore be a holy thing, and contribute to the reformation of the church, if priests, of every rank and order, who were public fornicators, were obliged to abstain from saying mass for a limited time.'"

The above Report, drawn up by clergymen of the University of Oxford, plainly asserts the fact of the general profligacy of their brethren; and that they considered the offenders as brethren, is evident from the very slight punishment which they proposed to inflict upon clergymen who were "public fornicators;" namely, that they should be "obliged to abstain from saying mass for a limited time." Whereas had any one of them presumed to marry a wife, he would have been deposed, excommunicated, and perhaps imprisoned in a convent for life, to do penance for his crime. "Archbishop Bourchier," (says the same historian,) "in a commission he granted to his commissary-general to attempt some reformation, says that many of the clergy, both secular and regular, were ignorant illiterate blockheads, or rather idiots; and that they were as profligate as they were ignorant, neglecting their cures, strolling about the country with bad women in their company, spending the revenues of their benefices in feasting and drinking, in fornication and adultery."

This worthy primate died in 1486, and was succeeded by John Morton, bishop of Ely, who appeared extremely desirous of reforming the clergy. Complaints of their enormous wickedness were made from all quarters; and even the preachers at St. Paul's Cross were bold enough to declaim against their vices in the hearing of the laity. Archbishop Morton, in the abundance of his zeal, published a pastoral letter, calling upon his clergy to reform themselves. "In this letter," says Dr. Henry, "the good primate doth not trouble his clergy with recommending a single virtue, or reproving a single vice; but he charges them, with great solemnity, not to wear short liripoops of silk, nor gowns open before, nor swords, nor daggers, nor embroidered girdles; to be very careful of their tonsure, and to keep their hair always so short that the world may see their

ears; and he threatens them with very severe censures if they do not obey these injunctions." Such was all the reformation that at first appeared to the primate of all England, as necessary among the clergy under his command.

By and by, however, he came to a better understanding of matters; for, in a letter to the abbot of St. Albans, which has been published, he charges him and his monks with the most odious vices, of which, he says, they were notoriously guilty. One of his crimes was that he had turned all the modest women out of the two nunneries of Pray and Sapwell, and filled them with prostitutes; that they were esteemed no better than brothels, and that he and his monks publicly frequented them as such. Such was the character and condition of these holy seminaries in the reign of Henry VII., and down to the period of the Reformation. For many more particulars, see Henry's History, cent. xv.

On the breaking out of the Reformation, Henry VIII. ordered a visitation of certain monasteries in order to their suppression. The following was the result, as given by Dr. Henry, cent. xvi., who refers to Strype, chap. 34, 35. "The visitors having received their commissions and instructions, were despatched into different parts of the kingdom at the same time, that the monks might have as little warning of their approach as possible. They executed their commissions with zeal and diligence, and made some curious discoveries almost in every house, not much to the honour of its inhabitants. In making these discoveries, they were greatly indebted to the violent factions which reigned among the monks and nuns, who informed against one another, and against their superiors. Accounts of their proceedings were transmitted by the visitors to the vicar-general, and contained sufficient materials to render the monastics completely infamous, and the objects of universal detestation, for their gross absurd superstition and idolatry, their infernal cruelty, their shameful impositions on the credulity of the people, their abandoned unnatural incontinency, their drunkenness, gluttony, and other vices. Some of the old abbots and friars did not attempt to conceal their amours, which they knew to be impossible. The holy father, the prior of Maiden-Bradely, assured the visitors, that he had only married six of his sons and one of his daughters out of the goods of the priory as yet; but that several more of his children were grown up, and would soon be marriageable. He produced a dispensation from the Pope, permitting him to keep a mistress; and he acquainted them that he took none but young maidens to be his mistresses, the handsomest he could procure; and when he was disposed to change, he got them husbands. But the page of history must not be stained with the abominations contained in the report of these visitors. It may be sufficient to lay before the reader, a short description of their contents in the preamble to the Act of Parliament which they produced: 'Forasmuch as manifest sin, vicious, carnal, and abominable living, is daily used and committed in abbeys, priories, and other religious houses, of monks, canons, and nuns; and albeit, many continual visitations have been heretofore had by the space of two hundred years and more, for an honest, charitable reformation of such unthrifty, carnal, and abominable living; yet nevertheless, little or none amendment is hitherto had, but their vicious living shamefully increaseth and augmenteth.' &c. It is but justice to notice, that though the corruption of the monastics in England at this time was very general, it was not universal: some in almost every monastery were regular in their conduct, and at their own desire were set at liberty. A few convents were found to be well governed and unexceptionable: and for the preservation of these the visitors pleaded with great earnestness."

In Scotland the state of matters was no better than in England, whatever worse. "Inferior benefices were put up to sale, or bestowed on the illiterate and unworthy minions of courtiers; on dice-players, strolling bards, and the bastards of bishops." M'Crie's Life of Knox, 1st ed. p. 15. "Again, (says the same author, page 16.) the lives of the clergy, exempted from secular jurisdiction, and corrupted by wealth and idleness, were become a scandal to religion, and an outrage to decency. While they professed chastity, and prohibited, under the severest penalties, any of the ecclesiastical order from contracting lawful wedlock, the bishops set the example of the most shameless profligacy before the inferior clergy; avowedly kept their harlots; provided their natural sons with benefices; and gave their daughters in marriage to the sons of the nobility and principal gentry; many of whom were so mean as to contaminate the blood of their families by such base alliances, for the sake of the rich dowries which they brought." The author adds in a note, "We need not appeal to the testimony of the Reformers, or to satirical poems published at the time, in proof of the extreme profligacy of the Popish clergy. The truth is registered in the acts of Parliament, in the decrees of their own councils, (Wilkins, Concil. tom. 4. p. 46—60; Keith's Hist. pref. 11.) in the records of legitimation, (Lord Hailes' Notes on Ancient Scottish Poems, p. 249, 250.) and in the confession of their own writers, &c." In another note, Dr. M. gives the following on the authority of Pitscottie: "They would thole no Priest to marry, but they would punish, and burn him to the dead; but if he had used then ten thousand whores he had not been burnt." *Hist.* p. 150, 152.

As an instance of what Dr. M'Crie mentions, of bishops marrying their natural children into noble families, I need only refer to the case of

Cardinal Beaton, who, having burnt Wishart to death for heresy, seemed to have the whole kingdom at his feet. He had settled with the Earl of Crawford the preliminaries of marriage between that earl's eldest son and one of his natural daughters, named Margaret, with whom he gave a very large fortune; and had just celebrated the marriage, when, on his return to his castle at St. Andrews, he was murdered, as is recorded in all the histories of that time.

If Romish priests at present in England and Scotland are not more virtuous, they are under the necessity of being more circumspect, and more private in the practice of their vices. But in those parts of Ireland which have been least favoured with the light of the Reformation, we are informed by one of themselves, that the lives of the clergy are nearly as profligate as ever. "That the lives of the Roman Catholic clergy, at this day, in Ireland," says the Rev. Charles Bourke, "as well as on the Continent, are not much more correct than those of the clergy at the time of the Reformation, when Luther inveighed against them, is a melancholy truth which cannot be denied." Again, "The mistresses and children of reverend gentlemen can be shown, whenever they may choose to put it to the trial.—They themselves know that I can prove this assertion incontestably." See *Popish Episcopal Tyranny Exposed*, preface and page 45.

Hence it is, I suppose, that Popish writers continue so pertinaciously to accuse the reformers of unchastity. They know how vulnerable the character of their own clergy is on this point; and, in order to divert the attention of their opponents, and put them on the defensive, they become the assailants and accusers. In almost all their writings it is asserted as an undoubted matter of fact, that Luther both taught and practised this vice; though it is a fact, that among the many thousands of enemies which he had during his life, there were none that could produce the smallest evidence of any thing worse than that he married a *religious* woman; that is, a woman, who, like himself, was under a vow of chastity. Similar accusations were brought against other leaders of the Reformation, with an equal disregard of truth; and it is not more than two years since a reverend father had the effrontery to assert in the pulpit of the Popish chapel here, that Knox plundered the cathedral of St. Andrews of its sacred vessels, and used them in drunken revelry with his concubines. Knox was a married man, and after the death of one wife he took another. This is the worst that his enemies can prove against him; and yet it is under this that the above monstrous charge is made, because Papists will not allow that ladies whom priests marry can be their lawful wives, and therefore they apply the above opprobrious epithet.

I need not here discuss the lawfulness of breaking the monastic vow; but I have no hesitation in saying, that so far as it is a vow of chastity, it would, in the case of most persons, stand more chance of being observed in the state of marriage, than in the state of celibacy. This is plainly the doctrine laid down by the apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 2. As the first reformers saw it their duty to marry, so in the reformation that has lately begun in Germany, under Von Wessenberg, this privilege is allowed to the priests, which is striking at the foundation of the Papal power in that quarter. This is the principal crime that the Pope lays to the charge of the modern reformer, which is done in the following words, in a document signed by Cardinal Gonsalvi: "The nunciature of Lucerne lost no time in transmitting to your curia, as it was in duty bound to do, the strongest representations against such enormous and grave abuses, and especially against the *greatest of all*, namely, that of giving the power of marriage to persons dedicated to God by a vow of perpetual chastity." *Reformation of the Catholic Church in Germany*, &c. Lond. 1819, page 24.

No. CXVIII.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14TH, 1820.

It would be easy to fill a dozen Numbers more with details of the horrible effects of clerical celibacy in the Church of Rome. The general licentiousness which it occasioned was not confined to the lower orders of the priesthood. All ranks were tainted up to the very head; and the head of the church himself was often worst of all. One can scarcely open the Lives of the Popes from the sixth century to the sixteenth, but he will find the most disgusting accounts of their debaucheries, and of the oppressions which they practised in order to provide fortunes for their natural children, whom they introduced to the world as nephews and nieces. But the world does not need to be informed on this subject; and I believe my readers will think they have had enough of matter so nauseous.

There is one thing more connected with this subject, to which I will advert in few words, and then proceed to something else: it is the inconsistency of calling matrimony a sacrament, and denying it to the clergy. In all other cases the priesthood insist upon having at least their own share of the good things of the church. The ordinances of divine appointment which are called sacraments, are given to the church as benefits; and they are signs of greater blessings than appear to the eye. The Church of Rome has made several foolish additions to their number: but she holds them all as good things, and profitable to be

observed. She indeed uses stronger language than any judicious Protestant will do. "A sacrament," says Bishop Hay, "is an outward sensible action, or sacred sign, ordained by Jesus Christ, as *a sure and certain means* to bring grace to our souls." The subject is too serious for a pun, else I would defy the Church of Rome to prove that all their sacraments are *sensible** actions: at least, not that one that sets all the senses at defiance. I will not, however, refuse this character to marriage; and if it be indeed a sacrament, and a sure and certain means to bring grace to the soul, I am sure it must be the most sensible thing the priests ever did, to take wives, and live like honest men. And perhaps it is because they neglect this sacrament, that all the other six have failed of their sure and certain effect with regard to many of them, as is but too evident from their graceless lives.

It is not my usual practice to begin a Number with the end of a subject, but sometimes, as in this instance, I find it expedient. †

Before entering upon another general head of discussion, I shall give place to a correspondent or two. The following is from my Galloway "Friend to fair dealing," whom I suspected to be a priest, and perhaps this is the principal reason why he is so very angry. If the reader will take the trouble of turning to my XCV. Number, he will see that I inserted only a part of a former letter from this gentleman, and my reasons for doing so. This is the avowed cause of his displeasure, although it is difficult to understand why he should have taken it so much amiss. I suppose he is the first that ever supposed that a periodical writer is obliged to print all that every man chooses to address to him, whether it be to the purpose or not.

"Sir,—I had not an opportunity of seeing your method of noticing my last letter to you till very lately. You have, I see, taken the method of all those who wishing to throw things unfavourable to their system into the back ground, represent only those features of the picture which are most for their advantage. It was a mean, cowardly artifice in you, not to give the public a full view of the arguments of your opponent, by presenting them with a faithful complete copy of his letter, and allowing them, without any fear of the consequences, to judge for themselves. I am aware, however, that some things were contained in that production, which it did not suit your purpose to give to public view. I must tell you, however, that I will permit no man to make free with altering my letters, or with giving a summary of their contents, but myself; more especially one whose interest it is that they should appear in a mutilated and distorted form. When you shall have given the public a *bona fide* transcript of my letter, I will proceed to reply to your answers to my queries, to refute some of your calumnious, ill-natured, ill-mannered, misrepresentations of Popery, and put some more queries to you. If you refuse to do that piece of justice, I will write no more to you on the subject, but after having made the public acquainted with the reasons of my silence, I will treat your arguments and production in the way they ought to have been all along treated; and which, in less than half a century, they will be treated with contempt.

"A Friend to Fair Dealing."

Now, in the first place, I wish this gentleman to understand, that I do not look upon *even his* correspondence as of so much value, that I will do an unreasonable thing to induce him to continue it; and that I consider his not writing to me any more as a matter of no very great importance. As I have the sole responsibility, I must be the sole judge of what is fit to appear in my pages. I have always felt reluctant to make my readers pay for extraneous and irrelevant matter; and, to avoid this, when at one time I was led into such matter, I gave the quantity of a whole Number *gratis*. (See No. L.) But I cannot afford to do the same with all that others may write. I suppose the feelings of my correspondent are not very acute on this score, as he has made me pay three postages of nine-pence half-penny each, which

---

* I am not sure if this word is used in the sense of wise, or judicious, or having good sense, south of the Tweed.

† Since writing the above, I have received the following communications, which I throw into a note here. The two anecdotes are not over decent, but they are such as one must expect to meet with, in reading on such a subject. My correspondent, who resides in Ireland, has given me the names of living authorities for both:—"A Roman Catholic gentleman, in the north of Munster, somewhat advanced in years, married a young and handsome wife, of the same communion. Naturally of a jealous disposition, and convinced of the corrupt principles and practices of his clergy, he would never permit the priest of the parish, or the friar who assisted him, to hear his wife's confession locked up together in a private room, according to the usual custom. But once a month, when the confession was to be heard, the priest attended for the purpose; and was obliged to *shrive* and absolve the lady in the lawn before the hall door, whilst the watchful husband sat in one of the windows of his drawing room, the rigid guardian of his wife's chastity, and his own honour." The following is of a more disgusting character:—"A full fed father Luke, in the county of Cavan, some years ago, had in vain attempted to seduce the affections of one of his fair parishioners. Soon after his repulse, he was consulted by the girl's father, on the disposal of her in marriage to a young man in a neighbouring county. The priest consented with reluctance, and the young people were made happy. Some months after he visited his young friend, and finding a convenient opportunity, he told her with horror in his looks, that she was pregnant of a monster. The woman was terrified, and such was her superstitious confidence in her guide, notwithstanding his former attempts upon her, that she believed his assertion; and it was not till he had made an infamous proposal, as a remedy for the evil, that she told the matter to her husband, who cudgelled the brute out of his house."

The following is from another correspondent:—

Extract from the translation of Sleidane's Commentaries translated by Jhon Dans, 1560, imprinted at London by Jhon Daye, for Abraham Veal and Nicholas England, 1560, 25th of September, L. III. fol. xxxv. xxxvi. "In many of theyr Townes it is the maner, that whan they receyue a newe minister of the churche, they bidde him take a lemane, lest he attempt to defyle honest women, whiche custome althoughe it be laughed at of many, yet was wittelye diuised as the tyme serued, and in so greate darkeness of doctrine depraued."—*Bohun's Trans. of Sledan.*

a little discretion would have taught him ought to have been paid by himself. Indeed all my Popish correspondents, whose letters came through the post office, are in the like fault, except one Glasgow one, whose discretion cost him only a penny. This is not a matter which I think worth complaining of as a hardship, but it is worth mentioning as a trait in the character of our Papists, and it stands in bold contrast with that of Protestants, for though their letters to me have been twenty, perhaps fifty times more in number, few of them cost me any thing.

This Friend to fair dealing gravely and authoritatively tells me, that he will *permit* no man, but himself, to do so and so with his letters; and I hereby assure him, that I will *permit* no man to dictate to me what I shall do with a letter, addressed to me, and for which I have paid ten times its value. I admit, at the same time, that he would have had cause to find fault, if I had given as his words, what were not his, or if I had given only detached scraps of his letter, separated from their connection, so as to misrepresent or conceal his meaning. But nothing of this kind have I done with his writing, or that of any other opponent. What I gave was a *bona fide* extract, containing an entire whole within itself, without the least dependence, for the understanding of its meaning, upon any other sentence in the sheet; so that I did not "alter" a single word, or even syllable, as he would insinuate when he says he will permit no man to do so but himself. He will not, he says, even permit any other man to give a summary of the contents of his letters; but how he is able to prevent this, I cannot divine, unless he shall keep them all carefully locked up in his secretaire.

This precious letter of his appears in his own esteem to be so weighty, that it did not suit my purpose to give it to public view. That is, I suppose, his arguments were so powerful, that I could not answer them, and feeling conscious of this, I had recourse to the "mean and cowardly artifice" of keeping them out of sight. I am perfectly willing thus to give his accusation in the plainest and broadest form; and I cheerfully meet it, by challenging him to publish his entire production to the world. It may be contained in a half sheet, about the size of one of my Numbers, and may be sold at the same price. If he has not retained a copy, I will deliver an exact transcript of the original to any printer whom he may authorize to receive it.

This undertaking of course ought to be at his own risk; but lest he should have before his eyes the melancholy fate of the Catholic Vindicator, whose numbers might have been bought for twopence per pound weight, as one of the retailers of it told in his public shop; I hereby promise to give it all the publicity that an advertisement in my Work can give. I make this offer from a real desire that the public may see what he considers so formidable, and for my own justification in declining to insert the whole letter,—every clause of which it would be easy to answer; but in answering it, I would be led many degrees away from my controversy with the Church of Rome, in order to give the history, and discuss the merits of the Glasgow Church Bill; and other matters equally irrelevant, for which see a more particular account in my summary of the letter in my XCV. Number.

If it shall be asked, why not gratify him at once by printing it entire? I answer again, that I did not at first think it right to tax the purses and the patience of my readers, by presenting them with such a great mass of useless words; and though my determination on this point might have been altered by a respectful request, I am not disposed to be influenced to change my opinion, or my procedure, by an "ill-natured" and "ill-mannered" threat. Besides, it appears that this "friend to fair dealing" sees my Work only occasionally. My extract and remarks on his former letter, were published on the 6th of May: and, in September, he writes, that he had not seen them till very lately, from which I infer that he is not a subscriber. He has no right, therefore, to demand insertion of his letter, and to make others pay for what he does not pay for himself. And, farther, it appears that he has not read the whole of my work, else he would find that I have answered, at least in part, what he calls upon me to answer again.

After all, I suspect that my correspondent has merely made a pretext for the purpose of securing what he will conceive to be an honourable retreat, and so to get quit of a controversy which he dreads entering farther into, seeing he cannot get me to enter the lists with him on subjects quite unconnected with the Popish errors which I am exposing. Why does he not reply to what I have written on transubstantiation, and purgatory, and auricular confession, and the worship of creatures, and those other points which affect the vitals of the system? The reason is, he does not choose to commit himself, in a country so enlightened as Scotland, by avowing the real doctrine of Rome on such points, and he dares not deny them, else he might suffer the censure of his superiors, and even canonical deprivation, if he be, as I suppose, a priest. Like other writers of his communion, therefore, he catches at some casual expressions, which are of about as much importance in relation to the controversy, as the vane of a kirk steeple is to the doctrine of the church; and because he cannot prevail upon me to waste my time, and exhaust the patience of my readers, by discussing such trifles, he cries out about my meanness and cowardice; and ventures gravely to predict, that in less than half a century, my arguments will be treated with contempt. I

thank him for giving me so long a lease of the good opinion with which I have the honour to be regarded by the public; and I wish he may live to renew the grant, in case it shall turn out that he is not a true prophet.

Now, if he were to honour me with another letter, the last sentence will furnish him with matter for a very long one. He would probably ask a dozen questions about the nature of leases, and upon what premises I made the conclusion that he had granted me one for fifty years? what was the criterion of public opinion? from what circumstance I inferred the probability of his living fifty years? and how was a false prophet to be known from a true one? This will appear very ridiculous; but it is precisely the manner in which this correspondent writes away from the subject, and attempts to draw me away from it.

I insert the following letter, not because I intend to enter at present upon the subject of "Catholic emancipation," but because it proves that certain facts and features of the character of Popery, which I have been honoured to bring to view, have altered the opinion of some, and I believe not a few, on that very important subject.

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"*Glasgow, Sept. 11th*, 1820.

"Sir,—I am a protestant dissenter, and a hearty friend to religious liberty, as I understand it. I have been for thirty years a friend also to Catholic emancipation in Ireland, and sincerely hoped it would be attained. However, from the recent conduct of the heads of the Popish church, I begin to doubt if this object be desirable. The Popish clergy are now exhibiting themselves in an attitude the most hostile to religious liberty. Common sense would say that no person has a right to molest or interrupt another in the exercise of religion, and in obeying his conscience. But if a person's conscience shall dictate to him that he is to violate the person, or property, or civil good name of others; or to debar them from the peaceable exercise of their industry, or of their religion, and if he shall call this religion —in a word, if he *do to others*, in those matters, what he would reckon an outrage if done to himself or his friends, he must be *restrained*. He, and his conscience, and his religion, must be all shut up in some bedlam or prison, or put into safe custody of some sort, which will prevent violent aggressions on others, and tumults in society.

"If Popery be indeed what it is represented to be by the titular Archbishop of Dublin, in his letter inserted in No. CXIII. of the Protestant, it is obviously a religion which requires restraint, and cannot safely be allowed to go at large.—On Sunday, August 2d, 1819, a school in Samson's Lane, Moore Street, Dublin, was peaceably employed in the usual exercises of teaching, and learning to read the Bible, when a Popish priest entered, interrupted the business, forced the books out of the hands of several of the children, and forced the children out of the school.—Now surely this conduct of this priest was highly outrageous. He had a right, which no person could justly forbid, to persuade parents not to send their children to such schools. No person had any right to hinder him from visiting all the parents who submitted to his authority, at their homes, and there charging them not to suffer their children to attend such schools, or to recall them instantly. In such visitations, none might prohibit him from using all his influence with parents and children, in support of such charges and commands. Nay he might publicly denounce in his own chapel, all such schools, and curse, if he pleased, three times a day all such schools, teachers, scholars, and all who should give them any countenance. But to go into another man's school-house, to interrupt the exercises, to seize the books, and to force away the pupils, was conduct to be restrained by the police.

"If this conduct is permitted with impunity, then, as often as a Popish priest thinks any of the young folks of his congregation are attending a parish church, or a dissenting meeting, he has a right to enter, to interrupt the public exercises, to force the Bibles, prayer-books, and hymn-books, out of the people's hands, and to drive such as he calls Catholics out of the place. If he cannot do this single-handed, he has a right to employ help. Nay, if such conduct is permitted, it will be equally right to make similar invasions on Popish chapels, as often as professed Protestants are suspected of being present. Every man must see how insufferable and destructive of peace such conduct would be.—Yet, in the judgment of the Archbishop of Dublin, (from his residence the most important Popish authority in Ireland,) the conduct of this priest was right, and exhibited a true practical view of Popery.

"He writes:—'Conformably to these maxims, and to the *uniform discipline of the Catholic Church*, Rev. Mr. S. went to your school to withdraw the Catholic children from it, at the very time when religious and moral instruction were given, particularly to children, in Liffey Street parish chapel. He cannot, on this account, be justly accused of opposition to the constituted authorities, which allow the free exercise of the Catholic religion, and the authority of its ministers to instruct the ignorant of their communion.'

"If such conduct be conformable to the 'uniform' discipline of the Popish church, and if liberty to act so be what Popish priests and others are urging after as the *free exercise of their religion*, it is obvious that this *free exercise* is totally inconsistent with the *civil peace* of society. When, allured by the novel charms of the organ, and of chanting in an unknown

language; and by the glare of sacerdotal paraphernalia and trappings, many of the Presbyterians, and others of Glasgow, attended the Popish chapel in Clyde Street; how would Mr. S. and his adherents have felt if all the other pastors in the city had bolted in, interrupted the service, and driven away every one his own adherents, or attempted to drive them away. This would justly have been reckoned persecution; but it would have been a piece of conduct quite parallel to that which the Archbishop of Popery in Dublin calls the *free exercise* of the Catholic religion. Papists have a right, before men, to inculcate certain of their principles, by all means of moral suasion and religious motives; but such a right must be used by them '*salvo jure cujusque*,' reserving to all others a similar right. They have a right to consider their own tenets true, and the only true tenets; but they must leave, and magistrates must leave to others the right to think them false. These principles the Archbishop does not recognise. He blames Protestants for *inviting* Catholic children to their schools; but *he* would glory in proselyting others, children or adults. He would not treat others as he would be treated, but would urge on others the paramount authority of his church.—Yours, AN IRISHMAN."

W. D. has favoured me with another letter, a great deal longer than either of his former ones; and has put me to the expense of double postage. I request him to publish it in a separate pamphlet, and I shall answer it when I come to treat the question, How we know the Bible to be the word of God, independently of the authority of the Church of Rome? In my reply to his last, I called upon him to inform me from what pulpits he had heard the doctrine asserted, that God revealed one religion to one country, and a contrary one to another, which he said he had "often heard from men of good education, even from the pulpits;" and the following is his answer:—"Well, Sir, I shall do more than you require, to convince you of what I said. If you take the trouble to go into the Presbyterian church of Scotland, you may depend upon it that the reverend minister will tell you, that his is one of the true religion; next be pleased to step into the Episcopal church of England, and you may rely upon it you will hear the same," &c. &c. In this manner W. D. makes a tour of a number of sects; and because every one maintains the truth of its own distinguishing peculiarity, he asserts that he hears from their pulpits, that *God has revealed one religion to one people, and a contrary one to another!* A man who can shuffle in this manner, has no right to expect that I shall hereafter respect his communications as I have done.

No. CXIX.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21ST, 1820.

THE following letter is written in a better spirit than most of those which I have received from adherents of the Church of Rome. It has, besides, the advantage of having a defined object; and that object is one of the principal points of the controversy. Therefore, though it be very long, as the writer himself acknowledges, I shall give it entire:—

"TO THE PROTESTANT.

"*4th July*, 1820.

"Sir,—Being a reader of your papers, and at present a member of that church against which they are directed, I have at times thought of laying before you some of the defences usually made by Catholics, in reply to their Protestant opponents, with my occasional remarks; in order that I might request the favour of your opinion upon them, as they might not be within the plan which you have adopted, but which you may perhaps have no objections to notice for the instruction of one, who, according to your belief, is not at present in the right road: yet, he is one who is not inclined to remain with any particular church, if he see sufficient grounds for forsaking it.

"Therefore, seeing you have lately commenced a subject, upon which, according to your correspondent J. C. the 'whole Popish system is built,' viz. 'on that supposed supremacy bestowed exclusively on Peter,' I have now ventured to trouble you with a few observations on this foundation of the papal system, with the hope, that if you think them worth your notice, you will with your convenience spare a page or two, for a few remarks thereon.

"In the first place, then, Christ promised to build his church upon a rock. Commenting on this, you say that this rock on which Christ promised to build his church, was not Peter, but himself:—on the other hand, St. Peter is, by Catholics and even by learned Protestants, said to be this rock; for that Christ, as a reward to Simon for the ardour of his love, strength of his faith, and the ready confession of his divinity, said to him, 'Thou art Peter, (that is, thou art a rock;) and upon this rock I will build my church.' 'And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c. Here, under the metaphor of the keys, Catholics say, that Christ declares his making Peter the chief governor of his church; in the same way, as when the keys of a city are delivered to a man, he is made ruler or governor of that city. When on the subject of the rock, in giving your definition of the Greek noun *Petros*, you say it signifies 'a stone,' viz. 'such a stone as we can handle, move, or turn over;' and that Christ, in giving him that name, meant to signify his *mobility* or fickleness. Now, from what I can see from the Greek

Lexicons, which are commonly used in our Protestant schools, it seems to me that Petros could as easily be rendered English, a *rock*, as a *stone*, and much easier than that of 'a loose moveable stone,' as your Number has it. So that I must still consider Peter to be the rock on which the church was to be built, until I see a reasonable account why this name was conferred upon him. As for your saying that it was to signify his versatility, it seems to me rather paradoxical; for 'when names were given to men as recorded in Scripture, whether compounded or not with the names of animals or inanimate things, it was done in allusion to the natures and qualities of these animals or things.' (PROTESTANT, No. XCIX.) This I consider to be perfectly applicable; so that Christ, in giving to Simon the name of Peter or rock, thereby signified the firmness of his faith, and the eminent station he was to hold.

"In No. C. you say, 'it is the avowed doctrine of St. Augustine, one of Rome's greatest oracles, that Christ did not promise to build his church upon Peter, but upon himself, the rock which Peter had confessed.' In opposition to the quotation you make from St. Augustine, I will lay one before you, from that Divine's Psalm against the Donatists: in it he says, 'reckon up the prelates in the very see of Peter, and in that order of fathers, see which has succeeded him. *This is the rock* over which the proud gates of hell prevail not.' These words carry with them a very different meaning from what you give as the avowed doctrine of this father. And one of his cotemporaries, in writing on this subject, uses words that plainer cannot be, to show the belief of the age in which they lived. 'Christ predicts, that not Simon, but Peter shall be his name; by the word opportunely signifying, that *on him*, as on a *firm rock*, he was about to build his church.' *St. Cyril of Alex. L. II. in Joan.* c. 12th. Thus far the opinion of the fathers of the beginning of the fifth century, to which you refer; let us, however, see what those of a still older date say upon this subject, as their testimony must have still greater weight. In the third century we find Origen saying, 'consider what was said by the Lord, to that great foundation of the church, and that most firm rock, on which Christ built his church, *O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?* Matt. xiv. 31.' *Hom. V. in Exod.* About the same time St. Cyprian writes, 'For the Lord in the first place gave to Peter, on whom he built his church,' &c. *Ep.* lxxiii. Again, 'Peter whom the Lord chose the first, and on whom he built his church,' &c. *Ep.* lxxi. In the fourth century St. Gregory of Nazianzen writes, 'You see how Peter, among the disciples of Christ, all great, and all worthy of choice, is called a rock, and receives, on the profession of his faith, the foundations of the church; while John is particularly beloved, and rests on the breast of Christ; and the other disciples bear this preference without repining.' *Orat.* XXVI. 'The memory of Peter, the head of the apostles, is celebrated, and with him, that of the other members of the church. But the church of God is firmly built on him. For he, according to the prerogative granted to him by the Lord, is that firm and solid rock upon which the Saviour built his church.' *St. Gregory of Nyssa, Orat.* II. Add to these St. Chrysostom, St. Epiphanius, St. Basil, &c. who all use words equally strong with those above noticed.

"In addition to these venerable names, I will now bring forward one or two respectable Protestant writers in favour of this subject; for example, Whitaker writes,* 'We do not deny Peter to have been the foundation and the governor of the church, neither shall we at all hesitate (if required) to acknowledge its having been promised to him in the words,' &c. *Whit. Cont.* 4. q. 2. ch. 2d. In another place he says, 'Who doth not confess that Peter is the rock and foundation of the church?' *Contra Dureum, L. V.* Sect. 4th. To Whitaker's declarations join those of a celebrated dignitary of the English church in the present age; viz. the celebrated Dr. Marsh; a writer whose Anti-Catholic principles are well known. Yet he, in his 'Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome,' p. 213, (in which work he wishes to show that the conduct of the Church of Rome is in general repugnant to the inspired Word of God,) has candidly shown that the words 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church,' must mean 'Thou art *rock by name*, and shalt be rock indeed; for on thee,' &c. When noticing those who hold a contrary opinion, he says, they 'have taken such unsuccessful pains to show, that our Saviour, under the word rock, did not understand St. Peter.'

"It was my intention that this letter should have been principally occupied by the subject of the supremacy; but that of the rock has filled more of my paper than I expected, so that I must confine myself chiefly to what you advance in regard to St. Augustine.

"You say 'It must be admitted this Divine was not a thorough-bred Papist. It was some ages after his time, that the man of sin came to maturity, or that the Pope was declared Universal Bishop. Augustine was not fully initiated in the doctrine of Peter's supremacy.' —PROTEST. No. C. With regard to these points, I am at present of a different opinion. In the first place, I find Pope Victor so early as the second century exercising his power as Universal Bishop, when he threatened to excommunicate the Bishops of Asia Minor, for keeping Easter at an undue time; and none of them charged him with usurping a power which did not belong to him.—Euseb. L. V. Hist. Eccles. c. 24. In the third century St. Cyprian, Ep. 67, wrote

* Also consult his answer to the Jesuit Campian, p. 72, 73.

to Pope Stephen, desiring him to despatch his letters into the province and to the people of Arles, by which they might be authorized to depose Marcianus the Bishop of Arles, and substitute another in his place. In the fourth century, Pope Julius cited St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, the second patriarch of the church, to his council at Rome, to answer the accusations of his adversaries; he accordingly did appear and was there cleared.—*Vide St. Athan. Apol. ag. the Arians.* The same Pope, about the same time, restored, by his authority, to their respective sees, whence they have been deposed by the Eusebians, St. Paul, Bishop of Constantinople, St. Lucius of Adrianople, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Ascelpas of Gaza, in Palestine; and this he did, says Sozomenus, 'because, by reason of the dignity of his see, the care of all belonged to him.'—L. III. c. 8. And about the time of St. Augustine, Pope Celestine deputed St. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, to proceed as his delegate to the excommunication of Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople.—*Tom.* III. *Concil. Labbe*, p. 349. From these historical facts, we see the Pope acknowledged Universal Bishop for ages before St. Augustine; and if I had room, the proofs could easily be carried up to the beginning of the seventh century, at which time some Protestants pretend the Pope received his supremacy from Phocas, Emperor of Constantinople, who began his reign anno 602.

"Now for a few words, whether or not St. Augustine was 'fully initiated' in the doctrine of the supremacy? You say he was not; but, from the following extracts, I am inclined to think he was. In his work, *De Donat. Dysidis*, he says, 'If we are to consider the series of Episcopal successions, with how much greater certainty we number from Peter, to *whom, as representing the whole church*, Christ said, On this rock I will build my church. To Peter succeeded Linus,' &c. In another place, 'For who can be ignorant that the most blessed Peter is the first of the apostles?' *In Evang. Joan.* 'Peter among the apostles, the first, the most ardent in his love of Christ, often answered for the rest.' Serm. xiii. And again, 'The apostle Peter, on account of the *primacy of his apostleship*, represented the church; as to himself by nature he was one man, by grace a Christian; but, by a more abundant grace, the first apostle.'—*In Evang. Joan.* To reconcile these extracts from the works of St. Augustine, with what you say in regard to that father, I am quite unable; for here, by the expressions he makes use of, he seems *most* 'fully initiated' in the belief of the supremacy. In the most explicit terms, he repeatedly calls him *the first* of the apostles; and in the last quotation, he uses words, that plainer cannot be, to show his belief in the superiority of Peter, viz. that by reason of his primacy he represented the church. The supremacy of St. Peter, and his successors, is not only clearly laid down by Eusebius, S. S. Leo, Cyrils, Gregories, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, &c. about the time of St. Augustine, but also by Origen and St. Cyprian of the third century, Tertullian and Irenæus of the second; all of whom agree in styling Peter the head and pillar of the church, and the bishops of Rome his successors.

"The purity of the church, for the first five centuries, is acknowledged by the most learned Protestants, which is the reason that I have given in this letter so many of the testimonies of the writers of those times. The famous Jewel, in his answer to Harding, writes: 'St. Augustine, and the other godly fathers, *rightly* yielded reverence to the see of Rome, for the purity of religion there preserved a long time without spot. The godly fathers of those times, seeking to the Church of Rome then for *purity* of religion, most famous above all others,' p. 246. And Whitaker, in his work on Antichrist, says: 'During the first 500 years, the church was pure, and inviolably taught the faith delivered by the apostles,' p. 31.

"In one of your late Numbers, you say that you bring the authority of the fathers against the Catholics, when you think their opinion is in your favour, as it must have great weight with them on their own principles; yet, when the fathers are in favour of the Catholics, you add, you care no more for their opinion than for that of any divine of the present age. But, when I consider that a number of important passages in the New Testament are subject to so many various and contradictory interpretations, by what means are we to come to the knowledge of the true meaning of those passages, if it be not by a reference to the writings of those eminent men who flourished in the apostolic age, or those ages immediately succeeding? for they certainly had every opportunity of knowing the belief and practice of the apostles, which, without doubt, would be carefully preserved and handed down from age to age by the Christian churches. So that, on account of the times and circumstances in which they were placed, the fathers had surely a better opportunity of knowing the true meaning of the inspired writings than any divine of the present age can pretend to. But you may perhaps give in answer, what you said in one of your Numbers some time ago, viz. that as the writings of the fathers were, for so many ages, only in the hands of the Papists, they could make such interpretations in them as they thought necessary to answer their own purposes. If that were the case, how did it come to pass, that they were so inconsiderate as not to alter the more important part viz. the New Testament, in such a manner, as that it would have been more explicit on those disputed points

upon which the fathers are so clear? Certainly they had the one in their power as much as the other. If it be said, they did make such alterations in the New Testament, where then did the Reformers at first get a copy for the instruction of their followers?

"Before finishing, I beg leave to say a few words on the supremacy in general.

"When, to show that Peter had no superiority, you bring forward St. Paul, in 2 Corinthians ch. xii. 11th, saying, that he was equal with the very chiefest of the apostles; in answer, is not the apostle here speaking in regard to his labours, miracles, &c. in which, without doubt, he was inferior to none?

"You say, that if St. Peter were the head of the apostles, how did St. Paul come to withstand him to his face at Antioch? The apostle, in the same place, tells us the reason—because he was to *blame*. And no one doubts, but that a superior, when in fault, may sometimes be lawfully reprehended by an inferior. St. Cyprian, writing on this subject, says, in his 71st Epistle, 'Nor did Peter, whom the Lord chose the first, and on whom he built his church, when afterwards he disagreed with Paul concerning circumcision, arrogate any thing to himself; saying, that he held the primacy, and that he ought to be obeyed by those who came after him. He despised not Paul because he had persecuted the church, but listened to the advice of truth, and assented to reason.'

"In short, that St. Peter was chief of the apostles, see satisfactory proofs in the Bishop of Lincoln's Elements of Christian Theology, vol. i. part second, xxv. p. 476,—an author whom no person can accuse of being a friend to the Catholic cause.

"In conclusion, I must apologize for the length to which I have carried my Letter, but I expect you will pardon the first offence against good breeding. So I finish with the hope, that you will excuse any inaccuracy of expression in one of the first attempts of

"Your humble servant,— JUVENIS."

Instead of making a particular reply to all the matters contained in the above, I request my readers to revert to what has been already said on the subject of Peter's supremacy, and that of the Pope, in THE PROTESTANT, No. XCIX. to CIV., inclusive. Juvenis manages his argument with more skill than I would expect from a mere youth; and yet he has not succeeded in proving that any one of my facts is doubtful, or any one of my arguments erroneous or inconclusive. The foundation on which such a fabric as the papal supremacy is built, ought surely to be very solid; but nothing that Juvenis has alleged, tends to invest it with this character.

He makes a fundamental mistake in the very outset, which vitiates the whole of his first argument. "In the first place," says he, "Christ promised to build his church upon *a* rock."

Now, there is no such promise in the New Testament. The mere English reader may see, that these are not Christ's words; but he who understands Greek, will perceive, in a much stronger light, that the above is not Christ's meaning. The original words, ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, are properly rendered by my correspondent J. C. *This* THE *rock*. Allowing that the word πετρος may signify rock, as well as stone, it points to no particular object; but the phrase, this *the* rock, points to a definite object, already known and acknowledged as the Rock of Israel. But after all, *Petros* was not the name which Christ gave to this apostle, but only a translation of it into Greek. Christ and his apostles spoke the language of the common people, which was the Syro-Chaldaic; and the name which Simon received was, in that language, *Cephas*, which the evangelists usually translated into Greek, the language in which they wrote the gospels. Our translators have, in general, retained the Greek word in an English form; but, in one instance, when they had the word Cephas itself to translate, they gave it the true English rendering:—"Thou art Simon, the son of Jonah; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, *a stone*;" John i. 42. Whether it be a moveable stone or not, it is merely a stone; or, even allowing the word to be translated in favour of my opponent, it is merely *a* rock, and cannot be *the* Rock on which the church is built, any more than *a* god among the gods many, can be *the* living and true God. My correspondent is equally unfortunate in his reference to the Greek Lexicons commonly used in our schools. These are chiefly Greek and Latin; and they do not profess to give the English of any Greek word: but there are two valuable Greek and English Lexicons, by means of which, a knowledge of the original language of the New Testament may be acquired without the intervention of Latin. These are the works of Ewing and Parkhurst. The former renders the word πετρος, a large stone, a piece, or fragment of a rock. The latter says, "Homer uses it constantly, I believe, for a large stone, *i. e.* a piece or fragment of a rock, but such as a strong man might throw."

I repeat, that with regard to any point of doctrine, or the meaning of any text of Scripture, St. Augustine is no greater authority than any other divine of ancient or modern times. I cited him to establish the fact, that the ancient fathers were not agreed about Peter's supremacy; and all that Juvenis cites from his other works, goes only to prove this other fact, that he was not agreed with himself; but wrote different, and even opposite sentiments, at different periods of his life. I make this remark upon the supposition, that what Juvenis quotes are really the words of Augustine; though if he, or the authors from whom he quotes, refer to the editions that have undergone the expurgatorian process of the index, he cannot be

sure whether they are his words or not. All the other fathers whom he cites are liable to the same objection; but though it were otherwise, I account them of no authority whatever, in support of a system of religion, which ought to rest on nothing less than divine authority. Thus the second argument of my correspondent falls to the ground like its predecessor, because it was built upon a foundation too weak to bear the weight of one article of faith, or one ordinance of worship; much less could it bear the weight of a whole system, like that of Popery, which professes to influence heaven, and earth, and hell.

As for the respectable Protestant divines who have conceded to the Church of Rome, that Peter is the rock on which Christ built his church, I have nothing to do with them, but to marvel at their inconsistency. As a Protestant, I claim the privilege of thinking for myself, and am not to be influenced by great names, to adopt a sentiment which appears to me inconsistent with the Word of God, and with those promises, in particular, which assure the absolute security of the church, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, whereas the enemy prevailed against Peter, once and again; and if the church has no more solid foundation than a mere creature, we cannot be sure of her stability for an hour.

No. CXX.

SATURDAY, October 28th, 1820.

I had asserted, that St Augustine was not a thorough-bred Papist; that it was some ages after his time that the man of sin came to maturity, or that the Pope was declared universal bishop: and that Augustine was not fully initiated in the doctrine of Peter's supremacy. I assert the same still; and every reader of church history knows it to be the fact, that the title of universal bishop was not conceded to the Pope of Rome for a long time after Augustine's death, and Gregory the Great declared, that the man who should assume that title, was the forerunner of Antichrist in his pride. (See Prot. No. CIV.) This is not like one of those doubtful maters about which historians grope in the dark, without being able to come to a satisfactory conclusion. It is as clearly recorded as any thing of the kind can be And what does my correspondent oppose to the well-known fact? Nothing, but that he is "*at present* of a different opinion." Then, as the ground on which he forms his opinion, he refers to certain Popes claiming universal jurisdiction, long before the time of Augustine, and he mentions an instance of an individual submitting to the claim, and, therefore, the Popes are said to have exercised the power of universal bishops. We know that the claim was made by certain individual bishops of high ambition, and was rejected with abhorrence by some churches in the east, long before the Pope of Rome was formally invested with it. That he claimed this high title, and professed to exercise universal jurisdiction at an earlier period, is no evidence that his title was acknowledged. It is but two years since a Popish priest in Glasgow, after the solemn farce of high mass, before an immense congregation of Protestants, who had gone to witness the ceremony, claimed the right and exercised the power, of denouncing, from the pulpit, the writer of these pages, and of virtually, if not actually excommunicating him. This holy father claimed, and even professed to exercise, a power and jurisdiction over my soul and body; but it does not follow, that he had a legal right to such power, or was acknowledged to possess it. No more does the claim of Pope Victor, and other early demagogues, over other churches beside their own, prove that they had a good title to exercise such power, or that it was generally conceded.

Juvenis tells me, that "the purity of the church of Rome for the first five centuries is acknowledged by the most learned Protestants." Before I concede this point, I must be informed what it is, that, in the opinion of these Protestants, constitutes church purity. I am sure that I could point out many impure things in that church, before the expiry of the fifth century; and yet I am willing to concede, that until that period she was *comparatively* pure. She was not then defiled by the absurdity of transubstantiation and the idolatry of the mass; nor was the worship of images then generally practised; nor were the clergy then forbidden to marry; nor was it then allowed to them to keep concubines; and there are fifty other abominable things which were not then countenanced, but which sprung up in the dark ages that followed, and are now so essentially incorporated with the system that they cannot be separated from it. But what does my correspondent gain by asserting the purity of his church for 500 years? This is a tacit admission that she has been impure for more than double the time, seeing he has not a word to say in her behalf since the end of the fifth century. It would be rather an ungracious way of complimenting an old man, to say, that the first twenty years of his life were spent virtuously, but as for the subsequent part, the less that is said the better. Now, it is chiefly the present state of a church, with which its members have to do. I advise Juvenis, therefore, not to satisfy himself with the notion, that his church was pure thirteen hundred years ago, seeing her more recent history presents her in a light so extremely bloated with every species of impurity; and seeing he professes himself not inclined to continue within her pale, if he sees sufficient grounds for forsaking her; I request him to pay attention to his Bible, and

follow where he shall find it to lead, leaving the works of fathers and saints of the church to the worms and the moths, who will digest them with much more advantage to themselves, than he will ever be able to do.

My correspondent inquires why his church may not have corrupted the text of the Bible, seeing they had it in their hands, as well as the writings of the fathers, which they are said to have corrupted? To this it may be replied, that the Church of Rome was not the sole depository of the Word of God, else we cannot say what liberties she might have taken with it. We know that the Old Testament has been carefully preserved by the Jews; and we know that the New Testament was received by many churches in the east, over which the Church of Rome could never prevail; and by them has been preserved to this day; so that it was not possible for Papists to make any material alteration in the Divine Word, without exposing themselves to detection. This, however, is a subject which requires more particular discussion; and I will have an opportunity of entering fully into it, when I come to reply to Mr. Andrews.

When I find the authority of ancient fathers against the present doctrine of the Papists, I consider it perfectly fair to adduce it, because it is an authority which they acknowledge, and to which, upon their own principles, they ought to submit; but when such authority is brought against the Protestant doctrine, I am not obliged to submit to it, for I never acknowledged it.

I will give all due respect to the fathers, as witnesses of matters of fact which came within their own knowledge, so far as they give a consistent testimony; but when they appear as expounders of the Divine Word, I consider them in no higher light than the present Rector of Aston Sandford, or the late Independent Minister in Chester, or any other parish priest or dissenting minister, who may write a commentary on the Scriptures. I have here in my eye certain works of great value, but they are human compositions; and no man ought to trust them implicitly, in their exposition of any text, but ought to judge for himself, as he must give account for himself, at the great day.

Juvenis has fallen into a great mistake, and I believe it is a prevalent one with persons of his communion, and perhaps with some others; namely, that the fathers who lived near the apostolic age, had better opportunities of knowing the meaning of what the apostles taught, than persons who are alive at this day.

This might have been true, if the apostles had trusted the communication of what they taught to oral tradition; but seeing they put their instructions in writing, any man who understands the writing, though he should live at the distance of two thousand years, is as capable of understanding the instructions, as if he had heard them with his ears, from the lips of the inspired teachers. The Greek is a language, remarkable for its precision, as well as its copiousness. Perhaps there is no language more capable of expressing every thing that the human tongue can express, and the human mind apprehend; and from the multitude of books which were written in it, while it was the language of the polite and learned world, it is easy for a diligent student to acquire such a knowledge of every word and phrase, that he shall find little difficulty in translating, into his native tongue, the plain testimony of the apostles concerning Jesus of Nazareth, and the foundation on which he promised to build his church. And this plain testimony, expressed in English, is as capable of being understood by the reader of English, as by any saint or father of the second century.

Besides, we know from the apostolic writings, that erroneous sentiments began to prevail in the first century. Jewish converts had their Jewish prejudices, and heathen converts had theirs; and both had begun to mix up these prejudices with the articles of their Christian profession. Suppose, then, the doctrines which the apostles taught, had been communicated by the oral testimony of a Jewish or of a heathen convert, and there was no other, they would almost necessarily have received a colouring, or bias, from the medium through which they passed. In this way, I doubt not, the early fathers of the church were led into many mistakes. In short, they had no security against error, but by having recourse to the *ipsissima verba*, the very words, which the apostles wrote; rejecting every oral traditionary gloss, as calculated to lead them astray, and taking the very words of the divine record in their simple grammatical sense. This is what we of the present day are as capable of doing as they were; and therefore we are not dependent on them for the understanding of the Word of God.

Before entering upon the subject of the Inquisition, I shall occupy a Number or two with a sketch of the doctrine and personal character of the Reformers; which will afford a relief to the religious mind, after the disgusting details which I was obliged to give of the wicked lives of the Romish priests, while discussing the subject of their constrained celibacy. I shall introduce the present subject with an extract from a letter by AMICUS VERITATIS, for which see THE PROTESTANT, page 28. In one of my letters, in the Glasgow Chronicle, I had stated the Christian doctrine, that Christ's death was a sufficient satisfaction to divine justice; and that sinners are saved by what Christ has done, not by any thing that they can do. To this my opponent replied:—

"Like Luther before him, with one dash of his pen, he (*i. e.* THE PROTESTANT) magnanimously abolishes the obligation of good works, and opens the gates of heaven to every man who can only boast the gift of an all-saving faith.

This solifidian tenet, it must be acknowledged, with the Church of England, in her articles, is 'a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.' The restraints of religion are too unpleasant to the passions of men:

> 'Tis prudent to reform her into ease,
> And put her in undress to make her please;
> A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,
> And leave the luggage of good works behind.'

"'On this head,' says a writer of the present day, 'we have undoubtedly great obligations to Luther. Our blessed Redeemer died for us, and still left the way to happiness strait and rugged; the new apostle rushed to the arms of his faithful Catharine, and made it spacious and commodious. After Christ it was still so uninviting, that, as he declared, few would choose to walk in it: after Luther, it was cleared of the thorns of virtue, and might with ease be trodden by thousands. His disciples, however, have gradually learned to blush at the extravagance of their master: in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned, on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of Scripture and common sense. But the unnatural portrait which their great patriarch had drawn of Catholic doctrine, they still cherish with filial respect, and consider it as an invaluable legacy.'"

This precious piece of popish buffoonery is given by AMICUS VERITATIS, partly as his own, partly as an extract from "a writer of the present day;" but there is not a word of it his own, except the first four, "Like Luther before him." His marks of quotation ought to have begun at, "with one dash of his pen;" but he throws them a few lines lower, that he may have the credit of what he will reckon a clever sneer at the doctrine of the church of England. His assertion consists of two falsehoods, which must be disposed of, before we proceed to any thing else. The first is, that by one stroke of my pen, I abolish the obligation of good works; and the second is, that Luther did this before me. Now there is not a word of truth in this, either with regard to Luther, or myself. I intreat every Papist in the kingdom to read and study my pages, from the beginning; and I challenge them all to point out a single sentence, that by fair construction, can be made to express, or even imply, that I abolish the obligation of good works; or, that I have said any thing that tends, in the smallest degree, to derogate from their importance and value. I request the reader, however, to observe that I refer to my own words only, or such words as I quote from others with approbation; for I am aware, that my pages contain many extracts from Popish writers, which do tend to set aside all obligation to good works; especially in my quotations from Jesuits' Morals, which go so far as to relieve men from the painful obligation of loving either God or man.

In speaking of the subject of indulgences, I had occasion to quote the words of the French Catechism, which are,—"The mind of the church is, to grant indulgences only to those who *attend to the duty of satisfying, on their part, divine justice.*" On this ground I convicted the Church of Rome of not only indulging, but commanding, or making it a duty, to commit sin: and certainly, if it be true that Christ has satisfied divine justice by the sacrifice of himself once for all, it must be a great sin, no less than rebellion against God, for any man to attempt to satisfy divine justice for himself; for this is to set aside the satisfaction of Christ, as not sufficient, but as requiring, in order to its sufficiency, the satisfaction of the sinner himself. This is the avowed doctrine of Rome. By commanding sinners "to satisfy, on their part, divine justice," she virtually commands them not to rely on the satisfaction, or atonement of Christ, but upon their own doings and sufferings. This I showed to be in direct opposition to the whole tenor of the gospel; and to be, in fact, an authoritative injunction, requiring all men to reject the gospel, and the salvation which it reveals; and to satisfy divine justice, and effect their own salvation, the best way they can. This I declare to be commanding men to commit sin; for if it be the duty of all to submit to the rightousness of God, and renounce their own, as the words of the apostle clearly imply, (Rom. x. 3.) then it must be a high degree of wickedness for any man to trust in his own righteousness, and not submit to the righteousness of God.

This is the substance of what I taught in the Glasgow Chronicle, (*see page* 19) and this is what AMICUS VERITATIS calls, "with one dash of my pen, abolishing the obligation of good works." It is enough for me to know, that the same objection was made to the same doctrine, when it was taught by the apostle Paul; and it was made by the same description of persons, —men who did not like to submit to the righteousness of God, but who went about seeking to establish their own righteousness. "Now we know, that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God: being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past,

through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God, who shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: Yea, we establish the law," Rom. iii. 19—31.

I have made this long quotation from the inspired writings, to show, that, upon the gospel plan, sinners believing in Christ, are justified without respect to any doings or merits of their own; that is, without their obedience to any law, either in the way of doing or suffering. This is a doctrine that has always startled sinners when proposed to them. It appears to them as making void the law of God; and the apostle, divinely inspired, anticipates their objection, and assures them that it does no such thing, but that it establishes the law.

"A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," are the express words of the Holy Spirit, speaking by his inspired messenger. This is what my opponent calls, with a sneer, "this solifidian (*i. e.* faith alone) tenet." I have no objection to the term; and I pity the sinner who can mock at what every sinner ought to receive with devout gratitude, as the best news that ever was proclaimed to our fallen race: and if it were not so, that a man is justified by faith, without regard to his own doings, no man ever could be justified at all; which is the same as to say, no man could ever be saved; and our whole race must lie for ever under the guilt and the punishment of sin; for no man ever did any good works which could entitle him to the pardon of his sins, or to his justification before God. "There is none righteous, no not one." "Every mouth must be stopped," on the plea of righteousness, "and the whole world become (be declared and acknowledged) guilty before God." Now for a guilty rebel against the Lord of all, to do any thing worthy of having his guilt removed, and his person justified, is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, and even to the dictates of enlightened reason. No man could think of it, without the most unworthy and degrading notions of the law of God, and of God himself.

But the gospel doctrine of justification by faith, through the divine righteousness, that is, the obedience and death of Christ, *establishes the law.* It even magnifies the law, and makes it appear honourable. And certainly the divine law is more likely to be obeyed by him who has high and honourable views of it, than by him who thinks meanly of it. No man ever thought highly enough of the holy law of God, or even thought rightly of it at all, until he understood how it was fulfilled and magnified by the obedience to death of the Son of God. He who really understands this as it is revealed in the Bible, is the most deeply impressed with the obligation of good works; not to procure his justification, but to manifest his justification; and he only will really do good works; for, believing in Christ he receives the new principle of spiritual life, from which alone works good and acceptable to God can proceed; he is created anew after Christ Jesus unto good works.

These things are familiar to every man whose religion is taken from the Bible. But it is impossible to make a Papist, or a self-righteous Protestant, understand them. They cannot imagine what good works are good for, unless it be to procure or aid in procuring their justification. The CATHOLIC VINDICATOR avows this very plainly, though I do not recollect his precise words; and to seek for them in such a mass of confusion as his volume is, would be like searching for a needle in a hay-stack. It will sometimes be found, that the less that people understand of the matter, and the less of good works they exhibit in their own practice, the more noisy are they in pleading the merit of them. Nay, as a living writer has observed, there are some who will swear mightily on behalf of good works, and curse as hypocrites those who really do them, because they disavow all merit in them, and hope for salvation solely by faith in Christ. AMICUS VERITATIS, and the author whose words he uses, have not gone the length of swearing against the solifidian doctrine; but they show their spite against it as much as if they had; and that too, under a professed regard for good works; while, in fact, the doctrine of justification by faith without works, is the only root from which good works ever did, or ever will spring, among the race of Adam.

From this, I hope, it will appear to every one who understands the Bible, that I have not, by one dash of my pen, abolished the obligation of good works. In the above vindication of my sentiments on this subject, I may have repeated something that I have written before; but it is a subject that will bear repetition; and of which no Christian will become weary.

A correspondent has favoured me with an extract from Augustine's "Retractions," a work which he published in the latter part of his life; in which, among other things, he retracts his former opinion, that Peter was the rock on which Christ built his church. The same correspondent gives extracts from the principal Greek and Latin Lexicons used in our schools, with regard to the meaning of πετρος, and its compounds, which confirm what I gave in my last Number. For instance, πετροβολος, a thrower of *stones;* would Juvenis translate it, a thrower *of rocks?* πετροω, in the verbal form, *to*

stone, would he translate it, *to rock?* There are some other curious examples of the strange work that such a mode of translating would make, for which I am sorry I have not room.

No. CXXI.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4TH, 1820.

IT is time now to inquire into the truth of the assertion, that Luther before me, by one dash of his pen, abolished the obligation of good works. I shall give a more complete view of this charge, by quoting a little more of the author from whom AMICUS VERITATIS, in his zeal for good works, *stole* the words which he gave as his own:—"When the magnanimous fathers of the Reformation," says this writer, "separated from the Church of Rome, one object which engaged much of their attention was to justify or palliate their schism. For this purpose, every species of expedient was adopted; and among the Catholic doctrines, which they misrepresented and vilified, was that which teaches the utility and necessity of good works. The piety of Luther urged him to retire as far as possible from the corruptions of Babylon. With one dash of his pen, he magnanimously abolished the obligation of good works," &c. No. CXX. p. 501. *A Vindication of the Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham*, p. 39.

Those who are not acquainted with the writings of Papists can have no idea of the barefaced impudence with which they can assert a falsehood, even knowing it to be such; for all the world knows, and this writer could not but know, that Luther's complaint against the Church of Rome, which led to his separation from it, was not her teaching the utility and necessity of good works; but because, by her infamous traffic in indulgences, she encouraged all manner of evil works. This is asserted by her own historians; and it is a fact as universally known as the fact of the Reformation itself; so that the writer could not but know it: and if his zeal for good works has not led him to curse and swear on their behalf, it has led him to tell a lie, knowing it to be such, for their sake.

It is, indeed, admitted, that, on this point, Luther taught the very same doctrine that THE PROTESTANT teaches; and it is nothing but what apostles and prophets, and Christ himself, taught before them,—that justification before God is by faith, through the righteousness of Christ, without regard to works of law. Of this Luther had so strong a perception, that he called it the article by holding or rejecting which a church would stand or fall: and in this he judged rightly; for this doctrine is such a connecting link in the system, that he who has a firm hold of it, commands the whole chain of Christian principles; whereas, he who lets go this link, abandons the whole system of Christianity, and embraces a totally different and opposite religion. It was by the preaching of this doctrine that the apostles turned men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God; and they went on preaching with wonderful success; insomuch that the kingdom of Satan was like to have been overthrown in the world, and the kingdom of Christ established on its ruins; when, in order to prevent this catastrophe, the prince of darkness began to insinuate into the minds of the converts of Paul, that their own obedience to the law must have some share in the work of their salvation. This subtile poison of the serpent soon pervaded all the churches in Galatia; insomuch that the apostle, in a letter addressed to them, is constrained to say, that he stood in doubt of them; that is, he was led to doubt whether they were really Christians or not, Gal. iv. 20. He was afraid that he had bestowed on them all his labour in vain, iv. 11, because they sought justification as it were by the works of the law, especially by being circumcised and observing the law of Moses; he assured them, that seeking justification in this way, Christ would profit them nothing; and that if righteousness came by the law, that is, if men could obtain justification in this way, Christ had died in vain; there was no need of such a sacrifice, if men could obtain salvation by their own obedience.

This was the great antichrist that appeared in the world, while yet some of the apostles were alive. This formed the greatest obstruction to the progress of the gospel in the days of the apostles, and in those that followed; for the error was interwoven with the natural pride of the human heart, and found an advocate in the bosom of every unrenewed man. In process of time, the error was embodied into a system. It supplanted Christianity over a great part of the world; it took the name of that which it had supplanted; and thus was imposed upon the world a system of self-righteousness, superstition, and idolatry, having for its head a monster, who called himself the Vicar of Christ, who professed to rule in the name of Christ; but whose whole administration was directed to maintain the reign of darkness, and the influence of the prince of darkness over the souls of men.

Thus Popery had its origin in the self-righteous bias of the human heart, and a disposition to submit to any thing, rather than the humbling self-denying truth, that we must be justified before God, if justified at all, upon the footing of what Christ has done, not what we can do for ourselves; and that for this we must be indebted to sovereign mercy. Disliking this method of salvation, the emissaries of the wicked one invented that system of rites and ceremonies which constitute what we call Popery. Their penances and pilgrimages, their masses

and their merits of saints, their holy spittle and their holy water, their beads and their crucifixes, and the whole host of their superstitious observances, and idolatrous practices, were all invented for the very purpose of being put in the place of Christ's righteousness, and that by them a sinner might merit justification for himself, and appear before God in a righteousness of his own. Let the reader observe, this is not merely the Popery of the dark ages. It is publicly maintained at this very day by our Papists in Glasgow, and their organ in London, who scout at the idea of justification by faith in Christ, without regard to their own works and deservings; though, alas! if their works were tried by the righteous law of God, it would be found that their deservings are such as they could not think of without fearful apprehension: and I say this not of Papists only, but of every man who trusts in himself that he is righteous, and who does not, by a cordial reception of the gospel, submit to the righteousness of God.

Now, when the mind of Luther began to be opened to see the errors of Popery, he was directed, by a divine influence, I have no doubt, to fix his eye particularly upon this grand fundamental truth, which had long been denied by the Church of Rome, but which he found plainly taught in the New Testament, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. He was not the first who discovered this truth, after it had been smothered for ages under the rubbish of Popery, for Wickliffe and Huss had taught it before him, and there were a few in the darkest ages who knew and lived by it; but he was honoured by divine grace to apprehend it more distinctly, to teach it with more clearness, and to enforce it with a more powerful eloquence, than had fallen to the lot of any man, for at least a thousand years. Of this his commentary on the epistle to the Galatians is a standing evidence: and well do I recollect the effect which some passages in this work had on my own mind, at a very early period of life. On the subject of justification, it contained, indeed, nothing more than I had learned to repeat from the shorter catechism, but it was presented with a force of argument which I found altogether irresistible; and though it must have been thirty years ago, the impression remains to this day.

Luther having declared this to be a fundamental article in the Reformation of which he was honoured to be the instrument, he gave it a prominent place in the works which he published, and even in his private epistolary correspondence. The following is a specimen of the manner in which he handled this important subject. It is part of his comment on Gal. ii. 21. "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." "These words of Paul ought diligently to be weighed and considered in this wise. Is it true that Christ suffered death or not? Again, did he suffer in vain or not? Here we are constrained to answer, unless we be stark mad, that he suffered in very deed, and that he suffered not in vain, nor for himself, but for us. If then he suffered not in vain, it followeth of necessity that righteousness cometh not by the law."

Then adverting to some of the evasions of Papists, by which they attempt to establish their own merits, he proceeds:—"Is this horrible blasphemy to be suffered or dissembled, that the divine Majesty not sparing his own dear Son, but delivering him up to death for us all, should not do all these things seriously and in good earnest, but as it were in sport? Before I would admit this blasphemy, I would not only that the holiness of all the Papists and merit-mongers, but also of all the saints and holy angels should be thrown into the bottom of hell, and condemned with the devil. Mine eyes shall behold nothing else but this inestimable price, my Lord and Saviour Christ. He ought to be such a treasure to me, that all other things should be but dung in comparison of him. He ought to be such a light unto me, that when I have apprehended him by faith, I should not know whether there be any law, any sin, any righteousness, or any unrighteousness in the world. For what are all things which are in heaven and earth, in comparison of the Son of God, Christ Jesus, my Lord and Saviour, who loved me, and gave himself for me!

"This thundering and lightning from heaven against the righteousness of the law, and man's own righteousness, should make us to abhor it. And here with this thunder-clap falleth down all the orders of monks and friars, with all such superstitious religions. For who will not detest his vows, his cowls, his shaven crown, all men's traditions, yea the very law of Moses also, if he hear that for these things he rejected the grace of God, and maketh the death of Christ unprofitable. The world hearing this, doth not believe that it is true. It thinketh that such horrible wickedness cannot enter into any man's heart, that he should reject the grace of God, and esteem the death of Christ as a thing of nought. And yet this sin commonly reigneth. For whosoever seeketh righteousness without Christ, either by works, merits, satisfactions, afflictions, or by the law, rejecteth the grace of God, and despiseth the death of Christ, whatsoever he protesteth with his mouth to the contrary."

In his preface he thus writes:—"Do we then nothing? do we work nothing for the obtaining of this righteousness? I answer, Nothing at all. For this is perfect righteousness, to do nothing, to hear nothing, to know nothing of the law or of works; but to know and believe this only, that Christ is gone to the Father, and is not now seen; that he sitteth in heaven at

the right hand of the Father, not as a judge, but made of God unto us, wisdom, righteousness, holiness, and redemption. Briefly, that he is our high priest, entreating for us, and reigning over us and in us by his grace.

"When I have this glorious righteousness dwelling in my heart, I descend from heaven as the rain, making fruitful the earth, that is to say, I come forth into another kingdom, and I do good works, how and whensoever occasion is offered. If I be a minister of the word, I preach, I comfort the broken-hearted, I administer the sacraments. If I be a householder, I govern my house and my family, I bring up my children in the knowledge and fear of God. If I be a magistrate, the charge that is given me from above, I diligently execute. If I be a servant, I do my master's business faithfully. To conclude, whosoever he be that is assuredly persuaded that Christ is his righteousness, doth not only cheerfully and gladly work well in his vocation, but also submitteth himself through love to the magistrates and to their laws, yea though they be severe, sharp, and cruel, and (if necessity so require) to all manner of burdens, and to all dangers of this present life, because he knoweth that this is the will of God, and that this obedience pleaseth him." In another place he writes;—"This I say to the end that no man should think we reject or forbid good works, as the Papists do most falsely slander us, neither understanding what they themselves say, or what we teach. They know nothing but the righteousness of the law, and yet they will judge of that doctrine which is far above the law, of which it is impossible that the carnal man should be able to judge. Therefore, they must needs be offended, for they can see no higher than the law."

These extracts afford a view of the doctrine of the Reformer, and of the manner in which he maintained it. There is a vehemence and boldness in his style, that show he was perfectly master of his subject, and fully assured of the ground on which he proceeded. I do not say that his mode of expression is in all instances the happiest that might be chosen. Some phrases are apt to startle a simple inquirer, and give occasion to misrepresent the doctrines of the gospel; such for instance as that in which he includes the law of Moses among things to be *detested.* It is very evident that he means not the law considered in itself, which is holy, just, and good; but the law represented as a medium by which a sinner may obtain righteousness. In this view it must be rejected, otherwise we reject the righteousness of Christ; but in no sense whatever is the law of God an object of *detestation.* It is the error of misrepresenting the law, and putting it out of its proper place, that is to be detested.

Here it is proper to remark, that Luther's respect for the law of God, and his deep sense of the obligation of good works, were made manifest by his own personal character, which was such as to command the esteem and respect of those who most intimately knew him. Without this, indeed, he would have made a poor figure as a reformer of religion. Papists, aware of this, have spared no pains, by forgery and sheer lying, to deprive him of his fair character, that they might vilify the Reformation. He has indeed been represented as a monster of wickedness, who learned his religion from the devil, and had the devil for his familiar friend and companion; and the writer quoted in my last Number, by a sneer about his faithful Catherine, does more than insinuate that he taught and practised immorality; though the fact referred to, infers no more than that he lived happily with his lawful wife. Cotemporary enemies, however, knew better than to speak evil of his moral character. Nay, they are compelled to speak highly of it; and they even speak of this as one reason why so much respect was paid to him. "Luther," says the Popish historian Maimbourg, "in his sermons attacked the vices of men with great acrimony: he likewise published, in the German and in the Latin languages, a number of pious books." "Moreover, as *he lived a moral life, and was not given in the smallest degree to covetousness or any other vice,* he was universally held to be a good and great, and even a holy man; insomuch, that it was the custom to paint his portrait with rays of glory round his head, as if he had been a canonized saint." See *Milner's Church History,* vol. iv. p. 509.

Now we ought not to forget that it is of the nature of the doctrine which Luther taught, and made the basis of the Reformation, to produce such a character as he is here described to have been. The Popish doctrine of justification by works never produced a truly holy man; I mean devoted in heart and life to the service of God, and making his service and glory paramount to every selfish consideration. Such Luther seems to have been. Aleander, the Pope's agent employed to reclaim him, is said to have disliked him on account "of the soundness and purity of his morals. He is known to have said, 'it is impossible to soften Luther by money. He is a brute, who will not look either to bribes or honours; otherwise, he might long ago have had many thousands paid to him at the banker's by the Pope's orders.'" *Milner,* vol. iv. p. 485, with the authorities in the margin.

It is not meant to assert that Luther was a perfect man, or that he had a perfect acquaintance with the whole of divine truth. He was miserably mistaken with regard to the presence of the real body of Christ in the sacrament; and he contended for his dogma with as much keenness, and with more asperity, than he did for the fundamental point of justification by faith. Indeed, his very asperity in the

sacramental controversy should have led him, in his cooler moments, to suspect that he was wrong; for it is comparatively seldom that men lose temper when they have truth on their side; whereas, it is scarcely possible to maintain and plead for error and nonsense, without getting into a passion.

Luther possessed many faults in point of temper, which no man knew better, and deplored more sincerely, than himself; but, in point of moral character, I do not only say that he will bear a comparison with the best of his adversaries, but that he stands in bright contrast with those who defamed and persecuted him. His associates, Melancthon, Ecolampadius, and others, were men of like character, and better temper. They were, in short, great lights in a dark age; and to them Europe, at this day, is under inexpressible obligations.

I know that my Popish neighbours will triumph greatly on account of my admission, that Luther erred, and that he had a violent temper; and what dependence, they will ask, can any man have on that religion, the founder of which was a fallible, and even an erring man? And I must tell them again, though they know it, that Protestants do not acknowledge Luther, or any mere man, as the founder of their religion; but that it has its foundation in the word of God, which Luther was an instrument of bringing to the view of the world at large, after the Church of Rome had done what she could to conceal it from public view; and it is one of the glories of that Reformation, that it has put it into the power of every man, and that it invites every man, to scrutinize the doctrines taught by him who was the chief instrument in that Reformation; and to reject such of them as we find not agreeable to the word of God; whereas, had we continued under the power of the Pope, we would not have been at liberty to scrutinize any doctrine, or believe or reject any thing, but as it might please the holy father. His children are slaves; those of the Reformation are free men.

The author on whom I am animadverting gravely tells us that Luther's disciples "have gradually learned to blush at the extravagance of their master: in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned, on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of scripture and common sense." I do not know that Luther has any disciples in this country; and as for those who bear his name on the continent of Europe, if they have abandoned the doctrine of justification by faith, it is the worse for themselves. They are what Luther would have called in the state of a fallen church; and if they seek, like the Papists, to be justified by their own works and deservings, it is of very little consequence what other tenets they may hold or reject. They are fallen from grace; Christ will profit them nothing. Gal. v. 2—4.

But though some churches have chosen to call themselves by the name of Luther, it is right the world should know, that the Reformer spurned with abhorrence the idea of having a sect named after him. In his warning against sedition and tumult, (says Milner, the historian, vol. v. p. 68.) he exhorts all men not so much as to mention his name in a sectarian view; not to call themselves Lutherans, but Christians. "The doctrine," says he, "is not mine, nor was I crucified for any one. Paul and Peter forbad the people to call themselves after their names: why should I, who am soon to be food for worms, desire the children of Christ to be called by the name of so poor a creature? By no means! No! No! Let us have done with factious appellations; and be called Christians, because we possess the doctrine of Christianity. The Papists have very properly another name, because they are not content with Christ's name and Christ's doctrine; they choose to be called Papists. Be it so, because they have a master. I desire to be no man's master. I hold with the Church the doctrine which belongs to us all in common, and of which Christ alone is the author."

The Churches of England and Scotland do not profess to be called after Luther, and it is unjust to call British Protestants his disciples; yet on the point of justification both Churches are entirely agreed with him. The former expresses herself as follows, in the eleventh article: "*Of the justification of man.* We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore that we be justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." And one would think, that to all who understand the terms, it must be comfortable to know, that our hope of salvation rests not upon the sand, but upon a foundation of divine righteousness that cannot be shaken. My opponents sneer at this, but it is the only sure anchor of hope to a perishing sinner. The doctrine of the Church of Scotland, and of almost all sects in this country, is precisely the same, with only a little difference in the mode of expression.

No. CXXII.

SATURDAY, November 11th, 1820.

My Popish opponent Amicus Veritatis, in his affected zeal for good works, has done what he could to make them appear disagreeable, if not hateful in the esteem of his readers. In this respect, he has outheathened the very heathens; for they spoke of virtue as being its own reward; and though they understood not well

what they meant, it is very clear that the doctrine which they intended to inculcate, was, that a good man was happier than a bad man, even in the present life, and whether the hope of a future state was taken into account or not. But AMICUS VERITATIS, and the author whom he takes for his guide, speak of virtue, or the way of holiness, as I choose rather to call it, as a rugged, uninviting, and thorny way. (See No. CXX. p. 502.) From this I infer, that they have no love to this way themselves, for no man would give an ill name to that which he loved, and in which he placed his delight.

"Our blessed Redeemer," say my authors, "died for us, and still left the way to happiness strait and rugged." This is the foundation of the Popish doctrine, that, notwithstanding what Christ has done, we must satisfy divine justice, and merit eternal life for ourselves. But where has Christ said that the way to happiness is strait and rugged? He has indeed said, "strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth to life, and few there be that find it;" but this straitness, or narrowness, arises not from the incapacity of the way, as if there were not room enough for all who should ever enter; but because, from the circumstance of few walking in it, the path is narrow. It is wide enough for all who shall ever go into it; and if the whole world were to enter, it would be wide enough for them all. "I am the door," says Christ to all who hear his word, "by me if *any man* enter in he shall be saved," which implies, that if *all men* would enter in they should be saved.

But Christ has not said a word about his way being *rugged*. On the contrary he describes it as smooth and pleasant. It is rest to the labouring and heavy laden. His yoke is easy, and his burden is light, Matt. xi. 28—30. Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace, Prov. iii. 17. According to the Popish doctrine, when sinners are turned from the evil of their ways, and begin to live a new life, that is, when they really begin to do good works, they enter upon a rugged path, so uninviting that few would choose to walk in it, and those who do enter upon it, may expect to be lacerated and torn by "the thorns of virtue." The plain English of this is, that the life of a real Christian must be a miserable one; and so it would, were it not for that doctrine which the Church of England declares to be wholesome and very full of comfort. (See No. CXX. p. 502.) Papists rejecting the righteousness of Christ, and trusting to their own doings, and their own penances, cannot possibly obtain comfort; for let them torment themselves ever so much, they can never be sure that they have done enough to satisfy divine justice. Nay, they may starve, or otherwise torture themselves to death, and yet not be sure that they may not be tormented in purgatory for a thousand years. Seeing AMICUS VERITATIS believes, and publicly maintains, that he must satisfy divine justice for himself, his language is perfectly natural. The way of good works must appear to him a rugged and a thorny path; and I appeal to every reader of common sense, whether good works are more likely to be promoted by such a representation of them, or by that which makes them appear amiable and profitable in the present life?

I maintain, that suppose there were no hereafter, a life of holiness, or, if you will, a life of good works, is infinitely more happy than a life of sin. AMICUS VERITATIS and his oracle assert, that Luther made the way to happiness spacious and commodious; and their meaning is, that he tolerated, and encouraged sinful practices, so that the way might be trodden with ease by thousands. Hence we derive this doctrine, that the way of sin is an *easy*, *spacious*, and *commodious* way. This is Popery, but like every other peculiarity of the system, it is directly opposed to the word of God. Here we are assured that the way of transgressors is hard. This is truly the rugged and the thorny way, which Papists falsely assert Christ to have left to his people, for his commandments are not grievous. If, therefore, Luther made the way to happiness easy and commodious, it was not by abolishing the obligation of good works, as my opponents falsely assert; but by showing how men became able to do good works, and to take pleasure in them, that is, by becoming interested in Christ by faith, and being renewed after the image of Christ unto the love and practice of good works. This takes place in the experience of every man who truly believes the gospel. He enters upon the way of holiness; and he finds it inexpressibly a more pleasant way than the way of sin had been. Godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come. He is an enemy of true religion who represents it as a gloomy thing.

I shall be told perhaps that the scriptures give a different representation; that many are the afflictions of the righteous; that God's people are called an afflicted and poor people; and that, if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable. I know that many are the afflictions of the righteous; but I know also that many are the horrors of the wicked; and that, while the afflictions of the former are counterbalanced by joy unspeakable, in possession and in prospect, the horrors of the latter are augmented by a certain fearful looking for of judgment: and that, if the former should be poor in this world, they are rich in faith and heirs of a kingdom, while the latter can derive no benefit from the wealth of this world, seeing they are poor towards God. As for Christians being of all men most miserable in this world, if it were not for the hope of another, I think any man

who should assert this, must sadly mistake the meaning of the passage. The apostle is by no means asserting an axiom of general application; but merely a fact with regard to himself and other apostles, upon the supposition that they had been preaching a lie. If Christ were not risen from the dead, as some in the Corinthian church asserted, then were the apostles false witnesses for Christ,—all their preaching was vain,—those who had died in the faith had perished, after all that Christ had done and suffered, we can have no hope beyond this life; if these things were so, then we, the apostles, are the most miserable men in the world. That this is the meaning of the passage any one may see who reads the words in their connection, 1 Cor. xv. 12—19.

Christians do indeed suffer many things in common with the men of the world, and they have afflictions peculiarly their own, of which worldly men can form no conception. Some of these are described by the apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans, seventh chapter. But these afflictions are not such as to justify the assertion, that the way of good works is a rugged and thorny way, as my opponents represent it. The righteous have more joy in their afflictions than the ungodly have even in their mirth; and then there is a remorse and horror which the ungodly suffer in their hours of sadness, from which the Christian is delivered by that gospel which brought peace to his conscience at first, and in the belief of which he continues to enjoy the peace of God which passeth all understanding. One thing is certain, that persons who had been in the most miserable state imaginable, whenever they believed the gospel preached by the apostles, were filled with joy and comfort. (See Acts ii. 42—47, and xvi. 34.) They never had done good works till then; and they never knew till then what true happiness was. The same effects are produced at this day by the same gospel, wherever it is received, as those know best who are most engaged in the preaching of it, and in cultivating acquaintance with those who believe it.

But there is no gospel, that is, no good news, for sinners in the Church of Rome. Popery is a system of bondage and terror. It affords no real peace to the conscience. It effects no change in the heart from sin to holiness. It furnishes neither means nor proper motives for the performance of good works; and while it sets men to the work of satisfying divine justice for themselves, it makes them look upon God as unreconciled, and, therefore, as their enemy. In this state they must necessarily be alienated from God in their minds; and such works as are pleasing to him, cannot be pleasing to them. This accounts for the language of AMICUS VERITATIS, and other papists, who represent the way of holiness as so rugged and thorny, that few would choose to walk in it. The language of Christ in his gospel is, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. xi. 28. This is not the rest of idleness, but the far more comfortable rest of honourable and useful activity in the service of God, in doing those things which he has commanded, believing that our doing so is acceptable and pleasing to him, because our persons are accepted, and our sins pardoned, through the righteousness of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. This doctrine effectually teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in the present evil world. But the belief of the slave, who looks upon God as unreconciled, and as inflicting the punishment of his sins upon his own person, for the satisfaction of justice, possesses that alienation of mind from God, and that blindness of heart, which can produce nothing but wicked works.

The reader will be interested to know the feelings of Luther on this subject. While yet a monk, and living a blameless life, which could not have been said of all his brethren, he was actually a hater of God; and if every one who thinks he must satisfy divine justice for himself, were to express the feelings of his mind with as much honesty, he would confess the same truth. "However blameless a life I might lead as a monk," says Luther, "I experienced a most unquiet conscience; I perceived myself a sinner before God; I saw that I could do nothing to appease him, and I hated the idea of a just God that punishes sinners. I was well versed in all St. Paul's writings; and, in particular, I had a most wonderful desire to understand the epistle to the Romans. But I was puzzled with the expression, 'THEREIN is the righteousness of God revealed.' My heart rose almost against God with a silent sort of blasphemy: at least in secret I said with great murmur and indignation, Was it not enough that wretched man, already eternally ruined by the curse of original depravity, should be oppressed with every species of misery through the condemning power of the commandment, but that, even through the gospel, God should threaten us with his anger and justice, and thereby add affliction to affliction? Thus I raged with a troubled conscience. Over and over I turned the above-mentioned passage to the Romans most importunately. My thirst to know the apostle's meaning was insatiable.

"At length, while I was meditating day and night upon the words, and their connection with that which immediately follows, namely, 'the just shall live by faith,' it pleased God to have pity upon me, to open mine eyes, and to show me that the righteousness of God, which is here said in the gospel to be revealed from faith to faith, relates to the method by which God, in his mercy, justifies a sinner through faith, agreeably to what is written, 'the just shall live by faith.' Hence

I felt myself a new man, and all the scriptures appeared to have a new face. I ran quickly through them, as my memory enabled me; I collected together the leading terms; and I observed in their meaning a strict analogy according to my new views. Thus, in many instances, the work of God means that which he works in us; and the power and wisdom of God, mean the power and wisdom which his Spirit operates in the minds of the faithful; and in the same manner are to be understood the patience, the salvation, the glory of God.

"The expression, RIGHTEOUSNESS of God, now became as sweet to my mind as it had been hateful before; and this very passage of St. Paul proved to me the entrance into paradise." *Luther's Works, Preface,* vol. i. quoted by Milner, vol. iv. p.419.

It was a great mortification to the Papists, that they could find nothing against the moral character of Luther during his life; but they thought it would equally serve the purpose of making odious the reformation of which he was the chief instrument, if they could make the world believe, that there was something mysterious and horrific in his death and burial. That he died in the faith and hope of the gospel, full of peace and comfort, has been certified by those who witnessed his last moments, for the truth of which I refer the reader to his Life by Melancthon, and others. But the Papists propagated the following ridiculous account of his death, and, for any thing I know, it is firmly believed by all good Papists to this day:—

"That going to bed merry and drunk, he was found the next morning dead in his bed, his body being black, and his tongue hanging forth as if he had been strangled; which some think was done by the devil, some by his wife. And that, as they bare him to the church to bury him, his body so smelt, that they were fain to throw it into a ditch, and go their ways." This is the Popish fiction; but the recorded fact is, that Luther was buried with great pomp, in the Tower church in Wittemberg, by the appointment of the Prince Elector, "Bugenhagius making the funeral sermon, and Melancthon the oration."

Another Papist, a Jesuit, wrote as follows: "The same day that Luther died, many that were possessed of devils in a town of Brabant, were on a sudden delivered, and not long after possessed again. And when it was demanded of the devils, where they had been? they answered, that by the appointment of their prince, they were called forth to the funeral of Luther. And this was proved to be true, because a servant of Luther's, who was in the chamber when he died, opening a casement to take in air, saw near unto him a great number of black spirits hopping and dancing." *See the Works of John White,* folio, London, 1624, § 57. It is pleasant to see how these stories neutralize one another. If Luther had a servant in his chamber when he died, it would not have been left as a matter of uncertainty, whether it was the devil or his wife that was the immediate cause of his death; and if a legion of devils had been called from Brabant to attend his funeral, it is not probable that they would have left his body in a ditch unburied. Such are some of the reflections of the author from whom my account is taken.

But the following is worthy of the most particular attention, being more than doubly miraculous, seeing it contains an account of the death and burial of a man who was alive and in perfect health. I quote from the same section of the same author, who gives his authority in the margin,—

"A horrible miracle, and such as was never heard of before; that God, who ever is to be praised, in the foul death of Martin Luther, damned in body and soul, showed for the glory of Christ, and the amendment and comfort of the godly. When Martin Luther fell into his disease, he desired the body of our Lord Jesus to be communicated to him; which having received, he died soon after. And when he saw his end approach, he desired that his body might be laid upon the altar, and worshipped with divine honours. But God, willing at the length to make an end of horrible errors, by a huge miracle warned the people to desist from the impiety that Luther had brought in. For his body being laid in the grave, on a sudden such a tumult and terror arose, as if the foundation of the earth had been shaken. Whereupon, they that were present at the funeral, grew amazed with fear, and lifting up their eyes, saw the holy host hanging in the air. Wherefore with great devotion they took it, and laid it in a holy place; which being done, this hellish noise was heard no more. The next night after, was heard a noise and cracking about Luther's tomb, much louder than before, which waked all that were in the city out of their sleep, trembling, and almost dead for fear. Wherefore, in the morning, opening the sepulchre where Luther's detestable body was laid, they found neither body nor bones, nor clothes, but a stink of brimstone coming out of the grave, and well nigh killed all the standers by. By the which miracle, many being terrified, reformed their lives to the honour of the Christian faith, and the glory of Jesus Christ." The above having spread over all Italy, and perhaps the greater part of Europe, fell at last into the hands of Luther himself, who, in perfect good humour, and not the least dismayed by the "horrible miracle" relating to his own funeral, wrote under the narrative as follows:—"I, Martin Luther, by this my hand-writing, confess and testify, that, upon the twenty-first of March, I received this fiction concerning my death, as it was full of malice and madness; and I read it with a glad

mind, and a cheerful countenance, but yet detested this blasphemy, whereby a stinking lie is fathered upon the divine majesty of God. As concerning the rest, I cannot but rejoice and laugh at the devil's malice, wherewith he and his rout, the Pope and his complices, pursue me. And God convert them from this devilish malice. But if this my prayer be for the sin that is unto death, that it cannot be heard, then God grant that they may fill up the measure of their sin, and with such lying libels as this, let them delight themselves one with another, to the full."

Luther was accustomed in his writings to ascribe evil thoughts, and suggestions of error, to the immediate agency of the devil. Thus, when he was suffering any temptation of this kind, he would say, "the devil told me so and so." In some of his works, he speaks of his temptations, and the opposition which he was enabled to make from the word of God, as if it had been a dialogue between the devil and himself. He had many anxious cogitations with regard to the great work in which he was engaged. These sometimes kept him awake in his bed; and when some discouraging suggestions occurred to his mind, and his courage was in danger of being shaken, he would say, in recording the fact, that the devil came to him at such an hour of the night, and pressed him with many weighty arguments; and then he would narrate how he answered the devil by such and such passages of scripture. In this there was nothing more than the occasional misgivings of a great mind, appalled by the magnitude of the work which he had undertaken, and an acknowledgment of the support which he derived from the word of God. But certain Popish writers, affecting to understand Luther's words in their literal sense, have stoutly maintained, and it is asserted to this day, that he held real and personal conferences with the devil, received his instructions from him, and was taught by him to argue so stoutly against the Church of Rome. "About Luther's conferences with the Devil," is the title of a chapter of a quarto volume which I have before me. The writer professes to have been brought up a Protestant, but falling into great doubts, he was led to examine the foundation of religion, and he became in due time a confirmed Papist. The circumstance of Luther's having been a disciple of the devil, had, it seems, great weight on his mind, in making him suspect the truth of Protestantism: but let us hear his own account of the matter:—

"And as for the matter of the devil's suggestion, both to M. Luther for rejecting the mass, and other articles of the Roman religion, and to Zuinglius for rejecting the real presence, did most stick in my mind, and caused some horror to think, that we in England should follow a doctrine revealed by the devil himself, I was very desirous to read the story at large in Luther himself: wherefore, I sought out Luther's works, and in the book *de Missa angulari, et de consecratione sacerdotum*, or, as others entitle it, *de Missa privata, et unctione sacerdotum;* and, for more certainty, I sought two editions of his works, the one of Wittemberg, Tome vii. the other of Jena, Tome vi. in which book is recounted at large the conference, or rather, large dispute which Luther said he had with the devil, or the devil rather with him, about the mass."—*A Search, &c. by Francis Walshingham*, p. 130.

The writer goes on to quote certain scraps of sentences from Luther's works; and, with great seriousness and apparent candour, he finds it his duty to renounce the doctrines taught by one who was so familiar with the devil. "Moreover," says he, "whereas before, I had a great aversion to believe that such a man of God as Luther, chosen to so great a work, (as I persuaded myself he was) should have any familiarity or conversation at all with the devil, and therefore could hardly believe that he should write of himself, that he knew him well, *and that he had eaten more than a bushel of salt with him*, and other such speeches recounted in the Defence of the censure; now reading over sundry parts of his works extant in print, I found many speeches of his not much differing from the other." Thus it appears the story about the bushel of salt is taken from another book, not from Luther himself. It is only a proverbial expression to intimate great familiarity; and the author is satisfied that it is Luther's, because in his own works he reads expressions "not much differing from the other," though Papists know well how to make a great difference in the meaning of a sentence, by a small omission or a small addition.

I have quoted these ridiculous conceits, to let the reader see to what contemptible arts Popish writers have had recourse to pervert the writings, and calumniate the memory of the great Reformer. I have great abundance of such matter, relating to Calvin and other reformers, but I think the foregoing will be considered enough as a sample.

No. CXXIII.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18TH, 1820.

FEW objects, of late, have received more of the public attention than the state of Ireland, and the improvement of our fellow-subjects in that kingdom. By the well-directed efforts of several societies, founded upon the most benevolent and liberal principles, many thousands of the poor peasantry are receiving an education that enables them to read the Word of God, and from the same, or similar benevolent

sources, they are receiving Bibles to read. The Pope and his clergy have taken the alarm, knowing that their craft is at stake, and that the great goddess of Rome, whom the world has so long worshipped, is in danger of being set at nought. His holiness has issued another bull, of date the 20th of August last, against the wolves in sheep's clothing, namely, the benevolent men who are giving the people the Word of God, and teaching them to read it. This new bull is little more than a second edition of the one which I reviewed in my eighty-first, and some succeeding Numbers; so that I need not waste my time in exposing the falsehoods and absurdities which it contains.

For the farther information of my readers, I shall proceed to lay before them an interesting extract of a letter from a gentleman in Ireland, with whom I am personally acquainted, and on whose veracity I have the most complete reliance. The letter is addressed to a clergyman of the church of Scotland, who has kindly favoured me with this extract: I forbear giving the writer's name lest it should expose him to inconvenience among his Popish neighbours:—

"I shall now direct your attention to a few remarks on the state of Ireland in general, collected since I came to the country by personal observation. Much has been said on the demoralization of Ireland, and many causes have been assigned in order to account for them; but, as I could not see the operation of the causes which I had so often heard of, I resolved to satisfy myself on the subject by personal inquiry; and, accordingly, in going out to itinerate, having a horse belonging to———, I rode through the country in different directions, going into the houses, and conversing with the people in every mode I could think of, in order to elicit the information I wished to acquire. After a considerable time spent in this way, I called upon the priests, and, in conversing with them, made the best use that I could of the hints of information which I had received from the people. The priests are very cautious in speaking with Protestants; and, therefore, from many of them I could ascertain very little. But the aggregate of their respective information perfectly corroborated the information which I had previously received from the people, and I think put me in possession of the real cause of the degradation of Ireland.

"The mass of the Irish population is entirely in the hands of the priests, and governed by a system of policy, consolidated by a union of design and operation, which extends to every spot within the precincts of the kingdom of Ireland. To make this plain I shall be more particular.—The parish priests are the sole judges in their respective parishes, not only in an ecclesiastical, but also in a civil capacity. The people resort to them for information on every point of law that may affect either their conduct or their property; and, whether the information obtained in this way is correct or not, few will think of going further to inquire. All differences among the people are also referred to the decision of the priest; and from his judgment there is seldom an appeal. Should it be necessary to make oath in any disputed case, this also is done before the priest; and, to avoid the law, which restricts the administration of oaths to magistrates, the person deponing before the priest must declare that he does so by voluntary oath; and should the affidavit thus made be committed to writing, which it often is, it is signed by the priest as voluntarily made before him, he considering himself as only a witness, while he is in fact the real administrator of the oath, and regarded as such by the party who makes it, as well as by the party for whose satisfaction it is made. Written affidavits obtained in this way are frequently to be met with; and more importance is attached to them, even by Protestants, than to affidavits made before magistrates. Many of the priests go so far as to inflict punishment, by penance, in cases tried before them; and I have not been able to discover an instance where the penance has not been performed. Thus their authority over their flocks is both legislative and executive; and I am sure that the greatest despot could not meet with a readier compliance with his mandates, than is given to the "*ipse dixit*" of these ecclesiastical tyrants. Another source of the influence of the priests, is their interference with the commercial concerns of their parishes. When any thing is to be sold in a parish, it must be advertised by the priest from the altar, after the celebration of mass; for if it is not, the people are taught to infer, that the proprietor of the article to be sold, is not in favour with the priest; and in that case he will find no purchasers. This is so notoriously the case, that when gentlemen in the country have any thing for sale, the result of the sale will be in exact proportion to the degree of good understanding that may exist between them and the priest. In public establishments, such as breweries, the case is the same. I have known the proprietors of such establishments give, in some instances, regular salaries to some of the most active of the priests, in order to have the sale of their commodities promoted by them, through their influence over the people. Some gentlemen among the Protestant landed interest of the country, do the same for the protection of their property.

"The priests have another mode of exerting their influence in the country, which checks most effectually the efforts of the clergy of the establishment, without appearing openly against them. Whenever any of the clergy begin to be active in the discharge of their parochial duties, the priests throw out their innuendoes, and the people soon take take them

up. When the collectors of the tithes go round for the tithes, they are shot at, and in many cases killed, and the clergyman is necessitated to relax his diligence, or lose his income, and perhaps his life. But if the minister be in good terms with the priest, (which he never can be unless he is inactive) the tithes may be collected with ease, and his life is perfectly secure.

"In addition to this, the priests are further supported in maintaining their system, by the constant intercourse which they keep up with their parishioners. Every individual in the parish, professing Popery, must confess to the priest, at least twice a year, at Easter and Christmas, when every thing must be told without reserve, even to the trifles of domestic life. The priests are thus in possession of every thing that can occur within their respective parishes; and, from the particularity of their inquiries, when they receive confessions, they can ascertain with the greatest precision the bent and disposition of the people's minds, as well as the different objects to which they may be directed, and the different points of view in which these objects may be considered. Add to this, that when the priests hear confessions they always direct the party, as to future conduct, according to the confession made; and, in this particular, they are sure to keep the interests of their system in view. The priests send a regular detail of the information thus acquired, to their respective bishops; who, in their turn, transmit it to the primate, and when the primate issues his annual address to the bishops, founded on the information thus received, they echo back his instructions in their diocesan charges to their priests, with such alterations as localities may require.

"With regard to the catholic question, the people are entirely in the dark. The priests never present it to them in a distinct point of view. They know, that if they were to enter into details, it would be impossible to convince the lower orders that they could be benefited by the much talked of emancipation; and therefore, to keep their minds in a constant agitation on the subject, they state the case generally, and in doing so, ascribe all the misery which exists in the country, to the refusal of government to grant their request. This puts both the government and the question, in a false point of view before the people; but the priests gain their end by it, and the minds of the Catholics become more and more embittered against the Protestants, every time that the subject is discussed. Thus you may perceive that every subject is made a handle of by the priests, to secure the attachment of the people; and in proportion as they succeed in securing their attachment, they will succeed in blinding their minds; for as ignorance is the mother of their devotion, so is she also the foundation on which their system stands. And every thing that can contribute to make this foundation more secure, is seized with an alacrity, and managed with an energy and address, which would astonish you. Popery, in short, is more than a religious system in this country; it is a political constitution perfectly distinct from the constitution of the empire, and conducted with such consummate dexterity, that many, who are under its influence, have no idea of its existence. It presents only one of its wheels at a time, while it conceals the grand engine by which that wheel is kept in motion; and, unless it be inspected with a watchfulness, equal to that which its conductors exercise for its concealment, the construction and operations of the machine never can be known.

"I respect the I. E. S. much, because I am convinced that as it has been the means of good to many, so it will be the means of good to many more; but I am certain, that if it were to identify with the objects which it has already taken up, that species of investigation to which I have alluded, it would be more generally useful, and its other plans would be more successfully executed. By the society's plan of preaching, its ministers have access only to some of the less bigoted Protestants; but by inquiring into the state of things among the Catholics, and acting on the information obtained, we open a door of general usefulness, and strike at the root of all the evils which exist in the country. I am so convinced of the necessity of this, that I am almost certain that no radical change in the moral or religious system of Ireland will be effected until it is done. The priests and their priest-craft must be dragged from their unhallowed concealment, and exposed to the just indignation of their deluded people, before the enthralling system, by which Ireland has so long been held in chains, can be overthrown.

"My intention has been long directed to this important work; but the host of the enemy is so numerous, that unless I could devote my whole time to it, I could not enter the field against them formally, although I do what I can when they come in my way. Could men be found who would unite their exertions to discover the nature and extent of the evils connected with the Popish system, as it now exists in Ireland, and to apply an efficient remedy, generations yet unborn would bless their memory, while they would enjoy, in the success of their labours, a present reward. I would not have dwelt so long on this subject, were I not convinced that there are many in Scotland who might be usefully employed in the cause I am pleading, and who perhaps might be influenced by the statement I have made, at least to give the subject their serious consideration. It involves the cause of souls, and the cause of souls is the cause of God and of his Christ. I have much more to say to you, but I am afraid I have already been too prolix."

It is difficult to imagine a state of more grievous bondage than that of the Irish people, under the domination of these ghostly tyrants. Every lover of his country is interested, therefore, in promoting the education of the youth among them, in order that by the slow, but sure operation of truth, the reign of error may be subverted, and Popery utterly extirpated. This is a consummation most devoutly to be wished for; and I think a train is laid by which it will be brought about, before the present generation pass away. The Pope himself seems to be aware of this, and to have a dread of it upon his mind. His weeping and wailing on on occasion of the Bible schools, is like the screeching of the owl when the dawn threatens the approach of the sun, whose rising he cannot prevent. An old priest is said to have remarked lately to his younger brethren, "I shall have my time of it; but you, young men, look to yourselves."

From the above statement it is easy to see, that the condition of the established clergy, in the more Popish parts of the country, must be extremely uncomfortable and insecure. If they are conscientious in the discharge of their duty, and if they presume to collect the provision which the law has made for them, it is at the hazard of their lives. Popery is therefore, in Ireland at this day, as hostile to the propagation of the gospel, as Mahomedanism is in Turkey, or heathenism in China. Let it be observed, it is not the mere collection of tithes that provokes the hostility of the Popish priests, it is also official diligence in the discharge of pastoral duties. If a parish minister shall preach the gospel to the poor, if he visit the sick, if he instruct the ignorant, if he warn his flock against false doctrine and the intrusion of false teachers, all which he is bound in duty to do, he is in danger of being shot at, and of losing his life. Now, as it is to be feared, there are many of the clergy of the established church in that kingdom, as well as elsewhere, who have not the courage and zeal of apostles, and who have no ambition for the crown of martyrdom, it is not surprising that non-residence and neglect of duty should prevail to a great extent. While this in some measure accounts for the fact, it is by no means a justification of it. Error will never be effectually put down, nor will the kingdom of Christ be universally established until more of the apostolic spirit, that is, more of the spirit of Christ himself, appear among those who are called his ministers. I know that Ireland is not altogether destitute of men endowed by the Holy Spirit, —full of zeal in the cause of the gospel both in the established church and out of it; but how few are they in proportion to the millions who are sitting in gross darkness!

If the churches in general were filled by such persons as I have referred to, the cause between truth and error would soon be brought to an issue. If the instructions communicated by the Bible read in schools, were followed up by preaching the gospel publicly, and from house to house, there can be no doubt the blessing of God would accompany the means of his own appointment, for turning many from their vain idols to the service of the living God. Popery could not long maintain its ground before the influence of truth, brought home to the heart and conscience, by the kind and affectionate ministrations of men whose own lives were cast in the mould of the gospel, and who were enabled to exhibit its kindly and sanctifying influence in their whole conversation and conduct. Some of them would no doubt lose their lives in the service; but this would be unspeakable gain to themselves, and it would hasten the overthrow of antichrist. We shall hear no more of farther concessions to the Papists, or of investing them with political power, when they shall appear among ourselves in their true character of bloody persecutors, as they always have been when they had power in their hands, and as I venture to predict they will be again, even without political power, or any other power than that which they usurp over their blinded adherents, whenever faithful ministers shall begin to labour in the manner which I have described, in those districts over which they claim spiritual oversight and authority. Popery, at this day, has not a firmer hold of Ireland than it had of Scotland, at the period of the reformation; yet we know how it was subverted, and almost extirpated, by means of preaching and suffering. The eloquence of a Knox was not more instrumental in effecting the happy change, than the blood of a Hamilton, a Mill, and a Wishart. Christ will be served by men who count not their lives dear to themselves, but who are willing to lay them down for his sake; and if all the clergy of Ireland were but half as much devoted to the service of Christ, as the soldiers of king George are to his service, we should soon hear of victories more glorious than ever were achieved upon the mountains of Spain, or the plain of Waterloo. It would be the victory of truth over error, of the kingdom of light over the prince of darkness.

It is one of the pleasing effects which result from the circulation of my Numbers in Ireland, that certain facts are corroborated and illustrated by persons who are acquainted with them, of which I shall here give a curious instance. In my seventy-eighth Number, p. 328, I gave an account of a priest having bequeathed money to procure masses for his soul, at the rate of 1s. 7d. each, which it seems should have been only 1s 6d.;* but all the rest is confirmed, with the following curious illustration, for which I am indebted to a correspondent of undoubted

* The difference may be reconciled by supposing the one to be Irish, the other sterling money.

credit. "I was well acquainted with father Lonergan of ——— who left the three legacies, and a more rational man by a fire-side, in general matters, I never knew; but to such a delusion are the wisest of them given up to believe a lie, that this man in his will gave a rare instance of spiritual foolishness and carnal wisdom, that makes one smile. The reason assigned in his will for ordering 1s. 6d. masses, was, 'and whereas the only difference between a guinea mass and a shilling mass consisting in the *intention* of the priest; and knowing by experience that whatever priests may say or intend, there is very little difference between the intention given in the one and in the other, I do will and direct, that the money be applied in masses of one and sixpence each, being persuaded that there is more intention in a hundred masses at one and sixpence each, than in twenty or more at a guinea each, and therefore more benefit to my soul!!!' I did not conceive what was the blindness of the human mind till I heard this part of the will. I got a new insight into the human mind, and the character of Popery."

There can be no doubt, I think, that this poor man really believed that his soul would derive some benefit from these masses; and yet he knew that all the benefit would depend upon the intention of the priest that should say them. Mr. Fletcher says somewhere in his Lectures, upon authority which he adduces, that many of the priests in Ireland do not really believe in Transubstantiation, and that their scepticism on this point is a leading article in their confessions to one another; and a learned divine of the church of England, who honours me with his correspondence, in a letter received a few days ago, assures me that Papists in England are allowed to disbelieve the same dogma in their hearts, provided they do not deny it with their lips. But here is a priest, and a polite gentleman too, upon the point of death, and making his last will, who seemed to believe most sincerely, that the money which he left behind him, would procure benefit to his soul after death. This can be accounted for only upon the ground of the divinely attested fact, that when men receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved, they are given up to strong delusions, that they may believe a lie.

This holy father, without intending it, has left in his last will and testament, a strong testimony against his religion. The virtue of the sacraments, and of the mass in particular, depends in a great measure, if not entirely, upon the intention of the officiating priest. He could not be sure that the masses said for his soul after death should be accompanied by the necessary intention; nay, there is reason to think the priests would owe him a grudge, seeing he imposed upon them the drudgery of doing a job for eighteen pence, for which they might as well have had a guinea; and, therefore, it is probable that they would take their revenge by saying his masses without any intention at all. At least he could not know but this might be the case; and, therefore, he could have no real hope in his death. The gospel believed gives a sure and certain hope of rest beyond the grave; and he that continues to the end shall be saved, without a peradventure. The righteous, therefore, hath hope in his death; but the Papist can have no such hope. It is at best mere peradventure with him. He is not only all his lifetime subject to bondage; but he dies in a state of bondage. It must be a miserable thing to trust in the doings of a fellow-creature; and yet Papists have not so much as even this to depend upon. Their whole dependence is upon the intention, that is, the secret thought of him who performs a certain ceremony. This melancholy view of Popery, which shows it to be truly ruinous to the souls of men, is confirmed by the dying words of one of its own priests, and he one of the best of his order. Surely every man who has a feeling of compassion for the souls of poor sinners, held thus in bondage by the devil, ought to lend his aid that such a delusion may be banished from the earth.

From the same correspondent, and in the same letter, I am furnished with the following curious particulars:—"Carrick is in the county of Tipperary; the county of Kilkenny commences about a mile from it, divided by a stream,—one in Ossory, the other in Cashell diocese. For many years the lents in Cashell diocese were black lents, and no meat allowed. In Ossory they were generally white lents, Kilkenny being more refined, and they had power to eat meat twice a week or more. The priests of Carrick not being able to eat meat in Tipperary county, always took advantage of the white lent in Ossory. Accordingly there was a public-house kept at the other side of the bridge that divides the county of Tipperary. It was kept by so notorious a woman that she was called Kate Heart; that is, she had too tender a heart to deny any man. At this woman's house the Carrick priests used to bespeak a meat dinner, on the Ossory meat-days, and from fifteen to twenty of them dined there during lent. They crossed the stream which was the line of demarcation between a curse and a blessing; and with all manner of jollification they feasted and drank till they were right full of what, had they eaten it at the other side of the bridge five yards wide, would have been an abomination fraught with mortal sin. There were cars to bring home those who were too wise to walk. This is keeping lent. Oh, Popery, what art thou!"

No. CXXIV.

SATURDAY, November 25th, 1820.

The *holy* Inquisition is the next subject that comes in my way according to the plan which I have prescribed to myself. As this is a tribunal established for the very purpose of taking cognizance of heresy, that is, any departure from the standard of faith which the Church of Rome has established, and of punishing to the uttermost all who shall be found guilty, or even suspected, of such a deviation, it will not be considered impertinent to introduce the subject with a few remarks on persecution for conscience' sake.

There can be nothing more certain, than that the genius of Christianity is hostile to persecution in every form. The gospel is addressed to the understanding, and to the heart of man, with this very solemn intimation, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned." The condemnation of unbelief, which is the only deadly heresy, is not committed to fellow-creatures for the purpose of being executed upon the persons of unbelievers in the present life. Unbelief is not a sin against men, but against God, whose testimony it rejects, and whose veracity therefore it impeaches. He reserves the judgment in this case to himself. He has commanded no man to interfere in the matter; and no man, and no church, has a right to interfere in it, farther than to declare, that he who rejects the divine testimony, can have no part in any divine ordinance. He is, therefore, with propriety, excluded from the fellowship of the visible church, but he ought not to suffer damage either in his person or property.

But there are persons who do not reject the divine testimony, but who really receive it, and who ought to be acknowledged as belonging to the household of faith, whose minds are but partially enlightened, with regard to many things connected with the faith and obedience of the Gospel. Now it was never meant by Christ, or taught by his apostles, that such persons should be compelled, by force, to think rightly upon every religious subject. The thing is absurd and impossible, for mind will not yield to any external pressure; and the Word of God authorizes no means for removing mistakes from the human mind, but instruction and persuasion; and these have often been found successful, while the world may be challenged to produce an instance of conviction of truth having been effected by brute force.

The use of compulsion, in relation to religious opinion, originated with the enemies of the truth, who, conscious that they could not maintain their ground by fair argument, had recourse to the power which they possessed in the strength of their arm, or the number of their adherents. Cain stands at the head of the black catalogue of persecutors. He was sadly mistaken with regard to the character of God, and the way of approaching to him with acceptance. Abel thought rightly on this most important subject; but it does not appear that he ever thought of compelling his elder brother to adopt more just ideas, or of murdering him if he did not. It was then, as in all subsequent ages: He that was after the flesh persecuted him that was after the Spirit. Every false religion excites its adherents to persecute the true religion, or to oppose it by force: but the spirit of Christianity is most remote from this; and, if any real Christian ever thought of promoting truth, or opposing error by other means than instruction and persuasion, he had learned his lesson, and taken his example from antichrist.

The primitive Christians suffered much from the Jews and the Heathens, especially the former, who, as they were the murderers of the Lord of glory, were also the most furious persecutors of his disciples. After the subversion of their nation, and their being deprived of the power of persecuting to any great extent, the work of wholesale murder was taken up by the Roman emperors, by whom many thousand Christians were destroyed for no crime but that of being Christians, which in Roman reckoning was enough to incur the sentence of being thrown to be devoured by wild beasts. It was not long after Constantine had taken Christianity under his protection, that persons, called Christians, began to persecute one another; but by this time the glory was departed. The word Christian had acquired a different meaning from that which it bore when first applied to the disciples at Antioch. Augustine and other early fathers strongly condemned violence on account of religion; but their voice was not heard. Heresy was considered a crime of the first magnitude; this was often a mere nickname of the truth, and the abettors of it were devoted to destruction. But persecution in every hideous form was never so completely reduced to a system, as after the Pope was seated upon his throne, showing himself as a god, having all power in heaven and in earth.

"In the following ages," says Limborch, speaking of a period subsequent to the age of Augustine, "the affairs of the church were so managed under the government of the Popes, and all persons so strictly curbed by the severity of the laws, that they durst not even so much as whisper against the received opinions of the church. Besides this, so deep was the ignorance that had spread itself over the world, that men, without the least regard to knowledge and learning, received, with a blind obedience, every thing that the ecclesiastics ordered them, however stupid and superstitious, without any examination; and if any one dared in the least

to contradict them, he was sure immediately to be punished; whereby the most absurd opinions came to be established by the violence of the Popes." *Hist. Inq.* chap. vii.

In the twelfth century it was found, that a numerous people inhabited the valleys of Piedmont, held certain doctrines different from those which the Pope commanded all men to receive, on pain of death. The people have been called Albigenses and Waldenses. The principal articles of their faith were substantially the same with those of the Reformation. It is not certain when or by whom such doctrines were first promulgated among them; but I think it is probable, that the truth of the gospel found an asylum among these mountains and valleys after it had been banished from Rome, and from every other part of the world to which the Pope could extend his influence. It is probable that the number of professors was very few for many ages; and, therefore, they escaped the notice of the holy see; but by the time mentioned they had become numerous; and they excited the utmost hatred of the Pope and his adherents. It was with a view to extirpate them that the Inquisition was established, and that *Saints* Dominic and Francis, the first Inquisitors, were set a-hunting after the precious lives of a simple and virtuous people, a thousand times more worthy than themselves.

It was the fashion, however, of the Church of Rome then, as it has always been since, to represent those who dissented from her errors as monsters of one kind or another. They could not persuade the world that the Waldenses were monsters of wickedness; for all who knew them, bare witness that they were a peaceable and harmless people; but they did succeed in their misrepresentations so far as to make the Duke of Savoy, and perhaps many others believe, that they, or at least their children, were not formed like other human creatures. At the instigation of the Pope, a cruel and murderous war had been carried on against the Waldenses, many of whom were subjects of the Duke of Savoy. He seeing his country in danger of being ruined by such violent measures, found means to put an end to the war: "Nay," says the historian from whom I quote, "it pleased God so to touch his heart with compassion for that poor people, that he spoke it openly, that for as much as he had always found them to be most faithful and obedient subjects, he would not suffer them to be so dealt with, by force of arms in future: only for what was past, he ordered, for formality's sake, that twelve of them should come to Pignerol where he then was, there to beg his pardon, for taking up arms in their own defence; the which they accordingly did, and his highness receiving them courteously, forgave them freely all that had passed during the time of the war, giving them to understand, that he had been misinformed, both as to their persons and their principles; and withal he desired to see some of their little ones, because there were some who had made him believe, that they were strange and monstrous creatures, having but one eye in their forehead, with four sets of black teeth, with many other such like fictions; whereupon some were brought before him, and he finding them, on the contrary, handsome-shapen and well favoured, did openly profess, how ill satisfied he was with the calumnies and slanders of their malicious adversaries, and thereupon did not only confirm their privileges and liberties, but withal made them a gracious promise to settle and establish the same for the time to come. And this was undoubtedly the real intention and resolution of that prince at that time, however afterwards wrought upon (or at least deluded) by the subtle devices of the Inquisitors, who took the boldness, notwithstanding all the gracious promises of their prince, to continue to persecute those poor Waldenses, laying violent hands on them, and delivering them up to the secular powers, who also, in most places, were not at all backward to lend them their helping hand." *Moreland's History of the Evangelical Churches in Piedmont*, folio, page 223.

Thus we see, that Popish malice against the professors of true Christianity, showed itself not only in speaking evil of their character and principles; but also in misrepresenting their personal form, so as to make princes believe that they were not human creatures, but something worse than wild beasts, that ought to be run down and destroyed; and, indeed, they were run down, and murdered with a ferocity such as has never been equalled by any attempt to extirpate the most savage beasts of the forest. For which see Moreland's History above quoted, and Jones' History of the Waldenses.

"It was the entire study and endeavour of the Popes, to crush, in its infancy, every doctrine that any way opposed their exorbitant power. In the year 1163, at the synod of Tours, all the bishops and priests in the country of Tholouse were commanded to take care, and to forbid, under the pain of excommunication, every person from presuming to give reception, or the least assistance to the followers of this heresy, which first began in the country of Tholouse, whenever they should be discovered. Neither were they to have any dealings with them in buying or selling; that by being thus deprived of the common assistances of life, they might be compelled to repent of the evil of their way. Whosoever shall dare to contravene this order, let him be excommunicated as a partner with them in guilt. As many of them as can be found, let them be imprisoned by the Catholic princes, and punished with the forfeiture of all their substance." *Limb. Hist. Inq.* chap. ix. This edict is expressed in pretty intelligible language. The heretics themselves were not

only to be extirpated with fire, and sword, and famine; but every man who should show them the smallest favour, were it only by selling a loaf to one of them, or giving him a drink of cold water, was to be excommunicated as a partner in the guilt of heresy; and this implied imprisonment, the forfeiture of goods, and of life itself. Such are the tender mercies of the wicked; such was Popery in the days of its glory; and such it is, and must be still, where it has space and opportunity to show its true character, for it is an infallible system, and, therefore, incapable of change to the better. I call upon the Papists in Ireland to answer this. They are living in peace, so far as they are able to live peaceably; they have the utmost freedom even in observing their idolatrous rites; they suffer no sort of molestation whatever on account of their religion; and yet they lately complained in a letter to the Pope, that they were the victims of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people. I have no desire to see the experiment tried upon them; but I think it would teach them a useful lesson, if they were placed but for one day, in the situation in which the holy father, their lord the Pope, placed the Waldenses, and all who should presume, for mere humanity's sake, to give any of them a cup of cold water. They and their oratorial demagogues would then learn what the word persecution means; for at present, they do not understand what they have never felt or seen.

The holy church instigated several sovereign princes to commence a crusade against the poor people who were desirous of living at peace with all men; and who asked nothing of any man, but to be allowed to possess and read the Word of God, and to worship him as that word dictated. This crusade was more murderous and cruel than that against the Turks for the recovery of the holy land, and similar or greater indulgences were granted to all who should take up the cross in the Popish sense of the expression. Those who went against the Turks, wore the sign of the cross on their backs; but those who went against the Waldenses wore it on their breasts. No historian that I have read, has attempted to account for this difference in the position of the Popish idol. I gave it, therefore, as a conjecture of my own, that when these heroic children of the Pope contemplated an encounter with so fierce a people as the Turks, they had an idea, that their backs would have more need of protection than their fronts; and, therefore, they placed the idol behind, expecting, no doubt, that it would protect both itself and them, from enemies whom they could not see after they had turned about. But they knew that the Waldenses were far from being formidable as men of war; that they were better acquainted with preaching and praying than with fighting; and, therefore, they thought they might venture to look them in the face, with weapons in their hands, and their idol before them.

Be this as it may, we are informed by Limborch, who gives the Popish historians Bzovius and Raynaldus as his authors, that the vast army of the cross-bearers, "every where attacked the heretics, took their cities, filled all places with slaughter and blood, and burnt many whom they had taken captives. For, in the year 1209, Buerre was taken by them, and all, without any regard to age, cruelly put to the sword, and the city itself destroyed by flames. Cæsarius tells us, that when the city was taken, the cross-bearers knew that there were several Catholics mixed with the heretics; and, when they were in doubt how to act, lest the Catholics should be slain, or the heretics feign themselves Catholics, Arnold, Abbot of Cisteaux, made answer, *Slay them all, for the Lord knows who are his;* whereupon the soldiers slew them all without exception.

"Carcassone also was destroyed; and by the common consent of the prelates and barons, Simon, Earl of Montfort, of the bastard race of Robert, king of France, (whom Petavius in his *Ration. temp.* calls a man as truly religious as valiant) was made governor of the whole country, both of what was already conquered, and what was to be conquered for the future. The same year he took several cities and reduced them to his own obedience. He cruelly treated his captive heretics, and put them to death by the most horrible punishments. In the city of Castres two were condemned to the flames, and when a certain person declared he would abjure his heresy, the cross-bearers were divided among themselves: some contended that he ought not to be put to death; others said, it was plain he had been a heretic, and that his abjuration was not sincere, but proceeded only from his fear of immediate death. Earl Montfort consented that he should be burnt; alleging, that if his conversion was real, the fire would expiate his sins; if otherwise, he would receive a just reward of his perfidiousness. In other places also, they raged with the like cruelty. One Robert who had been of the sect of the Albigenses, and afterwards joined himself to the Dominicans, supported by the authority of the princes and magistrates, burnt all who persisted in their heresy; so that within two or three months he caused fifty persons, without distinction of sex, either to be buried alive or burnt; from whence he gained the name of the Hammer of the Heretics. Raynold affirms, that it ought not to be doubted, but that Pope Innocent appointed him to this office. At Paris, one Bernard, with nine others, of whom four were priests, the followers of Almerick, were appre-

hended; and being all had into a field, were degraded before the whole clergy and people, and burnt in the presence of the king.

The year following, there was undertaken a new expedition of the cross-bearers against the Albigenses. They seized on Alby, and there put many to death. They took La Vaur by force, and burnt in it great numbers of the Albigenses. They hanged Aymerick the governor of the city, who was of a very noble family. They beheaded eighty of lesser degree, and did not spare the very women. They threw Girarda, Aymerick's sister, and the chief lady of that people, into an open pit, and covered her with stones. Afterwards they conquered Carcum, and put to death sixty men. They also seized on Pulchra Vallis, a large city near Tholouse and burnt in it four hundred Albigenses, and hanged fifty more. They took Castres de Termes, and in it Raymond de Termis whom they put in prison, where he died; and burnt, in one large fire, his wife, sister, and virgin daughter, with some other noble ladies, when they could not persuade them, by promises or threats, to embrace the faith of the church of Rome." *Hist. Inq.* chap. xi.

All this fury and massacre would not do. It was found impossible to extirpate the professors of a more scriptural faith than Rome professed. The Pope, therefore, "pressed the Inquisition as the most effectual remedy for the extirpation of heretics. Bzovius relates, that at this time many heretics were burnt in Germany, France, and Italy, and that in this year (1215,) no less than eighty persons were apprehended at once in the city of Strasburg, of whom but a very few were declared innocent. If any of these denied their heresy, friar Conrad of Marpurg, an apostolical inquisitor of the order of predicants, put them to the trial of the fire ordeal, and as many of them as were burnt by the iron, he delivered over to the secular power to be burnt as heretics; so that all who were accused and put to this trial, a few excepted, were condemned to the flames." *Ibid.*

These facts are given as an introduction to the subject of the Inquisition, which will come more into view in some of my future Numbers. This is a subject which modern Papists do not like to say much about. They would rejoice if all the histories which record the monstrous cruelties of their holy mother, were consigned to the flames. This, however, they cannot accomplish; and as the next best shift, they affect to discredit every historian who has written on the subject. In my thirteenth Number, I gave some strong facts from Limborch's History of the Inquisition; and in discussing the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, I had occasion to refer to the same author. In reference to this, "The Catholic Vindicator," "by one dash of his pen," abolishes his authority as an author, in the following manner:—"This Limborch, whom THE PROTESTANT here quotes, was minister of Gouda, and died in 1712. In religion he was half a Calvinist, and half a Socinian. He was the author of several works; and in his 'Complete Course of Divinity,' he shows himself as inconsistent in argument, as his quoter; for he therein rejects all tradition, but when he comes to distinguish the canonical books of Scripture from the apocryphal ones, he is obliged to have recourse to the very rule which he himself rejects." *Cath. Vind.* No. X. These circumstances, it seems, invalidate the authority of Limborch as an historian; and though he does not profess to give any thing upon his own authority, but gives the names of *Popish* authors, with the titles and pages of their works, in which his facts are recorded; all must go for nothing, because he was not very decided in his doctrinal opinions, and because there was some inconsistency in his mode of ascertaining the canonical books of Scripture. This is modern Popish logic! Limborch gives hundreds of well-attested facts, in the very words of great Popish authors, with reference in every instance to the works from which he quotes; but our modern Papists will not believe a word of such quotations, because Limborch was half a Calvinist, and half a Socinian, &c. There must be some wonderful virtue in the pen, or in the ink of a heretic, seeing he possesses the power of imparting a new meaning to the words of Popish authors, without altering a letter or a point; and seeing he can render facts untrue, by merely transplanting the words which assert them into his pages; and that, while they still remain true, in the pages of those who originally recorded what they saw and heard. For the satisfaction of the reader, however, I shall give here the character of Limborch, by a living author, of at least equal authority with the "Catholic Vindicator."

"He was a native of Amsterdam, born in 1633, a person of great learning and talents, which raised him to the rank of professor of divinity in that city. When his History of the Inquisition first came over to England, it was received with the highest approbation by many of the principal nobility and clergy. In particular, Mr Locke, that incomparable judge of men and books, bestowed the strongest eulogiums upon it,—commends it for its method and perspicuity, and the authorities with which it is so abundantly confirmed, and pronounces it to be a work of its kind absolutely perfect. In a letter to Limborch himself, he tells him, that he had so fully exposed their secret arts of wickedness, that if the Papists had any remains of humanity in them, they must be ashamed of their horrid tribunals, in which every thing that was just and right was so monstrously perverted; and that it was proper it should be translated into

the vulgar language of every nation, that the meanest people might understand the anti-christian practices of that execrable court. The papists became so alarmed at its publication, that the cardinals, inquisitors general at Rome, condemned it by an edict, and forbade the reading of it under the severest penalties." *Jones' Hist. Wald.* 1st ed. p. 399.*

No. CXXV.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2D, 1820.

MY last Number exhibited a sample of the manner in which the *holy* Roman church endeavoured to extirpate heresy. Fire and sword were the instruments employed for the purpose of compelling men to believe as the church believed; and not individuals or families only, but whole cities were put to the sword, if there were to be found, within their walls, any who would not assent and consent to all the impiety and nonsense which his holiness was pleased to impose upon them as matter of faith and Christian worship. Scotland and England suffered not a little at the period of their reformation, from the violence of the agents of Rome, who had still authority among the people; but, all that was suffered in this island, appears as nothing in comparison of what the Waldenses and Albigenses were called to suffer, long before the reformation under Luther was effected. It was determined by the holy see to hunt them down, and destroy them as "venomous adders;" and the provinces and cities in which any of them were to be found were exposed to all the horrors of military execution.

Hundreds of thousands of armed men, called pilgrims or cross-bearers, were let loose upon the provinces and cities in which heretics were supposed to reside. They were under the command of men devoted to Popery, and ready to lay the world in ruins, if they could, for the aggrandizement of the holy see. The army of the crusaders was indeed under the command of clergymen, who seemed to have in view nothing less than the universal subjection of the human mind, to the will and pleasure of the holy church; and any individual who refused to be so subjected, was instantly destroyed as not fit to live longer on this earth, which the Pope claimed as his own, in virtue of an imaginary grant to his great predecessor St Peter.

In my last Number I mentioned the melancholy fate of the city of Beziers, the whole inhabitants of which were put to the sword, Papists and all, because the besieging army could not distinguish between the heretics and the faithful, and because the Abbot of Cisteaux commanded to kill them all, for the Lord knew them that were his. A short historical sketch of what followed thereon, will be interesting to the reader, as furnishing a view of the manner in which the church of Rome was wont to defend and propagate the faith.

"The earl of Beziers, foreseeing the ruin which awaited his capital, made his escape, and withdrew to a neighbouring city of Carcassone. This place was much more strongly fortified, both by nature and art, than Beziers, and consequently more defensible. The city, or upper town, stands upon a hill, surrounded by a double wall; the lower town, or borough, is in the plain, about two miles distant from the city. Numbers of the Albigenses resided there, and many more fled to it for security. The young earl, who had now been fully instructed, by the horrible proceedings at Beziers, into the motives and determinations of the Catholics, resolved, as far as was practicable, to defend Carcassone."—"He, therefore, urged the inhabitants to defend themselves like men, and to recollect that both their lives and the free exercise of their religion were at stake, pledging himself that he would never forsake them in so honourable a cause, as was that of defending themselves against their common enemies, who under the mask of dissembled piety, were, in effect, nothing better than thieves and robbers."

In the meantime, says my author, Jones, in his History of the Waldenses, the army of the crusaders had been augmented by the arrival of the fresh levies from every part of France, as well as from Italy and Germany, to upwards of three hundred thousand men, some writers make them five hundred thousand. Here we have a half, or on a more moderate calculation, one third of a million of armed men, gathered together against one city, to destroy it, because it contained a number of persons who did not believe in transubstantiation, or in the efficacy of the mass sacrifice; and because they chose to worship God rather as he taught them in his own word, than as the Pope dictated. This is Popery, appearing in its genuine character; and I request my readers to look at it, and to say what they think of the religion which was so occupied upon a large scale, not to save men's lives but to destroy them. The pilgrims, or cross-bearers, had hard work in besieging Carcassone, notwithstanding they had the

* For the early history and sufferings of the Albigenses and Waldenses the following works may be safely consulted: "Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the ancient Churches of Piedmont," by D. Allix, 8vo, Oxford, 1821; and the same author's "Remarks upon the ancient Churches of the Albigenses," Oxford (at the University press), 1821. "History of the Crusades against the Albigenses in the 13th century, from the French of Simonde de Sismondi," 8vo, London, 1826; and for their modern history, the Narrative of an Excursion to the Mountains of Piedmont, and Researches amongst the Vaudois, by Rev. W. S. Gilly, 4th edition, 1827; and AUTHENTIC DETAILS of the Valdenses, with abridged translation of "l'Histoire" des Vaudois by Bresse, and the Rentree Glorieuse of Arnaud, 8vo, London, 1827—will furnish abundance of satisfactory information.

Pope's legate as their commander. They met with so violent a repulse, that the ground was covered with their dead bodies round about the city. The following day the legate ordered the scaling ladders to be applied, and a general assault to be made on the town, but the inhabitants made a resolute defence. They were, however, at length, overpowered with numbers, and beat back from the walls, when the enemy entered, and gave the inhabitants of the borough exactly the same treatment they had lately done to those at Beziers, *putting them all to the sword.* This, no doubt, was for the glory of God, and in defence of the true faith!

The city, or upper town, however, was yet secure, but the besieging army lost no time in proceeding to its reduction. The legate commanded them to play all their engines of war against it, and to take it by assault. But he had the mortification to see his soldiers of the cross fall by thousands,—the ground covered, and the ditches filled with the bodies of his pilgrims. The king of Arragon who was in the legate's or rather the Pope's army of pilgrims, who fought under the assurance that the gates of paradise would open to receive them, if they fell in this holy warfare, undertook to negotiate with the young earl of Beziers, who was himself a Papist, but did not like to see his subjects murdered because they were not Papists. The king endeavoured to persuade the earl to surrender, but without success. The earl acknowledged to the king, that many of his subjects possessed a faith very different from that of the Church of Rome, but they were persons who never did wrong or injury to any one, and in requital of their good services to himself, he was resolved never to desert them. This is a sufficient reply to those modern Popish writers, who represent the Waldenses and Albigenses as seditious persons, and as not fit to live under a regular government. The fact is, they were the quiet of the land wherever they resided. They were good neighbours and good subjects, as their sovereign here testifies; and it does not appear that on any occasion they took up arms, except at the command of their sovereign, or when they were driven to extremities by their unrelenting persecutors.

It was expected by the besieging army, that the city of Carcassone would ultimately be obliged to surrender to the immense host that surrounded it; and though, as yet, there was no appearance of this, the commander of the holy pilgrims, professing to be influenced by the intercession of the king of Arragon, offered the following terms of capitulation to the city, which were highly characteristic of such a band of holy Roman cross-bearers:—That the earl himself "should be permitted to come out of the city, and to bring with him a dozen more, with their bag and baggage. But with regard to the rest of the inhabitants, they should not leave the city, except at his discretion, of which they ought to entertain the most favourable opinion, *because he was the Pope's legate:* That all the inhabitants, both men, women, maidens, and children, should come forth without so much as their shirts or shifts on, or the smallest covering to hide their nakedness." Such was the discretion of the Pope's legate, of which all men were called upon to have the most favourable opinion, because he held that high office.

"The Spanish monarch was fully persuaded, that propositions so degrading as these were, it was needless to offer to the earl of Beziers; he, nevertheless, complied with the legate's request, and submitted them to the earl, who gave an immediate reply that he would never quit the city upon conditions so dishonourable and unjust, and that he was resolved to defend both himself and his subjects, by every means that God had put within his power.

"Finding himself thus foiled in his attempt to move the earl of Beziers, the legate soon had recourse to a less honourable, but more deep laid plot. He insinuated himself into the graces of one of the officers of his army, telling him that it lay in his power to render to the church a signal instance of kindness, and that if he would undertake it, besides the rewards which he would receive in heaven, he should be amply recompensed on earth. The object was, to get access to the earl of Beziers, professing himself to be his kinsman and friend, assuring him that he had something to communicate of the last importance to his interests, and, having thus far succeeded, he was to prevail upon him to accompany him to the legate, for the purpose of negotiating a peace, under a pledge that he would be safely conducted back again to the city. The officer played his part so dexterously, that the earl imprudently consented to accompany him. At their interview, the latter submitted to the legate the propriety of exercising a little more lenity and moderation towards his subjects, as a procedure that might have the happiest tendency in reducing the Albigenses into the Church of Rome; he also stated to him, that the conditions which had been formerly proposed to him, were dishonourable and shameful, and highly indecorous in those whose eyes ought to be as chaste as their thoughts; that his people would rather choose to die than submit to such disgraceful treatment. The legate replied, that the inhabitants of Carcassone might exercise their own pleasure; but that it was now unnecessary for the earl to trouble himself any farther about them, as he was himself a prisoner until Carcassone was taken, and his subjects had better learnt their duty.

"The earl was not a little astonished at this information—protested that he was betrayed, and that faith was violated; for that the

gentleman by whose entreaties he had been prevailed upon to meet the legate, had pledged himself by oaths and execrations to conduct him back in safety to Carcassone. But appeals, remonstrances, or entreaties, were of no avail; he was committed to the custody of the duke of Burgundy, and having been thrown into prison, died soon after, not without great suspicion of having been poisoned.

"No sooner had the inhabitants of Carcassone received the intelligence of the earl's confinement, than they burst into tears, and were seized with such terror, that they thought of nothing but how to escape the danger they were then placed in; but blocked up as they were on all sides, and the trenches filled with men, all human probability of escape vanished from their eyes. A report, however, was circulated, that there was a vault or subterraneous passage somewhere in the city, which led to the castle of Caberet, a distance of about three leagues from Carcassone, and that if the mouth or entry thereof could be found, providence had provided for them a way of escape. All the inhabitants of the city, except those who kept watch upon the rampires, immediately commenced the search, and success rewarded their labour. The entrance of the cavern was found, and at the beginning of the night they all commenced their journey through it, carrying with them only as much food as was deemed necessary to serve them for a few days. It was a dismal and sorrowful sight, says their historian, to witness their removal and departure, accompanied with sighs, tears, and lamentations, at the thoughts of quitting their habitations and all their worldly possessions, and betaking themselves to the uncertain event of saving themselves by flight; parents leading their children, and the more robust supporting decrepit old persons; and especially to hear the affecting lamentations of the women. They, however, arrived the following day at the castle, from whence they dispersed themselves through different parts of the country, some proceeding to Arragon, some to Catalonia, others to Tholouse and the cities belonging to their party, wherever God in his providence opened a way for their admission."—*Jones' Hist. Wald.* ch. v. sect. vi.

Here we have a view of Popery in all its glory. Provinces laid waste, and cities destroyed, marked the triumph of the successor of St Peter and the vicar of Christ. "The reader, who has never had an opportunity of exploring the history of this period, can scarcely conceive the scenes of baseness, perfidy, barbarity, indecency, and hypocrisy, over which Pope Innocent presided. The bare reflection of three hundred thousand men, actuated by motives of avarice and superstition, filling the country of the Albigenses with carnage and confusion, during a period of twenty years, is, in itself, sufficient to harrow up the soul; but to go into a circumstantial detail of all the multifarious atrocities which belong to it, would only be to impose upon the reader an obligation to throw aside the book, from a regard to his own feelings."—*Ibid.*

Some of these atrocities must, however, be brought to view before I have done, in order to show the reader the true character of Popery. I would not insist so much upon this, if our modern Papists would confess the truth, and acknowledge the faults of their predecessors. But when they maintain that their religious system has undergone no change, since it urged on their fathers to kill, destroy, and cause to perish, all who presumed to believe and worship as they learned from the Bible; and since they maintain that their religion is unchangeable, and infallible, and, therefore, incapable of having improved in the smallest degree, I do them no injustice when I lay the crimes of Innocent III. and of his army of priests at the door of Pius VII. and his host of clergy, whose principles being confessedly the same with those of Innocent, in every particular, their practice would also be the same, were it not for providential restraints, by which they are prevented from murdering heretics by thousands at a time, as was done formerly, as if it had been a mere matter of amusement.

"In the course of the war," says Jones, in the same section, "the castle of Minerva having surrendered at discretion, the Abbe Cisteau, who, ever since the election of Montfort to the command of the army, had continued the chief counsellor of the crusaders, hesitated for some time how he should dispose of the garrison and inhabitants. He sincerely desired the death of the enemies of Christ, says the author of the History of the Albigenses, but being a priest and a monk, he could not agree to the slaughter of the citizens, if they would be converted. Robert Mauvoisin, a zealot in the army, dissatisfied with this appearance of humanity and condescension, insisted that they had come there, not to favour heretics, but to exterminate them. In this dilemma, the blood-thirsty monk was relieved from his embarrassment, by the higher tone, not the fiercer spirit of a third person, who exclaimed, 'fear not, probably not one of them will accept of the alternative!' The event proved the correctness of his judgment, for the piles being kindled, they generally precipitated themselves into the flames." They chose to suffer the most cruel death, rather than to wound their consciences, and dishonour God, by being converted to the faith of Rome. And that they made a wise choice, no one will deny, who understands the import of Christ's words, "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it:" and, even if we should take lower ground than this, we may be convinced that they made a wise choice; for had they

professed to be converted, they would have been put to death in order to prevent a relapse, and that they might have the happiness of dying in the holy faith of the Pope. Thus they would have incurred the curse of having denied Christ before men, and they would have suffered the scorn and the cruelty of men into the bargain.

"But, independent of those who fell by the edge of the sword, or were committed to the flames by the soldiers and magistrates, the Inquisition was constantly at work, from the year 1206 to 1228, and produced the most dreadful havoc among the disciples of Christ. Of the effects occasioned by this infernal engine of cruelty and oppression, we may have some notion from this circumstance,—that in the last mentioned year the archbishops of Aix, Arles, and Narbonne, found it necessary to intercede with the monks of the Inquisition, to defer a little their work of imprisonment, until the Pope was apprized of the immense numbers apprehended—numbers so great, that it was impossible to defray the charge of their subsistence, or even to provide stone and mortar to build prisons for them. Their own language, indeed, is so remarkable, that it deserves to be laid before the reader, and here it is:—'It has come to our knowledge,' say they, 'that you have apprehended so many of the Waldenes, that it is not only impossible to defray the charge of their subsistence, but also to provide stone and mortar to build prisons for them. We, therefore, advise you to defer for a while augmenting their numbers, until the Pope be apprized of the great multitudes that have been apprehended, and until he notify what he pleases to have done in this case. Nor is there any reason you should *take offence* hereat; for as to those who are altogether impenitent and incorrigible, or concerning whom you may doubt of their relapse or escape, or that, being at large again, they would infect others, *you may condemn such without delay.*' Such is the representation given us, by writers of unimpeachable veracity, of the merciless treatment which the Albigenses received from the Catholics of this period, purely on account of their religious profession." *Hist Wald.* ch. v. sect. vi. It is computed, that, in the first twenty years of the thirteenth century, not less than a million of persons were put to death, by the command of the pretended vicar of Christ; solely because they would not believe and worship according to the standard which he had set up. *See Mede on the Apocalypse, p. 503, and Newton on the Prophecies, referred to by Jones, Hist. Wald.* How justly is the church of Rome, this mother of abominations, represented as drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus! Rev. xvii. 6. For these things more in detail, and a great deal more to the same purpose, I refer to Jones' History of the Waldenses, and Sir Samuel Moreland's History of the Evangelical churches in Piedmont.

The last mentioned author was English Ambassador at Geneva, at the time of a most horrible massacre of the Protestants in the valleys of Piedmont; the descendants of the Waldenses, which took place in the year 1655. * He gives a translation of a long letter, written by "some of the poor distressed Protestants" in these valleys, which exhibits such a picture of Popish cruelty on the one hand, and patient suffering on the other, as have scarcely been paralelled since the time of the persecution of the Christians by the Roman emperors. The letter begins thus:—"Brethren and fathers, our tears are no more tears of water but of blood, which do not only drown and obscure our sight, but even oppress our very hearts. Our pen is guided by a trembling hand; our brains are made dry by the many knocks we have received, and our mind so exceedingly troubled by such unexpected and sudden alarms, that we are not able to form a letter answerable to the intent of our minds, and the strangeness of our desolations." In the course of the narrative we read as follows: The persecuted people, having no way to flee or save themselves, were most fearfully massacred and put to death. "In one place they cruelly tormented no less than a hundred and fifty women and small children, and afterwards chopped off the heads of some, and dashed the brains of others against the rocks. As for a great part of the prisoners which they took, from fifteen years of age and upwards, who refused to go to mass, they hanged some, and nailed the feet of others to trees, with their heads hanging towards the ground." "'Tis too evident that all is lost, since there are some whole communities, especially St Giovanni, and La Torre, where the business of setting fire to our houses and churches was so dexterously managed by a Franciscan friar and a certain priest, that they left not so much as one of either, unburnt. In these desolations the mother was bereft of her sweet child, the husband of his dear wife. Those who were the richest among us, are forced to beg their bread; yea, what is worse, they are weltering in their own blood, and deprived of all the comforts of life."

I had some dreadful instances of cruelty to men, women, and children, which I intended for the conclusion of this Number; but I find I have not room for above one or two of them; and I think it better to forbear giving these by themselves. I wish to throw together, at once, what persons of weak nerves will not be able to read; and I intend to give them warning beforehand, that they may know when to stop.

* The following pamphlet gives an account of the civil and religious liberty enjoyed by the Waldensian Catholics since that date; "The history of the Persecutions of the Reformed Churches in France, Orange and Piedmont, from the year 1655 to this time."

No. CXXVI.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9TH, 1820.

ON the subject of the Inquisition, materials are so abundant, that it is difficult to comprise the substance of them within reasonable bounds. If I were to give this subject alone the space which it might occupy, I should be obliged to continue my labours for many years beyond the period at which I expect them to terminate: but I wish my Popish readers to understand, that I have no intention of continuing to torment them, as long as they and I shall live. Greatly encouraged as I am, to persevere in my labours, by the extensive and long-continued approbation of the best judges in the three kingdoms, I must not write for ever; and, therefore, I feel it necessary to take but a comparatively slight glance at the history and character of the holy Inquisition.

"The growth of the Inquisition was very gradual, and it is difficult to say when it commenced. Its advocates make it as old as the Mosaic dispensation, and represent Moses himself, and his successor Joshua, as having exercised the functions of Inquisitors-general. We must, however, look for the origin of the modern Inquisition in the persecutions excited by Innocent III. about the beginning of the thirteenth century, against the Albigenses. Honorius III. who succeeded Innocent, gave it a more regular form, and committed the superintendence of the system to Dominic de Gusman, commonly called St Dominic. Dominic founded an order of monks, and another of nuns, which are still continued under the name of Dominicans. He instituted also a third lay order, called "Militia Christi," the members of which have since been designated, Familiars of the Holy Office. Gregory IX. confirmed all that had previously been done, and committed the charge of the Inquisition to the Dominican friars, and in their absence to the Franciscans. Hitherto the Inquisition had extended only to Italy and France, but during the pontificate of Gregory, it was introduced into the Christian kingdoms of Spain, (meaning those parts of Spain in which Christianity was professed, in distinction from those possessed by the Moors;) and the Dominicans of that country soon found an ample field for the exercise of their office, among the Jewish and Moorish proselytes, whom interest or fear had drawn within the pale of the Catholic church. From this period the institution went on increasing in extent and activity till the year 1492, when Ferdinand and Isabella became sovereigns of all Spain. During their reign, it became the subject of much controversy between the courts of Spain and Rome. Isabella, a woman of considerable talents, appears to have foreseen the encroachments which the Inquisition would make upon the royal prerogatives, but her resistance was overruled; and in 1482, the famous Torquemada was appointed Inquisitor-general of Castile. In the succeeding year, his commission was extended to Arragon; and following the successes of Ferdinand and Isabella, he successively planted the Inquisition in the Moorish kingdoms of Seville, Cordona, Jaen, and Villa Real. The Inquisition thus established, continued in force till the invasion of Spain, by Bonaparte, and has latterly, with some reformations, been re-established under the auspices of Ferdinand VII." *See a well written article in the Literary and Statistical Magazine for March last, entitled, "Sketches of the Spanish Inquisition."* Since the above was published, Ferdinand has been obliged to retrace his steps, and again to abolish the Inquisition in Spain.

Heresy was the offence for the discovery and punishment of which this dreadful tribunal was instituted. But heresy was a thing so undefined in its nature, that it was easy to make the law against it apply to any thought that might pass through a man's mind, if that thought came to be revealed;—much more to any action of a man's life, or any word that he might speak. If a man think at all, his thoughts must have some relation to the things of time or of eternity. The holy church, of course, the holy Inquisition, professed to have unlimited jurisdiction over all words and thoughts relating to eternity; and they so explained the connection between temporal and eternal things, as to bring the former also under their cognizance; so that they actually obtained absolute dominion over the human mind, body, and estate. "Most offences were left to the cognizance of the secular tribunals," says the writer of the article above referred to, "but if a suspicion existed, that the offence had been committed under a persuasion of its not being criminal, this justified the interference of the holy office. As branches of heresy, the Inquisition examined all cases of blasphemy, divination, witchcraft, schism; and, even those who conversed with, or harboured heretics, were considered as justly suspected of heresy themselves. The breach of the vow of chastity, bigamy, and crimes against nature, were all supposed to imply a perversion of faith. At one period, the sale of Spanish horses to the French was considered as heresy, because the French were Huguenots, and would probably use the said horses against the interest of the Catholic church. Moors and Jews, who had embraced Christianity, and relapsed into their former errors, were classed among heretics; and, even if they had made no such profession, yet if, by word or deed, they made any attempt to shake the faith of any Christian, the Inquisition took cognizance of the offence. Even death, which is generally supposed to put its victims

out of the reach of human molestation, was unable to arrest the march of the Inquisition. Processes which had begun, were never suspended by the death of the accused; and accusations were received, even against those who, during their lives, had maintained a fair character for orthodoxy. In either case, if the charges were proved, the corpse of the accused was burnt by the common executioner, his memory devoted to infamy, and what was more important, his goods were forfeited to the holy office."

This tribunal was invested with all the power that it is possible for the strong to possess over the weak. I speak of its power, not as consisting so much in its physical strength, though in many places that was not small, but rather as consisting in the influence which it had over the minds of a superstitious people. The Inquisitors assumed, and they had silently conceded to them, absolute dominion over every soul within their jurisdiction, without being obliged to account to the civil powers for what they did with the persons and the property of the many thousands who fell under their displeasure, who were immured in dungeons, and never again heard of by their relatives or neighbours; some of whom perished in darkness and despair; others were privately tortured to death; and not a few publicly committed to the flames, for the amusement and edification of such faithful children of the church as had never been suspected of heretical pravity.

The word Inquisition, or Inquisitorial, has come into proverbial use, as denoting any thing that combines injustice, cruelty, perfidy, and cunning; and the Inquisition became so identified with the Church of Rome, that it is vain for modern Papists to attempt to clear their holy mother of the guilt of the misery which that tribunal has inflicted on the world for six hundred years. It is in full operation at this day in some parts of the world; and the abolition of it in Spain, within the present year, is no evidence that Popery has become more humane; but only that some enlightened men, who happily have got the direction of public affairs, are beginning to see the evil of Romish superstition and abomination, as is farther evident by the suppression of the monasteries in that kingdom.

It is difficult for the inhabitants of this country, long accustomed to freedom, and the administration of equitable laws, to imagine the anguish and despair which Popery inflicted upon many an innocent family, by means of the Inquisition. It was in the power of any miscreant, who conceived a hatred of his neighbour, to lodge a complaint, or insinuate a suspicion of heresy against him; and the same night the unsuspecting victim of malice was dragged from his family, confined to prison, and perhaps tortured to death, while his wife and children remained ignorant of his fate, as well as of the crime laid to his charge; and durst not inquire, lest the holy office should lay its merciless paw upon them also. And even, when there was not so much as a suspicion of heresy, it was usual to invent accusations against persons in order to obtain possession of their property. If the holy fathers took a fancy to a young lady, or to a married woman, it was their custom to send, at the dead hour of night, to tear them away from the bosom of their families: the husband was obliged to surrender his wife, and the father his daughter, without daring to whisper a complaint, or ever after to inquire what had become of those who were so dear to him; and neighbours durst not so much as remark that such persons were amissing, lest some spy of the holy office should inform against them, and they be brought to share the same fate.

Under the pretext of labouring to suppress heresy, the holy Inquisition was found to make war, not against true religion only, but also against what is demonstrably true in philosophy and science. We have a striking example of this in the case of Galileo, the first mathematician and astronomer of his age, who, if not the original inventor of the telescope, was the first that applied it to any valuable purpose in the science of astronomy. From a careful observation of the motions of the heavenly bodies, Galileo became a convert to the system of Copernicus, or what is now called the Newtonian system, having been, by Sir Isaac Newton, demonstrated to be the true system of the universe; that is, that the sun is the centre of motion to a number of planets, and the earth among the rest, which revolve round the sun at different periods, in proportion to their respective distances. I suppose there is scarcely a peasant in Scotland in the present day, who has studied the subject, who is not convinced of the truth of the system thus described; and yet, for daring to teach it, Galileo was in danger of being burnt to death.

The process against the philosopher is given by Limborch at great length, and copied from him by subsequent writers. I shall give here the substance of it. It would occupy too much space to give the indictment verbatim; but when I come to the philosopher's recantation, I shall give it without abridgement. The names of certain great ecclesiastical dignitaries are given as sitting in judgment upon the poor astronomer, and his libel runs in the following strain:—

Whereas, you Galileus, of Florence, aged 70, were informed against in the year 1615, in this holy office, for maintaining as true, a certain false doctrine, held by many, viz. that the sun is the centre of the world, and immoveable, and that the earth moves round it with a daily motion. Likewise, that you have certain scholars to whom you have taught the same doctrine. Likewise, that you have kept up a

correspondence with certain German mathematicians concerning the same. Likewise, that you have published certain letters concerning the solar spots, in which you have explained the same doctrine as true, and that you have answered the objections which in several places were made against you, from the authority of the holy Scriptures, by construing or glossing over the said Scriptures, according to your own opinions. And finally, whereas the copy of a writing under the form of a letter, reported to have been written by you to one who was formerly your scholar, has been shown to us, in which you have followed the hypothesis of Copernicus, which contains certain propositions contrary to the true sense and authority of the holy Scriptures.

Now, this holy tribunal, being desirous to provide against the inconveniences and dangers which this statement may occasion, to the detriment of the holy faith, by the command of the most eminent lords, cardinals, &c. of this supreme and universal Inquisition, have caused the two following propositions concerning the immoveability of the sun, and the motion of the earth, to be thus qualified by the divines, viz.

"That the sun is the centre of the world and immoveable, with a local motion, is an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and absolutely heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the holy Scriptures.

"That the earth is neither the centre of the world nor immoveable, but that it possesses a daily motion, is likewise an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and, theologically considered, at least erroneous in point of faith.

"But as it pleased us in the first instance to proceed kindly with you, it was decreed in the said congregation, held before our lord N. Feb. 25, anno 1616, that the most eminent lord cardinal Bellarmine should command you, that you should entirely depart from the said false doctrine, and in case you should refuse to obey him, that you should be commanded by the commissary of the holy office, to abandon the same, and that you should neither teach it to others, defend it, nor say any thing concerning it, and that, if you should not submit to this order, you should be put in gaol," &c. &c. Thus, for merely entertaining and expressing an opinion with regard to the system of the universe, was the greatest philosopher of his age subjected to be imprisoned in the gaol of the Inquisition, which imprisonment almost necessarily inferred the forfeiture of life by means of burning; and if the holy Inquisitors, in their great mercy, were pleased not to burn him to death, the circumstance of being imprisoned by them necessarily inferred the forfeiture of all his property, and the consigning of his name to infamy. The opinion which the holy fathers condemned happens to be true in philosophy, and not contrary to Scripture, for the word of God is occupied about higher matters, and does not pronounce any decision upon a subject so unimportant as the structure of the universe; but supposing the doctrine, that the earth moves round the sun, and not the sun round the earth, to be false in philosophy, what right had the Church of Rome to imprison, and commit men to the flames for believing it? The error was not greater, than to maintain that two and three make six; and truly that must be a *holy office* that will burn men to death for such a harmless opinion.

After a long round-about account of the errors of Galileo's writings, their condemnation of the same, and their dealings with the unhappy author in order to his recantation, the holy fathers proceed as follows:—

"Invoking, therefore, the most holy name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his most glorious mother, Mary, ever a virgin, we do, by this our definitive sentence, which, sitting in our tribunal, we pronounce in these writings, with the advice and judgment of the reverend masters, doctors of divinity, and both laws, with whom we have consulted concerning the cause and causes now depending before us, between the magnificent Carolus Sincerus, doctor of both laws, and procurator of the exchequer of this holy office of the one part, and you Galileus Galilei, a criminal here under the power of the Inquisition, by this present written process, examined and confessed as above, of the other part; We do say, judge, and declare, that you the aforesaid Galileus have, upon account of those things, which are produced in the written process, and which you have confessed as above, subjected yourself to a strong suspicion of heresy in this holy office, by believing and holding to be true, a doctrine which is false and contrary to the sacred and divine Scripture; viz. that the sun is the centre of the orb of the earth, and does not move from the east to the west; and that the earth moves, and is not the centre of the world, and that these things may be considered and defended as probable opinions, although they have been declared and determined to be contrary to the sacred Scripture; and consequently, that you have incurred all the censures and penalties appointed and promulgated by the sacred canons, and other general and particular acts against such offenders; from which it is our pleasure that you should be absolved, provided that you do first, with a sincere heart, and a true faith, abjure, curse, and detest, before us, the aforesaid errors and heresies, and every other error and heresy contrary to the catholic and apostolic Roman church, in the form which shall be prescribed to you by us." Then follows the formal condemnation and prohibition of Galileo's book,

with an injunction of suitable penance, such as the holy fathers should please to inflict upon the miserable author, who happened, unfortunately for himself, to know more of God's works of creation, than the Church of Rome chose that any man should know. The deed, if given at length, would nearly fill one of my Numbers; it is subscribed by no less than seven cardinals; and it shows what must have been the low state of learning and science in Europe, only two hundred years ago. The following is the abjuration, which I give at full length, though the substance of it might have been expressed in half the number of words:

"I, Galileus, son of the late Vincentius Galileus, a Florentine, aged 70, being here personally upon my trial, and on my knees before you, the most learned and eminent the lords, cardinals, inquisitors-general, of the universal Christian commonwealth, against heretical wickedness, and having before my eyes the most holy gospels, which I touch with my proper hands, do swear that I always have believed, and do now believe, and by the aid of God I will in future believe, every thing which the holy catholic and apostolic Roman church doth hold, preach, and teach. But whereas, notwithstanding, after I had been legally enjoined and commanded by this holy office, to abandon wholly that false opinion, which maintains that the sun is the centre of the universe, and immoveable, and that I should not hold, defend, or in any way, either by word or writing, teach the aforesaid false doctrine; and whereas, also, after it had been notified to me, that the aforesaid doctrine was contrary to the holy Scripture, I wrote and published a book, in which I treated of the doctrine which had been condemned, and produced reasons of great force in favour of it, without giving any answers to them, for which I have been judged by the holy office to have incurred a strong suspicion of heresy, viz. for believing that the sun is the centre of the world, and that the earth is not the centre, but moves. Being, therefore, willing to remove from the minds of your eminences, and of every catholic Christian, this strong suspicion which has been legally conceived against me, I do, with a sincere heart, and a true faith, abjure, curse, and detest, not only the aforesaid errors and heresies, but generally every other error and opinion which may be contrary to the aforesaid holy church; and I swear, that, for the future, I will never more say or assert, either by word or writing, any thing that shall give occasion for a like suspicion; but that if I should know any heretic, or person suspected of heresy, I will inform against him to this holy office, or to the inquisitor, or ordinary of the place, in which I shall then be. Moreover, I swear and promise, that I will fulfil and fully observe all the penances which have been, or shall be hereafter enjoined me by this holy office. But if, which God forbid, it should happen that I should act contrary to my word, promises, protestations, and oaths, I do hereby subject myself to all the penalties and punishments which have been ordained and published against such offenders by the sacred canons and other acts, both general and particular. So help me God, and these holy gospels which I now touch with my own proper hand, I, the above-mentioned Galileus Galilei, have abjured, sworn, promised, and bound myself as above, and in testimony of these things I have subscribed, with my own proper hand, this present instrument of my abjuration, and have repeated it word by word at Rome, in the convent of Minerva, this 22d day of July, anno 1633. I, Galileus Galilei, have abjured as above, with my own proper hand."

It must be admitted, that the great philosopher appears here in a contemptible light. He denies upon oath what he believes to be true. He had indeed no alternative between this and being burnt to death; and mere philosophy could not furnish him with a reason and a motive for laying down his life for her sake. Had he been actuated by Christian principle, he would rather have died than have sworn to a falsehood, though it had been in a matter of no more importance than that two and three make five. But if the philosopher appears contemptible in this matter, what shall we say of the holy Church of Rome, that imposed such a hardship upon the wisest of her children? She appears not only as the enemy of truth and righteousness, but also as the enemy of science and literature. Under her influence, men could have no heart for making discoveries of any kind. Had any man proposed in Italy 200 years ago, to light a city by means of an invisible substance extracted from pit-coal, he would have been suspected of heretical intercourse with the devil; and if he should have succeeded in his plan, as our Gas Light Company has done, he would have been thrown into one of his own retorts, or more publicly burnt at an Auto-de-fe, as a wizard, or convicted heretic at least. It is easier to conceive how He that made all things out of nothing, should make the earth to move round the sun, than that a fellow-creature should be able to bring light out of darkness. The things, however, are both alike true. The one is proved by experiment, the other by observation; but if we were under the dominion of Popery, we should be obliged to deny both upon oath, or submit to the alternative of being thrown into the fire.

No. CXXVII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 16TH, 1820.

IN treating of the holy Inquisition, it is not necessary that I go minutely into the consideration of its constitution, the laws by which it is regulated, and the titles and functions of the officers by whom it is governed. A full account of these may be found in "Limborch's History of the Inquisition;"—"The History of the Inquisition as it subsists in the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal," by Baker; Dellon's Account of the Inquisition at Goa; and in the work of a late, and I suppose, living author, entitled, "A narrative of the persecution of Hippolyto Joseph da Costa Pereira Furtado de Mendoza,"* who was imprisoned and tried in Lisbon, by the Inquisition, about eighteen years ago, for the alleged crime of being a freemason. The narrative of this writer with regard to his own sufferings is highly interesting; but his account of the constitution and laws of the "Holy Office," is in a great measure a compilation from Limborch and others; and it ought to be mentioned, to the honour of the last mentioned author, that though he wrote about the middle of the 17th, his account is confirmed by the narrative of one who suffered in the Inquisition at the beginning of the 19th century.

But as my plan is to expose the cruelty and extreme wickedness of Popery, as these appear in the conduct of the sacred tribunal, I shall, in a great measure, confine myself to facts illustrative of what I assert. Let it be remembered, that the grand avowed object of the institution was the suppression of heresy; that is, to prevent any man from thinking and speaking about religion, except according to a fixed rule, laid down by the Church of Rome; and if any man would not be persuaded to think and speak according to this rule, it was the business of the holy office to deliver him up to the flames. But though this was the avowed object of the Inquisition, it will appear in the sequel, that it was used by great luxurious ecclesiastics as a mean of providing for the gratification of their lusts. The grand Turk has not a more splendid seraglio within the walls of his palace, than holy fathers are known to have kept within the prison of the Inquisition: and these very fathers would, without scruple, have sent any man of their own order to the flames, if he had presumed to commit the heresy of marrying, and living honestly with one woman.

About the beginning of the last century, there happened to be a sort of a civil war in Spain, in which the troops of the king of France were actively engaged on one side. In their victorious career they came into possession of the city of Zaragosa, in Arragon, in which were a number of convents, particularly one of Dominicans. The French commander, M. Legal, found it necessary to levy a pretty heavy contribution upon the inhabitants, not omitting the convents. The Dominicans, all whose friars were familiars of the holy Inquisition, excused themselves in a civil manner, saying, they had no money, and if M. Legal insisted upon the demand of a thousand pistoles, which fell to their share, they could not pay him in any other way than by sending him the silver bodies of the saints. The friars imagined that the French commander would not have the heart to require such a sacrifice, and they thought, that if he should insist upon it, they would, by raising the cry of heresy against him, raise the mass of the people to take their part. The Frenchman, however, felt no qualms of conscience about the matter. He signified that the silver saints would be very welcome visitors. The friars, seeing they could not mend the matter, carried their gods to the governor, Legal, in a solemn procession, with lighted candles. The governor having heard that it was their intention to make a procession, and raise a mob, if they could, ordered out four companies of grenadiers, well armed, to receive the saints in the most devout and honourable manner; so that the design of raising the people completely failed. The saints were forthwith sent to the mint; and the holy fathers applied to the Inquisition to interpose its supreme power in order to save them from the furnace. This power was readily exercised in the way of excommunicating M. Legal. An instrument to this effect having been drawn up and signed, the secretary of the holy office was commanded to go and read it to the governor. Having performed his duty, the excommunicated governor, instead of expressing displeasure, with a mild countenance took the paper from the secretary, and said, "Pray tell your masters, the Inquisitors, that I will answer them to-morrow morning."

The governor then ordered his secretary to draw a copy of the excommunication, with the simple alteration of inserting "the holy Inquisitors," instead of his own name; and the next morning he ordered four regiments to be sent along with his secretary to the Inquisition, with command to read the excommunication to the Inquisitors themselves, and if they made the least noise, to turn them out, open all the prisons, and quarter two regiments there. The

* To the authors mentioned in this page as treating upon the Inquisition, may be added the work of Llorente in 4 vols. 8vo, both in Spanish and French; but by the ordinary reader the following may be considered sufficient:—"The History of the Inquisition of Spain, from its Establishment to the reign of Ferdinand VII., from the Original Documents of the Archives of the Supreme Council, abridged from the work of Jean Antoine Llorente," 8vo, London, 1826; a very good abridgement. We refer likewise with pleasure to the "History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Spain, by Thomas M'Crie, D. D." 8vo, Edinburgh, 1829. To show the leaden malignity of the church of Rome, we may just mention that persons condemned by the Inquisition are considered as if they had never been born. See Mendham's "Policy of the Church of Rome," p. 319, edit. 1830.

orders were obeyed; and the holy fathers were deeply amazed and confounded, to find themselves excommunicated by a man who had no authority for it; and they began a hue and cry against the governor as a heretic, and as having publicly insulted the Catholic faith. "Holy Inquisitors," said the secretary, "the king wants this house to quarter his troops in; so walk out immediately;" and having no alternative, they were compelled to obey. The doors of the prisons were thrown open; and then the wickedness of the Inquisitors was exposed to the world. Four hundred prisoners got liberty that day; and among them sixty well dressed young women, who were found to be the private property of the three Inquisitors, and of which they had robbed the families of the city and neighbourhood.

The archbishop, seriously concerned for the honour of the holy tribunal, desired M. Legal to send these women to his palace, promising that he would take care of them; and in the mean time, he published an ecclesiastical censure against all who should defame by groundless reports the holy office of the Inquisition; that is, all who should mention the fact thus come to light. The governor professed his willingness to comply with his grace's desire; but as to the young women, that was not in his power, for the French officers had hurried them all away, being glad to get such fine mistresses. In fact, they were chiefly young ladies, beautiful and accomplished, who had been forcibly carried away, at the pleasure of the holy fathers, from the most opulent families in the city, and who probably would never have been seen without the walls of the sacred building, but for such a deliverance as that which was effected by the French soldiers. Some of them were afterwards married to their deliverers, one of whom furnished Mr. Gavin, from whom I abridge this statement, with a narrative of her own case, which I am sure will be interesting to my readers. I shall give the substance of it, without adhering strictly to the author's phraseology, as I think I can give it in fewer words than he does. He having been bred a Papist, seems not to have been able, after his conversion, to lay aside the Popish verbose, round-about style of writing.

Travelling in France some time after the event above referred to, and after he had renounced his situation as a Popish priest, he met one of the ladies at Rochfort, in an inn where he happened to lodge. She was then the wife of the innkeeper's son, who had been a lieutenant in the French service in Spain. Though she did not know Mr. Gavin in his secular habit, he recognized her as the daughter of counsellor Belabriga, in Zaragosa, with whose family he had been acquainted. Her father, it seems, had died of grief, after having lost her, without the comfort of revealing the cause of his trouble, even to his confessor; so great was his dread of the Inquisition. From this lady Mr. Gavin obtained an account of the manner of her abduction, and of the treatment which she received in the holy office.

"I went one day, said she, with my mother to visit the countess of Attarass, and I met there Don Francisco Torrejon, her confessor, and second Inquisitor. After we had drunk chocolate, he asked me my age, my confessor's name, and so many intricate questions about religion, that I could not answer him. His serious countenance frightened me; and perceiving my fear, he desired the countess to tell me, that he was not so severe as I supposed, after which he caressed me very kindly. He gave me his hand, which I kissed with great respect and modesty; and when he went away he told me, 'My dear child, I shall remember you till the next time.' I did not know what he meant, being quite unexperienced, and only fifteen years old. Indeed, he did remember me; for that very night, when in bed, hearing a hard knocking at the door, the maid who lay in the room with me went to the window, and asking who was there? I heard the reply, 'The holy Inquisition.' I could not forbear crying out, Father, father, I am ruined for ever. My dear father got up, and inquiring what the matter was, I answered him with tears, the Inquisition; he, for fear that the maid would not open the door so quickly as such a case required, went himself to open the door, and like another Abraham to offer his child to the fire; and as I did not cease to cry out, my dear father, all in tears, stopped my mouth, to show his obedience to the holy office, for he supposed I had committed some crime against religion. The officers gave me time only to put on a petticoat and a mantle: they took me into the coach; and without allowing me the satisfaction of embracing my father and mother, they carried me into the Inquisition.

"I expected to die that night; but when they carried me into a noble room, well furnished, I was quite surprised. The officers left me there, and immediately a maid came in with a salver of sweetmeats and cinnamon water, desiring me to take some refreshment before I went to bed. I told her I could not, but that I should be obliged to her, if she could tell me whether I was to die that night or not? Die, said she, you do not come here to die, but to live like a princess, and you shall want for nothing in the world but the liberty of going out; so be not afraid, but go to bed, and sleep easy, for to-morrow you shall see wonders in this house; and as I am chosen to be your waiting-maid, I hope you will be kind to me. I was going to ask some questions, but she told me she had not leave to tell me any thing more till the next day, only nobody shall come to disturb you; so she left me for a quarter of an hour. The great amazement

I was in, took away the exercise of my senses to such a degree, that I could neither think of my parents nor my own dangerous situation. In this suspension of thought, the maid returned, and locked the chamber door after her. Madam, said she, let us go to bed, and be pleased to tell me at what time in the morning you will have the chocolate ready. I asked her name, and she told me it was Mary. Mary, said I, for God's sake, tell me whether I come to die or not? I have told you Madam, said she, that you come to be one of the happiest ladies in the world. I went to bed, but the fear of death prevented me from shutting my eyes, so that I rose at break of day. Mary lay till 6 o'clock, and was surprised to find me up. She said little, but in half an hour she brought me, on a silver plate, two cups of chocolate and biscuits; I drank one cup, and desired her to drink the other, which she did. Well, Mary, said I, can you give me any account of the reasons of my being here? Not yet, Madam, said she; have a little patience. With this answer she left me, and an hour after came again, with a fine Holland shift, a Holland under petticoat, finely laced round, two silk petticoats, and a little Spanish waistcoat, fringed all over with gold, and combs, and ribbons, and every thing suitable to a lady of higher quality than I; but my greatest surprise was to see a gold snuff box, with the picture of Don Francisco Torrejon in it. Then I understood the meaning of my confinement. I considered with myself, that to refuse the present would be the occasion of my immediate death; and that to accept it, was to give him too great encouragement against my honour. But I found, as I thought, a medium in the case; so I said to Mary, Pray give my service to Don Francisco Torrejon, and tell him, that as I could not bring my clothes along with me last night, honesty permits me to receive what is necessary to keep me decent; but since I do not take snuff, I beg his lordship to excuse me if I do not accept this box. Mary went to him with this answer, and came again with a picture, nicely set in gold, with four diamonds at the four corners of it, and told me that his lordship had mistaken, and that he desired me to accept that picture. While I was musing what to do, Mary said, Pray Madam, take my poor advice, accept the picture and every thing he sends you; for consider, that if you do not comply with every thing he has a mind for, you shall soon be put to death, and nobody can defend you; but if you are obliging to him, he is a very complaisant gentleman, and will be a charming lover, and you will be here like a queen. He will give you another apartment with fine gardens, and many young ladies shall come to visit you; so I advise you to send a civil answer, and desire a visit from him, or else you will soon repent it. O dear, cried I, must I abandon my honour without remedy? and if I oppose his desire he will by force obtain it. So full of confusion, I bid Mary give him what answer she pleased. She was very glad of my humble submission, and went to give Don Francisco an account of it. In a few minutes she returned, with great joy, to tell me that is lordship would honour me with his company to supper. In the meantime he desired me to mind nothing but how to divert myself, and to give Mary my measure for some new clothes, and order her to bring me every thing I wished for. Mary added,—Madam, I may now call you my mistress, and must now tell you, that I have been in this holy office these fourteen years, and know the customs of it well; but as silence is imposed on me under pain of death, I cannot tell you any thing but what concerns your person: so, in the first place, do not oppose the holy father's will: secondly, if you see some young ladies here, never ask them any questions, neither will they ask you; and take care that you never tell them any thing. You may come and divert yourself among them at such hours as are appointed. You shall have music, and all sorts of recreations. Three days hence you shall dine with them; they are all ladies of quality, young and merry. You will live so happily here, that you will not wish to go abroad; and when your time is expired, the holy fathers will send you out of this country, and marry you to some nobleman. Never mention your name, nor Don Francisco's to any. If you see here some young ladies you have formerly been acquainted with, no notice must be taken; and nothing must be talked of but indifferent matters. All this made me astonished, or rather stupified, and the whole seemed to me a piece of enchantment. With this lesson she left me, saying she was going to order my dinner; every time she went out, she locked the door. There were but two windows in my room, and they were so high that I could see nothing through them, but hunting about, I found a closet, with all sorts of historical and profane books; so I spent my time till dinner in reading, which was some satisfaction to me.

"In about two hours she brought dinner, at which was every thing that could satisfy the most nice appetite. When dinner was over, she left me alone, and told me if I wanted any thing, to ring the bell: so I went to the closet again, and spent three hours in reading. I think I was really under some enchantment; for I was in a perfect suspension of thought, so as to remember neither father nor mother. Mary came and told me that Don Francisco was come home, and that she thought he would come and see me very soon, and begged me to receive him with all manner of kindness.

"At seven in the evening Don Francisco came, in his night-gown and cap; not with the

gravity of an inquisitor, but with the gaiety of an officer. He saluted me with great respect, and told me that his coming to see me, was only to show the value he had for my family, and to tell me that some of my lovers had procured my ruin, having accused me in matters of religion; that the informations were taken, and the sentence pronounced against me, to be burnt alive in a dry-pan, with a slow fire; but that he, out of pity and love to my family, had stopped the execution of it. Every word was a mortal stroke to my heart. I threw myself at his feet, and said, Ah! Seignior, have you stopped the execution for ever? It only belongs to you to stop it, or not, said he, and with this he bade me good night. As soon as he went away, I fell a crying, but Mary came and asked what made me cry so bitterly? Ah! good Mary, said I, tell me what is the meaning of the dry-pan and gradual fire? for I expect to die by it. O Madam, said she, never fear. You shall see ere long the dry-pan and the gradual fire; but they are made for those that oppose the holy father's will; not for you that are so obliging as to obey it. But pray, was Don Francisco very obliging? I do not know, said I, for his discourse has put me out of my wits; he saluted me with great civility, but he left me abruptly. Well, said Mary, you do not yet know his temper; he is extremely kind to people that are obedient to him, but if they are not, he is as unmerciful as Nero; so for your own sake, take care to oblige him in all respects. She bade me be easy and go to supper; but the thoughts of the dry-pan so troubled me, that I could neither eat nor sleep that night.

"Early in the morning Mary got up, and told me, that nobody was yet stirring in the house, and that if I would promise secrecy, she would show me the dry-pan and the gradual fire; so taking me down stairs, she brought me into a large room with a thick iron door, and within it was an oven burning, and a large brass pan upon it, with a cover of the same and a lock to it. In the next room, there was a great wheel covered on both sides with thick boards; and opening a little window in the centre of it, she desired me to look with a candle on the inside of it. There I saw that all the circumference of the wheel was set with sharp razors. After that she showed me a pit full of serpents and toads. Now, my good mistress, said she, I'll tell you the use of these three things. The dry-pan is for heretics, and those who oppose the holy father's will and pleasure. They are put naked alive into the pan, and the cover of it being locked up, the executioner begins to put a small fire in the oven, and by degrees he increases it till the body is reduced to ashes. The second is designed for those that speak against the Pope, and the holy fathers; for they are put within the wheel; and the little door being locked, the executioner turns the wheel till the person is dead. And the third is for those who contemn the images, and refuse to give due respect and veneration to ecclesiastical persons; for they are thrown into the pit, and become the food of serpents and toads. Then Mary said to me, that another day she would show me the torments for public sinners: but I was in so great an agony at what I had seen, that I desired her to show me no more places; so we went to my room, and she again charged me to be very obedient to all the commands of Don Francisco, for I might be assured if I was not, that I must undergo the torments of the dry-pan. I conceived such a horror of the gradual fire, that I was not mistress of my senses; so I promised Mary to follow her advice. If you are in that disposition, said she, leave off all fear, and expect nothing but pleasure and satisfaction.—"

Hitherto I have given the narrative nearly in the author's words, with very little abridgment; but I forbear giving the particulars of what immediately follows. Seduction, in its most refined form, is a process which ought not to meet the public eye. The holy fathers of the Inquisition knew perfectly how to work upon the imagination of their wretched victims, first by putting lascivious books in their way, and then upon their fears, by showing them the instruments of torture, so as effectually to bend the most unyielding to their will. The sequel of the story shall be given in my next Number. There can be no doubt with regard to the truth of the narrative. The author was known, after his conversion from Popery, to some of the nobility and dignitaries of the Church of England; and he has his character certified at the beginning of his first volume, under the hand of the bishop of London. He wrote what he saw and heard from eye and ear witnesses; and the reverend J. Baker, who must have been his contemporary, in his History of the Inquisition, gives this entire story, with a declaration of his conviction of its truth.

No. CXXVIII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 23RD, 1820.

PROCEED we now to the sequel of the story of the young lady in the Inquisition, whose case occupied the greater part of my last Number.—"About ten o'clock, Mary came, says she, and dressed me. We left Don Francisco in bed, and she carried me into another chamber, very delightful, and better furnished than the first; for the windows were lower, and I had the pleasure of seeing the river and gardens. Mary then told me, that the young ladies would come and pay me their respects before dinner, and would take me to dine with them; and begged me to remember her advice; she had

scarcely finished, when I saw a troop of young beautiful ladies, finely dressed, who came, one after another, to embrace me, and to wish me joy. My surprise was so great, that I was unable to answer their compliments; but one of them seeing me silent, said, Madam, the solitude of this place will affect you in the beginning, but when you begin to feel the pleasures we enjoy, you will quit your pensive thoughts. Now we beg of you the honour to come and dine with us to-day; and henceforth three days in a week. I returned them thanks; so we went to dinner. That day we had all sorts of exquisite meats, delicate fruits, and sweetmeats. The room was long, with two tables on each side, and another at the front of it; and I reckoned in it that day fifty-two young ladies, the eldest not exceeding twenty-four years. After dinner we went up to a long gallery, where some of us played on instruments of music, others at cards; and some walked about for three or four hours together. At last Mary came up ringing a small bell, which was, as I was told, the signal to go to our own rooms; but Mary said to the whole company, 'Ladies, to-day is a day of recreation, so you may go into what rooms you please till eight o'clock.' They all desired to go into my apartment with me. We found in my antichamber a table, with all sorts of sweetmeats upon it;—iced cinnamon, almond milk, and the like. Every one ate and drank, but nobody spake a word about the sumptuousness of the table, or the Inquisition, or the holy fathers.

"They retired to their respective apartments at eight o'clock, when Mary came to conduct me to Don Francisco, with whom I was to sup and spend the night. In the morning, when I returned to my own chamber, I found ready two suits of clothes of rich brocade, and every thing else suitable to a lady of the first rank. I put on one, and when I was quite dressed, the ladies came to wish me joy, all dressed in different clothes, much richer than before. We spent the second and the third day in the same sort of recreation; Don Francisco continuing in the same manner with me: but on the fourth morning, after drinking chocolate, (which it was the custom to do in bed,) Mary told me, that a lady was waiting for me in her own room, and with an air of authority desired me to get up. Don Francisco saying nothing to the contrary, I obeyed, and left him in bed. I thought this was to give me some new comfort, but I was very much mistaken; for Mary conveyed me into a lady's room not eight feet long, which was a perfect prison; and told me this was my room, and this young lady my bedfellow and companion; and without saying any more she left me there.

"What is this, dear lady? said I; is it an enchanted place, or hell upon earth? I have lost father and mother, and what is worse, I have lost my honour, and my soul for ever. My new companion, seeing my agitation, took me by the hands, and said, Dear sister, forbear to cry and grieve; for such extravagant behaviour will only draw upon you a cruel death. Your misfortunes and ours are exactly of a piece. You suffer nothing that we have not suffered before you; but we dare not show our grief for fear of greater evils. She advised me to be sure and show no uneasiness before Mary, who was the only instrument of their torments or comfort. I was in a most desperate condition; but my new sister Leonora prevailed so much upon me, that I overcame my vexation before Mary came to bring our dinner, which was very different from what we had had for three days before. After dinner another maid came to take away the plate and knife, for we had but one for us both; and after she had gone out and locked the door, Leonora told me that we should not be disturbed again till eight o'clock; and that if I would promise to keep secret what she should tell me, while I remained in that house, she would reveal all that she knew. I promised all that she desired, upon which she began as follows:—

'My dear sister, you think your case very hard; but I assure you all the ladies in this house have already gone through the same. In time you will know all their stories, as they hope to know yours. I suppose Mary has been the chief instrument of your fright, as she has been of ours; and I warrant she has shown you some horrible places, though not all; and at the mere thought of them, you were so much troubled in your mind, that you have chosen the same way we did to redeem yourself from death. By what has happened to us, we know that Don Francisco has been your Nero; for the three colours of our clothes are the distinguishing tokens of the three holy fathers; the red silk belongs to Don Francisco, the blue to Guerrero, and the green to Aliaga. We are strictly commanded to make all demonstrations of joy, and to be very merry for three days when a lady comes first here, as we did with you, and you must do with others; but afterwards we live like prisoners, without seeing a living soul, but the six maids, and Mary, who is the housekeeper. We dine all of us in the hall three days in the week. When any one of the holy fathers has a mind for any one of his slaves, Mary comes at nine o'clock, and conducts her to his apartment. Some nights Mary leaves the door of our rooms open, and that is a sign that one of the fathers has a mind to visit us that night; but we do not know whether it is our patron or not. If one of us happens to be with child, she is removed to a better chamber, and she sees nobody but the maid till she is delivered. The child is taken away, and we know not where it is carried. I have been in this house six years, and was not fourteen when the officers took

me from my father's house. I have had one child here. We have at present fifty-two young ladies; and we loose every year six or eight; but where they are sent we do not know. We always get new in their places; and I have seen here seventy-three ladies at once. Our continual torment is to think that when the holy fathers are tired of us they will put us to death; for they never will run the hazard of being discovered in their villany. So, though we cannot oppose their commands, yet we continually pray to God to pardon those ills which we are forced to commit, and to deliver us out of their hands; so, my dear sister, arm yourself with patience, for there is no other remedy."

By this discourse of Leonora, the young captive was prevailed upon to make the best of her condition. She found every thing to be as she was told. She continued in durance eighteen months, in which time the company lost eleven ladies, and got nineteen new ones. "When the French soldiers threw open the doors of their prison, M. Faulcant, says she, happily for me, opened the door of my room, and from the moment he saw me, showed me great civility. He took Leonora and me to his own lodgings, and, after hearing our stories, for fear things should turn to our disadvantage, he dressed us in men's clothes, and sent us to his father's. So we came to this house, where I was kept for two years as the old man's daughter; till M. Faulcant's regiment being broke, he came home, and two months after married me. Leonora was married to another officer, and went to live in Orleans."

From the above it appears, that about once a month, upon an average, a family in Zaragossa was robbed of a daughter to recruit the seraglio of the holy fathers of the inquisition. This narrative does not refer to the dark ages of Popery; the thing took place but about a hundred years ago; and who can tell the misery that was thus inflicted upon many a family? In fact, there could be no such thing as domestic comfort in any country in which the Inquisition was established. It was not enough that every young lady kept at home; that she did not so much as show her face at a window; this would certainly have made her a victim to any member of the holy office whose spies might be passing. Every exposure of the kind therefore was most carefully avoided; but this did not serve the purpose of concealing such as might be desirable inmates of the Inquisition. Every lady was required to make confession to a priest twice, or at least once, a year; the priests were all dependants of the holy office; they were in short the panders of lewdness to the lords Inquisitors; and becoming, by means of confession, acquainted with the name and circumstances of every individual in every family, it was easy for them to inform their superiors where they might obtain a victim, to be sacrificed at the shrine of their lusts.

It is difficult to exhibit any thing more wicked than what I have related, with regard to the Inquisition, in this and my last Number; but there is something more tragical in what follows; in which we shall find that all the horrors of the "dry-pan," or burning to death, were actually realized in the case of young accomplished ladies, for no crime but that of heresy, or believing as they were taught by the word of God. I quote from an article formerly referred to, in the Literary and Statistical Magazine for June last; as continued from the Number for March:—

"Among the twenty-one victims who were burned at Valladolid, in the Auto-da-fe of 1559, the case of Dona Maria de Bohorques is peculiarly interesting. Dona Maria was a natural daughter of Pedro Garcia de Xeres Bohorques, and had just completed her twenty-first year, when she was arrested on suspicion of Lutheranism. Under the instruction of D. Juan Gil, Bishop elect of Tortosa, she was perfectly acquainted with the Latin language, and had made considerable progress in Greek. She knew the Gospels by heart, and was deeply read in those commentaries, which explain in a Lutheran sense, the texts referring to justification by faith, good works, the sacraments, and the characteristics of the true church.

"Dona Maria was confined in the secret prison of the Inquisition, where she avowed the doctrines imputed to her, defended them against the arguments of the priests who visited her, and boldly told the Inquisitors, that instead of punishing her for the creed which she held, they would do much better to imitate her example. With regard to the depositions of her accusers, though she allowed the principal points, she persisted in denying some facts which related to the opinions of other individuals; and this denial gave the Inquisitors an opportunity of putting her to the rack. By this torture they only procured a confession, that her sister Johanna Bohorques knew her sentiments and had not disapproved them: and as she persisted in her profession of faith, sentence was passed upon her as an obstinate heretic. In the interval between her condemnation and the Auto-da-fe, in which she was to suffer, the Inquisitors made every exertion to bring her back to the Romish faith. They sent to her successively two Jesuit and two Dominican priests, who laboured with great zeal for her conversion, but returned without having effected their object, full of admiration of the talents she displayed, and regretting the obstinacy with which she persisted in what they supposed a damnable heresy. The evening before the Auto-da-fe, two Dominicans joined in the attempt, and were followed by several theologians of other orders. Dona Maria received them with civility, but dissuad-

ed them from attempting a hopeless task. To the professions which they made of being interested in the welfare of her soul, she answered that she believed them to be sincere, but that they must not suppose that she, being the party chiefly concerned, felt a less interest in the matter than they did. She told them that she came to prison fully satisfied of the orthodoxy of the creed which she held, and that she had been confirmed in her belief by the evident futility of the arguments brought against it.

"At the stake, Don Juan Ponce de Leon, who had just abjured the Lutheran doctrines, exhorted Dona Maria to follow his example. The weakness of this apostate for a moment overcame her, and she silenced him by language rather of contempt than of pity. Recollecting herself, however, she told him that the time for controversy was past, and that their wisest plan would be, to occupy the few minutes which remained to them, in meditating on the death of their Redeemer, in order to confirm that faith by which alone they could be justified. We have already mentioned, that if a condemned heretic renounced his heresy even at the stake, he was not burned alive, but first strangled and then burned; (and this was all that poor Juan Ponce de Leon gained by apostacy.) On this occasion the attendant priests, moved by the youth and talents of Dona Maria, offered her this milder death if she would merely repeat the creed. With this offer she readily complied, but having finished it, she immediately began to explain its articles according to the sense of the reformers. This confession of faith was immediately interrupted; Dona Maria was strangled by the executioner, and her body was afterwards consumed to ashes.

"We have mentioned that the only confession extorted by the rack from Maria Bohorques was, that her sister knew her religious sentiments, and had not disapproved them. This sister was named Johanna; she was a legitimate daughter of the same Pedro Garcia, and was married to Don Francis de Vargas, lord of Heguera. She was immediately arrested upon the confession of her sister Maria, and though six months advanced in pregnancy, she was confined in one of the common dungeons of the inquisition. In this dungeon she was delivered of a child, and received no assistance except from a young woman, confined on a charge of Lutheranism, who occupied the same cell. Eight days after its birth the child was taken from her; and soon after, her friendly nurse, having been tortured, returned to the dungeon with bruised and dislocated limbs; and Dona Johanna, still feeble from her confinement, was called upon to repay the charitable attentions she had received. Before her health was established, she also was subjected to the torture. Her enfeebled frame sunk under its sufferings: a blood vessel burst while she was on the rack, and in two days she was delivered by death from any farther persecution. After perpetrating this foul murder, the Inquisitors thought it sufficient expiation to declare Dona Johanna innocent at the ensuing Auto-da-fe."

Cases of the same kind might be multiplied to any extent; but my design is to give only a selection by way of sample. The following affords a view of the secrecy with which the affairs of the holy office were conducted: "When the Familiar is sent for to apprehend any person, he has the following order put into his hand. 'By the command of the reverend father N. an Inquisitor of heretical pravity, let B. be apprehended and committed to the prisons of this holy office, and not be released out of them, but by the express order of the said reverend Inquisitor.' And if several persons are to be taken up at the same time, the Familiars are commanded so to order things, that they may know nothing of one another's being apprehended. And at this the Familiars are so expert, that a father and his three sons, and three daughters, who lived together in the same house, were all carried prisoners to the inquisition, without knowing any thing of one another's being there until seven years afterwards, when they that were alive came forth to an Auto-da-fe."—*Limborch*, vol. i. p. 187.

Thus persons the most nearly related to one another, may be confined in contiguous cells without knowing it; and the merciless turnkeys of the holy office are constantly on the watch, to prevent the utterance of any sound, lest it should occasion the discovery of some secret. If a person bemoans himself, or bewails his misfortune, or prays to God with an audible voice, or sings a psalm or sacred hymn, he is instantly silenced. Persons may know one another by their cough, as well as by their articulate voice, and therefore, no man was allowed even this expression of his misery in the damp dungeons of the Inquisition. Limborch relates the following instance, which, he says, he had from several persons. "A prisoner in the Inquisition coughed. The jailors came to him, and admonished him to forbear coughing, because it was unlawful to make any noise in that house. He answered it was not in his power to forbear. However, they admonished him a second time to forbear it, and because he did not, they stripped him naked and cruelly beat him. This increased his cough, for which they beat him so often, that at last he died through the pain and anguish of his stripes."

I shall bring in here what was intended for the conclusion of No. CXXV. but for which I had not room. These cruelties were not, indeed, committed within the walls of the Inquisition, but they were done with the con-

currence of the head of the church, and the head Inquisitor at Rome.

Sir Samuel Moreland has given a great number of instances of cruelty to individuals whom he names, with the attestations of witnesses, which he procured upon the spot. With a few of these I shall conclude the present Number. I have been accused of being too delicate in some instances, especially in my treatment of the subject of clerical celibacy. I have now with some reluctance brought myself to speak plainly out, some facts and circumstances, which I hope will have the effect which I have all along avowed to be the object of my work, not to injure the persons of Papists, but to hold up the system of Popery, which I maintain to be the invention of the devil, to universal detestation. I advise all who have the misfortune to have weak nerves, to read no more of this Number.

Upon the 22d of April, 1655, in a certain place called La Sarcena, one Captain Pola of Pancalier, took two poor women of La Torre and with a falchion ripped up their bellies, and left them wallowing upon the snow in this lamentable condition. And this was seen by M. Gross, minister of Villaro.

Martha Constantin, wife of Jacob Barral, after she had seen others most cruelly put to death, was herself first ravished, and then had her breasts cut off. The soldiers took and fried them and presented them to their comrades as tripe.

Anna, daughter of Giovanni Charboniere, had a long stake thrust through her body longitudinally, by some soldiers, who carried her thus upon their shoulders, quite naked, until they were tired; and then they stuck the end of the stake in the ground, and thus left her dead body exposed to the world.

Giovanni Tolasano, a mercer of Villaro, as he was passing by the hill of Juliano, saw a poor woman flying from the soldiers, with a cradle on her head, wherein was a young sucking child; but seeing she was like to be overtaken by them, she left her cradle in the middle of the way, as verily believing those butchers could not possibly have such hearts of adamant as to lay violent hands upon the poor innocent babe, and so hid herself not far from the place, in a cleft of the rock. But those blood-hounds having found the infant in the cradle, in a most savage manner took it out, and pulled it into four pieces or quarters; and afterwards finding the mother, ravished her, then cut off her head, and left her dead body upon the snow.

The daughter of Moyses Long, of Bobio, about ten years of age, was taken by the soldiers of Piedmont, as she was flying upon the snow, who, broaching her upon a pike or halbert, roasted her alive upon a broad stone not far from the place. When they had thus done, they cut off a slice of her flesh, intending to have made a meal's meat on her, but not finding it thoroughly roasted, their stomachs would not serve them to eat it.

M. Gross, pastor of Villario, in Bobio, told the author (Sir S. M.) during his abode at Geneva, that being at Pignerolio, he heard several persons affirm, that some of the murderers, having taken eleven men at Garcigliana, heated a great oven or furnace red-hot, and caused those poor creatures to throw one another into the said fiery furnace; and when it came to the last man, they themselves threw him in. It is a thing most certain also, that very frequently these blood-hounds pursued and hunted out multitudes of those poor Protestants among the rocks and mountains, by the very traces of their bleeding feet and legs, which had been sorely cut and mangled by the ice and flints which they met with by the way, in their flight.

These are a few examples, taken almost at random from a catalogue of some hundreds, related with horrible minuteness by the English Ambassador. It would be difficult to find instances of such cruelty among the rudest savages; for there is no ferocity or cruelty equal to that with which the devil qualifies his agents for the propagation of idolatry and superstition, and for blotting out the knowledge of real Christianity from the earth.

This remark is confirmed by what Dr Geddes records of what came under his own observation, when he was an eyewitness of an Auto-da-fe. The victims were chained to stakes, at the height of about four feet from the ground. A quantity of furse that lay round the bottom of the stakes was set on fire; by a current of wind it was in some cases prevented from reaching above the lowest extremities of the body. Some were thus kept in torture for an hour or two, and were actually roasted, not burnt to death. This spectacle, says he, is beheld by people of both sexes, and all ages, with such transports of joy and satisfaction, as are not on any other occasion to be met with. And that the reader may not think that this inhuman joy is the effect of a natural cruelty that is in these people's disposition, and not the spirit of their religion, he may rest assured, that all public malefactors, except heretics, have their violent death no where more tenderly lamented, than amongst the same people, and even when there is nothing in the manner of their death that appears inhuman or cruel.—See *Limborch*, vol. ii. p. 301.

No. CXXIX.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30TH, 1820.

ACCORDING to the courtly, or ever-courteous morality of this world, it is alleged, that the

more deficient a man is known to be, with respect to any particular virtue, the more abundantly it ought to be bestowed upon him, by his flatterers during his life, and his panegyrists after his death. The Inquisition seems to have acted upon this principle from its very commencement. It gave itself out as the *holy* office, and all men were required to regard it, and call it holy, though it is well known to have been the most unholy tribunal that ever afflicted the world. In like manner the Inquisition incessantly boasted of its justice and its mercy, especially of the latter, though it is certain that its justice was a perversion of all righteousness, and the tenderest of its mercies was the most barbarous cruelty.

I had thought of afflicting my readers by presenting them with a particular account of an Auto-da-fe, which would have occupied a Number or two, but on reflection, I rather chose to pass this over. Those who wish to have their souls harrowed up by such an exhibition, may find materials in Limborch's History, and in almost all the Martyrologies in the English language. Suffice it to say, that an Auto-da-fe, or Act of Faith, was the burning to death of such persons as the holy Inquisition was pleased to pronounce defective in their belief of all, or any of the error and nonsense which the Church of Rome had propounded as articles of faith. This burning took place as often as the holy office could provide subjects for the fire. Kings and queens were not only invited to witness it as a most joyful spectacle; but actually required to sanction it with their presence, under the pain of being themselves suspected of heretical pravity. Limborch gives a series of prints, in which the king and queen of Spain are represented under a rich and royal canopy, feasting their eyes with the delightful spectacle of a number of poor wretches led to be committed to the flames; and the representation is by no means a production of the fancy. It is sober historical truth, the memory of which will remain to the latest ages, as an evidence of the diabolical cruelty and wickedness of the Church of Rome, and of all those who lent themselves to its support.

It was the manner of the holy Inquisitors to be continually boasting of their mercy. It often happened that the most inoffensive man in a city was brought before them, under a vague suspicion of something which related to the integrity of the faith. After having his spirits broken by confinement in a dungeon for months or years, he was required to make confession of his crimes, while he was not conscious of any thing in his conduct that deserved the name of crime. The holy fathers would not condescend to tell him what it was of which he was accused; but they would assure him that the holy Inquisition was merciful, and that if he would make a free and candid confession, he should be mercifully dealt with. The poor man could not confess crimes of which he was not guilty; and the holy Inquisitors, in their great mercy, would send him back to his dungeon, with a command to review his whole life; and there they would leave him for a year or two longer, to recollect, if he could, every word that he had spoken, and every person to whom he had spoken, during the whole period of his conscious existence.

A man thus shut up in a dark and loathsome dungeon, without the society of a living creature, would very probably recollect some foolish thing that he had said to some person in the course of his life; and trusting in the boasted mercy of the holy tribunal, he would confess this the next time he was called to a hearing. This however would only furnish his tormentors with a pretext for teasing him with more ensnaring questions, not only with regard to himself, but also the persons with whom he had conversed upon any point of religion. These persons would be immured within the sacred walls before the next morning; and he himself would be sent back to his dungeon to consider of what other crimes he ought to accuse himself.

These reflections are not thrown out at random. They are supported by incontestible facts, as any person may see who will read the numerous relations in Limborch, and in Baker's History of the Inquisition. This last author, among a number of instances, relates at great length, the sufferings of one Isaac Martin, an English merchant in Malaga, who was confined in the Inquisition in 1714, and grievously tormented, upon suspicion of his being a Jew, and that upon no stronger evidence than that his name was Isaac, and that he had a son whom he had named Abraham. It was in vain that he protested that he was a Christian of the Church of England, and that Abraham and Isaac were not Jews, but had lived hundreds of years before the designation of *Jew* was known in the world. The Inquisitors would not believe his assertion either with regard to himself or the patriarchs. He was known to be guilty of the crime of being rich, of which he was effectually purged by the holy office, for this heresy yields to force sooner than any other; and then he was sent out of the country with a body dreadfully torn by scourging and other torments which he had endured.

But the unparalleled hypocrisy and impudence of the Inquisitors appear chiefly in their professions of mercy for those whom they have devoted to the flames. It is pretended that the holy office puts no man to death. It merely, on finding persons obstinate heretics, delivers them over to the civil power, which in a Popish country must submit to be the church's hangman; and when men are so delivered over, it is with great affectation of pity

and compassion on the part of the ghostly fathers, who beseech the magistrate, perhaps with tears in their eyes, as a crocodile is said to shed tears over the prey he is about to devour, to deal mercifully with the unhappy criminals, and to be sure not to hurt them; and this at the very time when the stake is fixed, the fuel prepared, and people assembled to witness their execution; and if any magistrate should so understand them as to comply with their request, the fire would soon be applied to himself as a favourer of heretics.

"Is there," says Dr Geddes, in his view of the Court of Inquisition in Portugal, p. 446. "in all history, an instance of so gross and confident a mockery of God, and the world, as this of the Inquisitors beseeching the civil magistrate, not to put the heretics they have condemned and delivered to them, to death? For were they in earnest when they made this solemn petition to the secular magistrates, why do they bring their prisoners out of the Inquisition, and deliver them to those magistrates in coats painted over with flames? Why do they teach that heretics, above all other malefactors, ought to be punished with death? And why do they never resent the secular magistrates having so little regard to their earnest and joint petition as never to fail to burn all the heretics that are delivered to them by the Inquisition, within an hour or two after they have them in their hands? And why in Rome, where the supreme, civil, and ecclesiastical authority are lodged in the same person, is this petition of the Inquisition, which is made there as well as in other places, never granted?"—Thus far Dr Geddes. And let me here add, that this hypocrisy and dissimulation is the more vile and execrable, in that the Inquisitors are commanded by the bulls of several Popes, to compel the secular magistrate, under penalty of excommunication and other ecclesiastical censures, within six days, readily to execute the sentences pronounced by the Inquisitors against heretics, that is, to burn them. *Limborch*, vol. ii. p. 289.

On entering upon this subject, I said that Popish writers traced the Inquisition to a period as ancient as that of the Mosaic dispensation. I have since received from a correspondent, an extract from a Spanish author, who maintains that the holy tribunal had its origin in paradise; but instead of ascribing it to its real author, who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning, this writer blasphemously represents the Creator himself as the first Inquisitor, and Adam and Eve as the first who were brought before the holy tribunal. The words are "Dizen que Dios fue Inquisidor de Adam y Eva por haver comido el vedado fruto." &c. &c. That is, "It is said that God was Inquisitor of Adam and Eve, for having eaten the forbidden fruit."

If there be any of my readers who wish to see more evidence of the bloody and murderous character of Popery than I have given in my late Numbers, I refer them to the narrative of the grand massacre in Paris, which is recorded in all our ecclesiastical histories and martyrologies. And here I take the opportunity of expressing my best thanks to a worthy correspondent in Ireland, for sending me an impression in wax, of a genuine medal which Pope Gregory XIII. ordered to be struck, in honourable commemoration of that, to him, joyful event. It is pretty generally known, that the Pope was so delighted with the intelligence which he received from Paris on that occasion, that he ordered solemn thanksgiving to God to be offered up in all the churches. But that the memory of the thing might not be forgotten, he ordered to be struck a medal in silver, which has on one side, a well-defined profile of himself, and on the reverse, the figure of an angel, with a crucifix in one hand, and a drawn sword in the other, in the act of destroying a confused multitude of human creatures, who are represented as falling down before him. O, what a delightful picture this must be to all good Papists! and how they would rejoice if they had it in their power to do the thing over again! Some sentimental Protestants will cry out against this as uncharitable, and they will insist upon it, that modern Papists are not so bloody-minded; then let modern Papists themselves say so. Let them condemn the bloody massacre of thousands of peaceable citizens; and let them condemn the fiend-like triumph and rejoicing of the head of their church on the occasion, and then they may perhaps deserve credit for their professions of being more humane and less bloody-minded than their fathers were. But I know they will not, and that they dare not pronounce any such condemnation. They will not say that the head of their church did wrong in rejoicing, and in calling the whole church to rejoice in that horrible massacre; and, therefore, I do them no wrong in maintaining, that they would practise the same thing if they had it in their power.

The Papists in France had another glorious opportunity of glutting themselves with the blood of Protestants, on the revocation of the edict of Nantz, by Lewis XIV. For particulars, I refer the reader to Jurieu's Pastoral Letters:—the Introduction to Quick's Synodicon:—and to a work in French entitled, "Etat des Réformes en France:" printed at the Hague in 1685, during the very heat of the persecution. This work was lately sent me by a reverend gentleman from a remote part of the Highlands. It goes with much detail into the dreadful sufferings which Protestants were called to endure on that occasion. I do not know if there be an edition of it in English.

To come nearer home, I might fill a volume with a tragical account of the sufferings of

Protestants in Ireland, in the great massacre and rebellion that commenced in 1641, in the reign of Charles I. "The rebellion," says Hume, "which had been upwards of fourteen years threatened in Ireland, and which had been repressed only by the vigour of the Earl of Stafford's government, broke out at this time with incredible fury. On this fatal day, the Irish, every where intermingled with the English, needed but a hint from their leaders and priests to begin hostilities against a people whom they hated on account of their religion, and envied for their riches and prosperity. The houses, cattle, and goods of the unwary English were first seized. Those who heard of the commotions in their neighbourhood, instead of deserting their habitations, and assembling together for mutual protection, remained at home, in hopes of defending their property, and fell thus separately into the hands of their enemies. After rapacity had fully exerted itself, cruelty, and that the most barbarous that ever in any nation was known or heard of, began its operations. A universal massacre commenced of the English (Protestants) now defenceless, and passively resigned to their inhuman foes; no age, no sex, no condition was spared. The wife weeping for her butchered husband, and embracing her helpless children, was pierced with them, and perished by the same stroke; the old, the young, the vigorous, the infirm, underwent the like fate, and were confounded in one common ruin. In vain did flight save from the first assault; destruction was every where let loose, and met the hunted victims at every turn. In vain was recourse had to relations, to companions, to friends; all connections were dissolved, and death was dealt by that hand from which protection was implored and expected. Without provocation, without opposition, the astonished English (Protestants), being in profound peace and full security, were massacred by their nearest neighbours with whom they had long upheld a continued intercourse of kindness and good offices. But death was the lightest punishment inflicted by those enraged rebels; all the tortures which wanton cruelty could devise, all the lingering pains of body, and anguish of mind, the agonies of despair, could not satiate revenge excited without injury, and cruelty derived from no cause. To enter into particulars would shock the least delicate humanity; such enormities, though attested by undoubted evidence, would appear almost incredible.

"The weaker sex themselves, naturally tender and compassionate, here emulated their more robust companions in the practice of every cruelty. Even children, taught by the example, and encouraged by the exhortations of their parents, essayed their feeble blows on the dead carcasses, or defenceless children of the English (Protestants). The very avarice of the Irish was not a sufficient restraint to their cruelty; such was their frenzy, that the cattle which they had seized, and by rapine made their own, yet because they bore the name of English, were wantonly slaughtered, or when covered with wounds, turned loose into the woods and deserts.

"The stately buildings or commodious habitations of the planters, as if upbraiding the sloth and ignorance of the natives, were consumed with fire, or laid level with the ground; and where the miserable owners shut up their houses and prepared for defence, perished in the flames, together with their wives and children, a double triumph was afforded to their insulting foes. If any where a number assembled together, and assuming courage from despair, were resolved to sweeten death by revenge upon their assassins, they were disarmed by capitulations and promises of safety, confirmed by the most solemn oaths; then the rebels (in the immutable spirit of Popery), with perfidy equal to their cruelty, made them share the fate of their unhappy countrymen. Others more ingenious still in their barbarity, tempted their prisoners with the fond hope of life, to embrue their hands in the blood of their friends, brothers, and parents; and having thus rendered them accomplices in guilt, gave them that death which they sought to shun by deserving it.

"Amidst all these enormities, the sacred name of religion sounded on every side, not to stop the hands of these murderers, but to enforce their blows, and to steel their hearts against every movement of human or social sympathy. The English, as heretics abhorred of God, and detestable to all holy men, were marked out by the priests for slaughter; and of all actions, to rid the world of these declared enemies to Catholic faith and piety, was represented as the most meritorious in its nature, which, in that rude people, sufficiently inclined to atrocious deeds, was further stimulated by precepts and national prejudices, empoisoned by those aversions, more deadly and incurable, which arose from an enraged superstition. While death finished the sufferings of each victim, the bigoted assassins, with joy and exultation, still echoed in his expiring ears, that these agonies were but the commencement of torments infinite and eternal."

This extract from Hume's History is given by the Rev. Mr Graham, as an Introduction to his interesting work,—The Annals of Ireland. "That he has not heightened the picture beyond reality," says this author, "the writings of Temple, of Clarendon, of Rushworth, of Whitlock, contemporary historians, and volumes of original depositions taken on the occasion, and now extant in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, sufficiently prove."

Mr Graham has, with immense labour, collected and arranged such a number of well attested facts on this subject, in his "Annals

of Ireland," as will make the labour of the future historians very easy, and hold up to the abhorrence of future ages the cruel and unrelenting spirit of the Romish religion. After the general massacre had commenced, and thousands were obliged to flee for their lives, Mr Graham proceeds as follows, and gives Temple for his authority:—

"Many persons of good rank and quality came into Dublin, covered with old rags, and some without any other covering than a little twisted straw to hide their nakedness. Some reverend ministers escaped with their lives, sorely wounded—wives came bitterly lamenting the murder of their husbands—mothers lamenting their children barbarously destroyed before their faces. Some were so overwearied with long travel, that they came creeping on their knees, others frozen up with cold, ready to give up the ghost in the streets. To add to their miseries, they found all manner of relief utterly disproportionable to their wants, the Popish inhabitants refusing to minister the least comfort to them, so that these sad creatures appeared like living ghosts in every street. Many empty houses in the city were, by special direction, taken for them; barns, stables, and outhouses were filled with them, yet many lay in the open streets, and there most miserably perished. Those of a better quality who could not bring themselves to beg, crept into private places, and some of them, who had not friends to relieve them, wasted away silently, and died unnoticed."

The infatuated and unfortunate King Charles I., who was most unhappily beset by a Popish queen, and a host of Jesuit priests, was pretty generally suspected of having given his countenance to this rebellion of his Popish, and consequent massacre of his Protestant subjects; and it is certain that the rebels gave out that they acted under a commission from him; but this is accounted for in the following manner, for which Mr Graham refers to Borlase, p. 30, Nov. 4, 1641. "On this day Sir Phelim O'Neil, and Roger M'Guire, gave notice to their confederates, from the rebel camp at Newry, of their having received a commission from the king under the great seal of Scotland. This pretended commission was disclaimed by Lord M'Guire afterwards; and it appears that one Plunket, a worthy branch of the Cavan family of Popish advocates, having taken an old broad seal from an obsolete patent out of Farnham Abbey, fixed it to his forged commission, to seduce the vulgar into an opinion of the loyalty of those who had excited them to take arms." It will be in the recollection of most of my readers, that a similar trick was practised, a few years ago, upon the Lord Mayor and citizens of London, by means of which, the public funds rose 20 per cent. in one hour. We need not then be surprised, that the Papists of Ireland, few, if any, of whom, in those days, could read, should have been deceived; and that the king should have got the blame of what arose from the unstimulated barbarity of his Popish subjects; or which, if stimulated at all, was by the queen and her Jesuit incendiaries.

It was then publicly declared by the rebels, *that no Protestant should be suffered to live in Ireland.* On Sunday, October 24, "Rory M'Guire, who had, on the preceding day hanged seventeen Protestants in the church of Clowes, seized Mr Middleton, at Castlekeagh, alias Ballybalfure, in the county of Fermanagh, robbed him of his money, burned the county records in this gentleman's possession, and compelled him to declare himself a Papist, after which they hanged him and his wife and children, and put one hundred persons in the town to death." P. 9, with reference to Borlase, p. 58, &c.

Let us never forget that this wickedness was perpetrated under the influence of an unchanged and unchangeable religion, which is maintained in all its integrity by the Papists of the present day. My author introduces a remark of a late eminent civilian, which is well worthy of the attention of every man who is concerned for the safety of his country. "The government and legislature had better beware of attempting to conciliate the Roman Catholics of Ireland by reiterated concessions, for although they grant all the demands of the laity, *show me the man that can say, that their clergy have ever suffered a document to issue from their hands, by which the extent of their pretensions and expectations can be ascertained.*" The fact is, their expectations are nothing less than the overthrow of the present established order of things;—the establishment of their own religion, to the exclusion of every other;—and the restoration of all the property which belonged to the Popish establishment, and to Popish families, in former ages, and which had been forfeited by their treasons. This is what our Papists expect and desire; but it does not suit their purpose to make much talk about the extent of their expectations.

No. CXXX.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 6TH, 1821.

DECEIT and violence are the two main pillars of Satan's kingdom. This corresponds with the character of the adversary himself, who has been a *liar* and a *murderer* from the beginning; that is, one who makes use of deceit and violence for the promotion of his cause in the world. Viewed in this light, Popery proves itself to be of its father the devil. In my late Numbers, I have given, I think, sufficient evidence of its violent and murderous character. I shall now proceed to

show how deceitful it is; and that it is no less dependent upon lying than upon murder for its support. I do not rest this assertion merely upon the falsehoods published by our Glasgow Papists against myself, which were exposed in my Letter to Mr M'Hardy, which exposure remains to this day unrefuted. I shall prove my point by reference to a greater authority in the Romish church than any that Glasgow can boast of having possessed for at least two hundred and forty years.

It is a prominent feature in the character of Papists, that they will tell a man to his face what both he and they know to be a lie, and command him to believe it, under pain of death. In my last Number, I alluded in general terms to the revocation of the edict of Nantz, and the miseries which were, in consequence of this revocation, inflicted upon the Protestants in that kingdom, thousands of whom were compelled to leave their country for ever, or submit to the alternative of becoming Papists, or being put to death, or condemned to the galleys for life, which was the mildest sentence that any of them could expect. For almost a century, the Protestant religion had been legally recognised in that kingdom, and its professors protected, according to the edict above mentioned, for which they were indebted to the famous Henry IV. In these circumstances, there were many who professed to be Protestants merely because they had been so educated; but who had no heartfelt conviction of the truth and importance of the tenets by which they were distinguished from their Popish neighbours. When the edict was revoked, and when all men were required, under pain of military execution, to conform to the church of Rome, and subscribe a declaration to that effect, which declaration was presented by a host of armed dragoons, there were not a few who refused to conform, choosing rather to suffer death, or the galleys, as it might please their tormentors, the merciful agents of the Pope, and Lewis XIV.; but at the same time, it must be admitted, that great numbers of those who were Protestants only in name, terrified by what was threatened, and what they saw their neighbours suffer, did subscribe the declaration, did renounce the Protestant religion, and declare themselves good Papists, according to the will of the Pope and the King. Some real Christians, under the influence of fear, were induced to subscribe; but finding no peace in their consciences, they publicly recanted their cowardly compliance, and chose to suffer death rather than continue to deny the truth. These, however, were few in comparison of those over whom the fear of man prevailed, and who suffered themselves quietly to be considered as belonging to the merciful, holy, and infallible church of Rome.

On this occasion the celebrated Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, a man of rare talents, but a devoted partisan of the holy see, published what he called "The Pastoral Letter of my Lord the Bishop of Meaux to the new Catholics of his diocese." By the "new Catholics" are meant the recent converts, who had been compelled at the point of the bayonet to renounce the Protestant religion. "The Pastoral Letter" congratulates them on their reconciliation with the only true church, in such language as this:—"I do not marvel, my dearest brethren, that you are returned *in troops, and with so much ease,* to the church where your ancestors have served God. The foundation of Christianity, and, as I have already said, the character of baptism, hath secretly called you hither." In the esteem of the bishop, who remained quietly at home, the conversion of these men was effected with much ease; but it appears, that in some instances at least, it was no easy task for the dragoons. "Set him matter of fact," says M. Jurieu, "against this pretended *facility* (of conversion) and assure him, that for four months time there have been assemblies almost every day in the Cevennes, and in the adjacent parts, for the offering up prayers and supplications to God, sometimes in woods, at other times in caves, and rocks, and dens of the earth. The dragoons, which almost always surprise them, put them to the sword, according to their instructions; they kill, and hang, and drag them to prisons; but all signifies nothing; they assemble nevertheless. In the month of June last, near the end thereof, the dragoons having surprised an assembly near Nismes, they killed many of them on the place, and four they hung upon the trees. The hangmen withdrew, supposing that they would have no great inclination to return again to that place. But two hours after there was another assembly in the same place, on the dead bodies, and in the view of the carcases that hung on the trees of the mountains. There is not a week passes without like assemblies and like massacres."

Now it was while the Protestants were suffering such cruel persecution, that the bishop of Meaux, in his Pastoral Letter, addressed his new Catholics,*—those who had been compelled to become such, and that he had the impudence to tell them that they were voluntary converts,—that they had suffered nothing,—and that they had not even heard of such a thing as persons suffering on account of religion. His words are;—"Not one of you hath suffered violence, either in his person or goods. So far have you been from suffering torments, that you have not so much *as heard them mentioned.* I hear other bishops say the same. But for you, my brethren, I say no-

* On this address see some excellent observations of Archbishop Wake, in his Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England. Part I. page 28.

thing to you but what you may speak as well as I. *You are returned peaceably to us,* YOU KNOW IT." The design of the bishop was to make the world believe that there was no persecution in France at the time; but that thousands of heretics were, of their own accord, and from a conviction of the truth, returning to the bosom of the Church; and his appeal to the converts themselves was a Jesuitical trick, by which he hoped to stop the mouths of all gainsayers; for it would be said that the new converts acquiesced in the truth of the statement;—they had been appealed to as to the fact, and no one had denied it. But the bishop knew well that no one dared deny it, else he would have lost all the benefit of his conversion, and have been sent to the flames, or to the galleys for life. Thus were deceit and violence combined to prop up the tottering system of Antichrist. Violence is not so common now as it was then, for the world will not suffer it; but the system of deceit is as prevalent as ever, of the truth of which I could produce abundant evidence. I long ago brought to view one fact which is conclusive on this subject. All the world knows that Popery is tolerated and protected in every part of the British empire, and that there is no legal obstruction to the free exercise of Popish worship any more than to that of other dissenters from the established religion, yet our Irish Papists lately told the head of their church, and published to the world, that they were suffering the most *sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people.* The impudence of the assertion was equal to that of the bishop of Meaux, who told a miserable and persecuted people, in the face of the world, that they had suffered no persecution; and while the bishop stood only upon his personal responsibility as an author, the Hibernian lie was asserted by a board, professing to represent the whole of "Catholic Ireland;" and it may therefore be considered as asserted by all the Papists in that kingdom, though not one of them should have suffered in a hair of his head, or to the extent of a farthing of his property on account of being a Papist.

My almost forgotten opponent Amicus Veritatis, in one of his letters in the Glasgow Chronicle, (see Prot. part I. p. 28,) has some piteous wailing about persecution; but he has taken care not to enter into particulars, lest the reader should discover that his Popish ancestors in this country had nothing to complain of, at least very little in comparison of what they inflicted upon Protestants in the times of their power. In support of something that I had written, I had quoted a bull of Pope Urban VIII. To this Amicus Veritatis replied as follows:—"Respecting the bull of Pope Urban VIII., the style and language in which it is couched assure me that it must be a forgery. Its very date increases my suspicion. A period when the sword of persecution was unsheathed from its scabbard—when the flames of intolerance raged with destructive violence—when the storms of passion, like a hurricane upon the deep, overwhelmed the miserable victims of their fury—when the demon of falsehood spread her malignant influence over the hearts and sensibilities of men, and prompted them to invent the most wicked calumnies for the destruction of their Catholic brethren. Who would take a review, from the year 1577 to the year 1684, that would not shudder at the horrific scenes that were the consequence of accumulated forgeries?" &c.

I shall not stay long to inquire how my opponent comes to be so well acquainted with the "style and language" of the holy see, as to be assured that the bull here referred to is a forgery, and that merely from its style, and language, and date. It was produced in the Court of King's Bench, on the trial of one of the Irish rebels, February 10th, 1644, and so far as appears, no objection was made to it, either by the court, or the criminal. Its authenticity was not then questioned; and it is rather too late to question it now. This bull granted a plenary indulgence, and full remission of all their sins, to such Irish Papists as should most effectually contribute to the *extirpation* of their Protestant neighbours; and that the command of the holy father was obeyed to a fearful extent, and with the most barbarous cruelty, I again refer to the reverend Mr Graham's Annals of Ireland, in which the fact is proved by the most abundant evidence.

During this period, to adopt the elegant language of my opponent, the sword of persecution was *unsheathed from its sheath,* or scabbard, as he has it. He was not thinking of the many thousands who were murdered in Ireland, by their Popish neighbours, solely because they were Protestants. This subject had no magnitude in his eye. The murdered persons were heretics; and therefore, according to the true Romish doctrine, laid down by the Rhemish translators of the New Testament, putting them to death was no crime. (See their note on Rev. xvii. 6.) His declamation about "flames of intolerance," "storms of passion" overwhelming "the miserable victims of its fury," relates merely to the sufferings of a few Jesuits, who, in the reign of Elizabeth, and for some time after, were found plotting against the state, with a view to overturn the established order, and to restore Popery, and who, of course, suffered the penalty of their treason. As for his accusation that Protestants invented "the most wicked calumnies for the destruction of their Catholic brethren," I maintain, that the thing was impossible; for no such creatures were then known by Protestants as "Catholic brethren." Those who now assume the name would then have been

called "Popish malignants;" and there was no occasion to invent calumnies against them: —they were the known and convicted enemies of our Protestant established government.

I am by no means disposed to deny that Protestants have been persecutors; but I do maintain that Papists have suffered little from this quarter, while Protestants themselves have suffered not a little from it. Severe laws were indeed enacted against Papists, but at different periods, from the Reformation to the Revolution in 1688, they were a mere dead letter. If a Papist chose to enjoy his religion in peace, he was much safer in England than a Puritan, and in Scotland than a Covenanter. I grant indeed, that during the period to which this remark chiefly refers, our government, though nominally Protestant, was much under Popish influence, as was less or more the case during the reigns of the three last of the Stuarts, when many conscientious Protestants suffered nearly as much as they had done under Popery; and those who were suffering very naturally desired, and loudly demanded the execution of the laws against Papists, who they believed were instigators of the persecution. The fact is, our Reformers brought their intolerant notions from Rome, and it was long ere their successors could shake themselves loose of principles which they had imbibed from their fathers. No consistent Protestant of the present day will justify Cranmer in putting poor women to death for being Anabaptists; —or the Presbyterians for attempting to compel all England to submit to their discipline; —or the Independents in New England for their severities against Quakers and witches. It would be easy to make out a bloody case against one or other of the three denominations, which might emulate, at an humble distance, some of the least horrible instances of cruelty which I have given in my late Numbers. But it would be unjust, as well as ungenerous, to bring an accusation of this kind against the Independents, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians of the present day, because they disavow and condemn in the most unequivocal terms, not only persecution in general, but the specific acts of it, which stand on record against their predecessors, and the conduct of these predecessors themselves, by name, if they are able to ascertain the names of individuals who were guilty.

But the principles of Popery, and of course of all true Papists, are always the same. What the Pope commanded in the thirteenth century, when he issued an order to destroy and tread under foot, as venomous adders, hundreds of thousands of human beings, for disbelieving transubstantiation and purgatory, he has a right still to command; and his subjects have no right but to obey. In a Protestant country like this, they will condemn and argue against persecution for conscience' sake, when it is considered merely as an abstract question; but they will not condemn any specific act of persecution of which their holy church, or holy father, stands convicted; and the reason is, they do not consider, at least they dare not call that persecution which the holy church pleases to do for the maintenance of the true faith. The doctrine of the church of Rome is very distinctly laid down by the bishop of Meaux, in a private letter to a gentleman of his diocese, who, it would appear, had some qualms of conscience about the severities which were inflicted upon the Protestants, and who had gone, or was about to go over to them notwithstanding their persecutions. The bishop disavows persecution on the part of the church; but finds the state bound to do it at the church's bidding. It is worthy of remark, that this letter was written about the very time that he addressed his Pastoral Letter to the new converts, who were assured by him, that they had neither suffered nor heard of any persecution, or violence being inflicted upon persons on account of religion. I quote from Jurieu's Pastoral Letters, Let. I.

"*From* Meaux, *April* 3*d*, 1686.

"MONSIEUR,—I continue to write to you, notwithstanding the answer you made to my former letter. I have there observed a character and style too much of a minister, to attribute it to you. In a word, I apprehend that it does not proceed from a spirit such as yours. But although it be so, I shall not cease to invite you to return. I have seen in the letter you wrote to Mademoiselle of U. that the true church does not persecute. What understand you by that, Sir? Do you understand that the church *by herself* never makes use of force? That is very true, since the church has no other arms but spiritual. Do you understand that princes, who are sons of the church, never ought to make use of the sword which God hath put into their hands to abase the enemies thereof? Do you dare to say contrary to the opinion of your own doctors, who have maintained by so many writings, that the republic of Geneva had power and right to condemn Servetus to the fire for denying the divinity of the Son of God? And without serving myself of the examples and authority of your doctors, tell me in what texts of Scripture heretics and schismatics are excepted from the number of those malefactors against which St Paul says, God hath armed kings and princes. And although you will not permit Christian princes to take vengeance of such great crimes, because they are injurious to God, can they not take vengeance on them because they cause trouble and sedition in states? Do you not see clearly that they build upon a false principle?"—

Such is the doctrine of the great bishop of Meaux, who is allowed to be a pillar in the

Romish temple. He is indeed of such authority among modern Papists, that his writings are usually referred to, as furnishing the best defence of the system that has appeared in modern times. Here, however, he appears as a mere sophist, and a sophist of the very lowest order. "Tell me," says he, "in what texts of Scripture heretics and schismatics are excepted from the number of those malefactors against which St Paul says, God has armed kings and princes?" To this question another question would be a sufficient reply:—Tell me in what texts of Scripture heresy and schism are declared to be crimes cognizable by the civil magistrate? It is not in the power of the Pope himself to point out in the Bible any such text; and the bishop's challenge amounts simply to this;—supposing it were a crime for a man or a woman to have red hair,—tell me in what texts of Scripture persons having red hair are excepted from the number of those malefactors against which God has armed kings and governors? I do most unequivocally maintain that the colour of a man's hair is as much cognizable by the civil magistrate, as his private thoughts in relation to any religious principle in which he may conceive the salvation of his soul to be interested. If a man shall think erroneously on such an important subject, the matter rests between God and himself; and no human power has a right to interfere. There is nothing in the apostle's words which can lead us to infer that civil governors have a right to interfere in our religious opinions, any more than in the colour of our hair. I must not be understood as asserting that heresy and schism are in themselves, and in the sight of God, as innocent as the colour of our hair; but I do maintain, that in the sight of the civil magistrate they ought to be held equally innocent; for they are not offences against the state, and therefore the magistrate, as head of the state, has nothing to do with them. If false principles in religion shall lead any to be guilty of immoral acts, or to disturb the peace of society, such persons ought then to be taken up and punished by the magistrate, but not till then.

The bishop of Meaux seems very glad to avail himself of a Protestant authority for putting men to death for conscience' sake. He refers to the republic of Geneva, which claimed the power and right to condemn Servetus to death for denying the divinity of the Son of God. Such a power will not be conceded to the republic by Protestants of the present day; and the melancholy fact here referred to, proves nothing but that the Genevese, though they had renounced Popery in name, held fast too much of the thing, when they could, in cold blood, consign a man to be burnt to death for certain speculative opinions, however erroneous, or even blasphemous these opinions were. Our great Reformer, Calvin, has been much reviled of late years for the hand which he is said to have had in this business; and I am far from saying that Calvin understood the subject of liberty of conscience, for no man in his day understood it; and perhaps he did not use the means which he might have used for saving Servetus from the cruel death to which he was condemned; but what I would remark here is, that the bishop of Meaux, who certainly had no good will towards Calvin, and who would have been happy to publish any thing unfavourable to him, had it come in his way, does not so much as insinuate that he had any hand in the burning of Servetus; but gives it as the doing of the *republic of Geneva*, without so much as mentioning the name of the Reformer. The bishop lived much nearer the time of Calvin than we do, and according to a principle much insisted upon by Papists, had better opportunities of knowing the facts than we can have. Since, therefore, he did not consider Calvin implicated in the infamous transaction, the Anticalvinists of the present day have no right to declare him guilty.

I now, for the present, take leave of the subject of persecution and the Inquisition. I have got over the most disagreeable part of my labours; but I have still a great deal of work before me, which will occupy the greater part of the present year at least. In the next, and some following numbers, I shall pay my respects to some correspondents, beginning with an extract of a letter from Juvenis with remarks thereon.

No. CXXXI.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 13TH, 1821.

A FEW weeks ago, I was favoured with a second letter from my correspondent Juvenis, equally well written, and in equally good temper with his former one. Had it been of moderate length, I should cheerfully have inserted it entire; but I think his own good sense will suggest to him, that he cannot reasonably expect, that I should occupy so many of my pages with mere verbal criticism, as his dissertation on the Greek word πετρος alone would occupy; not to mention his long extracts from the writings of ancient fathers, which have no weight with me, in reference to the point in question, and which would be of very little importance to my readers in general. Were I to print his whole letter, and reply to it all, it would take me the third time over the same ground, without having a new idea to suggest, or a new argument to combat.

Suffice it to say, that he has laboured with great ingenuity and acuteness to prove that πετρος signifies *rock* as well as *stone*. He has

not convinced me that it is so; but as I said before, (see Prot. No. CXIX. p. 499,) though I were to concede this to him, it would signify very little. He has not shown that it signifies *the* rock (τη πετρᾳ) on which Christ promised to build his church; and now I say, that were even this conceded to him, which it is not, he would be as far as ever from having shown, that Peter was bishop of Rome; that the Popes are his successors; that those lechers and murderers, who filled the see of Rome for hundreds of years, were Peter's successors, and Christ's vicars, and the foundation on which Christ built his church; and yet, unless Juvenis can prove this, all his arguments go for nothing. It is the system of Popery as it appears in the world at present, and has done for a thousand years, with which I am contending; and unless Juvenis can make it appear from the New Testament, that such a system was appointed by Jesus Christ, it is of no use to dispute about the meaning of a word, or whether Christ constituted the apostle Peter his vicar, and head over his fellow-apostles. I defy the whole Church of Rome to prove even this; but suppose they had proved it, it would not follow, that the greatest monsters of cruelty and impurity, as most of the Popes have been, were Christ's vicars and heads of his church.

Juvenis disavows an inference which I drew from a clause in his former letter; namely, that by asserting the purity of the Church of Rome for the first 500 years, and limiting his remark to this period, he tacitly admitted its impurity thereafter. Justice requires me to insert his reply to this in his own words; and as he has some other things in the concluding part of his letter which are worthy of remark, I shall give it verbatim from this point:—

"'But what' you say, 'does my correspondent gain by asserting the purity of his church for 500 years? This is a tacit admission that she has been impure for more than double that time, seeing he has not a word to say in her behalf since the end of the fifth century.' This admission I deny. I however admit the well-known fact, that many Protestants assert the church's corruption in the time to which you refer; and, to use the words of the Homilist, that '*the whole of Christendom* had been *at once* drowned in *abominable idolatry*, and that for the space of 800 years and *more*; but how far this was really the case, or how far it was consistent with the promises of Christ, does not fall to be examined in the subject I have in hand. In treating of the subject of the supremacy, I was aware that in consequence of this common opinion, the belief of those times would be of no authority: for this reason I kept myself to those ages immediately succeeding, and adduced the writers of those times as witnesses of the faith delivered by the apostles, which then continued to be taught. For giving so many proofs from these authors, I stated, that it was by reason of the clearness of the testimony of Protestant authorities, the words of some of whom I gave, as so explicitly admitting the purity of the church in those times. This, however, was only confining myself to the evidence of an authority acknowledged by the most learned Protestants, and by no means an admission that she was impure in any succeeding age. But you demand, what those Protestants meant by the church purity of those times? To me it seems to require no explanation; the words 'pure' and 'purity' are used in the most unlimited sense, and no comparison whatever with any future period; and to give it in still more unequivocal terms, adding that *they inviolably taught the faith delivered by the apostles*, words which require no comment. Those sagacious opponents would not have made such a concession, had they the least ground for saying the fact was otherwise.

"'It has been,' says a celebrated divine of the established church, 'the common profession of Protestants to stand to the judgment of antiquity for the first 400 years and more, in all things; nay, we give the Romans the scope of the first 500 or 600 years.'—*Bishop Morton's Appeal for Protestants*, p. 354. * Yet to all the venerable writers of those times, which I cited as evidence of the faith of those ages, on the point in question, you declare that you are not obliged to submit to them, as you have never acknowledged their authority. You however add, that you will pay all due respect to the fathers in matters of fact, which came under their own observation, in so far as their account is consistent. This comes at once to the true nature of the question: I cited the fathers not as *judges* or expounders of the sense of Scripture, but as witnesses of the belief of the times in which they lived; those times which are declared to have taught the faith delivered by the apostles. Now as the sacred volume, in the point in question, as well as in many others, is liable to two interpretations, of a meaning directly opposite, what proof, I again ask, can we have which is the true one, but by referring to the belief of the Christian churches in those ages, which are allowed to have had the faith in the same purity as it was delivered? Therefore, as from the proofs I gave of the belief of the supremacy in those ages, it must be considered as the doctrine of apostles; and those testimonies are a farther confirmation of the plain course of our Saviour's words without the aid of any forced interpretation. But you would wish to know what proof there is that

* This work is so valuable, and so well supported by authorities, that we give the title in full. "A Catholic Appeal for Protestants out of the Confessions of the Roman Doctors, particularly answering the misnamed Catholic Apology" (Brereley's) by Thomas Morton, 1610.

these are the genuine writings of the fathers. What proof has the learned world that the works ascribed to a Livy or a Xenophon are really the writings of these historians? The answer is generally known, and the cases are parallel. But then you assert that the Church of Rome found it convenient in '*the dark ages*,' to make such erasures as were necessary to answer her own purposes. This you observe she could not so easily do with the New Testament, as the Greek church would be a check upon her. This subject, however, you promise to discuss at a future period. In the meantime, I may here ask a question, Had the Greek church none of the writings of the fathers? If she had, there was no doubt but she would preserve them from what you call the expurgatorian process of the *Index*, and be as much a check in the one case as in the other. As to the doctrines taught by the apostles, you deny that the fathers of the first ages had a better opportunity of knowing their true meaning than we ourselves have, seeing that they committed them to writing, which you observe we can understand as well as they could do. This might be true, if the inspired writings were so plain and simple as to be incapable of different interpretations; but as unhappily they are so subject to this abuse, it must be that the Christians of the first ages, living in times so near the apostles, and which continued to teach the faith pure, had better opportunities of knowing the true meaning, on doubtful points, than we have at this remote period, amidst so many contradictory explanations. On this point I will give you the opinion of one of the most eminent divines of the established church, of the present day. The *Sacramental Catechism*, a work in general estimation in the church of our own country, in page 6, after asking if the communion was to be of perpetual duration, and giving the words of 1 Cor. xi. 26. it adds, 'and because the Christians of the first ages, *who enjoyed the best means of information*, had this opinion of it.' The opinion that the earlier Christians enjoyed better opportunities for information on doubtful points, than we do, is by no means singular; but this specimen may be sufficient as coming from such a respectable source.

"You advise me to forsake the writings of saints and fathers, to pay attention to my Bible, and follow where I shall find it to lead. The advice to a certain extent is good. The Bible would doubtlessly be the only rule in matters of religion, if it were sufficiently plain on all points of Christian doctrine; but as unfortunately this is not the case, the inspired writer himself telling us, that there are many parts hard to be understood, which many wrest to their own destruction, and which we ourselves see made to answer the most opposite opinions. In these circumstances there surely can be no impropriety in referring to the writings of those who lived in purer times; not, however, as judges, but as witnesses of the faith of the Christian church, whilst it is declared to have taught the faith in the same purity as it had been delivered by the apostles.

"There are two or three points in my letter which have not been noticed. Perhaps they may not have been worthy of it, or perhaps it is a 'tacit admission' of their being correct. In it I observe the mistake of a word, p. 118, line 9, for *interpretations* read *interpolations*. I am sorry that this should have as little to boast of brevity as its predecessor: with all my endeavours I could not be more concise. I, however, trust you will excuse even a second intrusion on your patience. With your convenience, your remarks will truly oblige, yours, with respect, JUVENIS."

29*th Nov.* 1820, (under the Edinburgh post mark.)

From the explanation with which my correspondent has favoured me, in the first paragraph of the preceding extract, I am satisfied that he did not mean to concede that his church became impure after the fifth century. He shows in a very intelligible manner, that he confined his remarks to the first 500 years, in condescension to certain Protestant writers, who had acknowledged the purity of the church of Rome during this period; not that *he* admitted the fact of her subsequent departure from purity of faith; and therefore, I do most readily relieve him from the imputation which such an admission might be understood to imply. I understand him, therefore, to assert that, in his opinion, the church of Rome at this day, holds the faith delivered by the apostles, with as much purity as she did at the conclusion of the fifth century. I may, hereafter, show that she was not very pure even then; but in the meantime, I wish to call the attention of my correspondent, and of my readers in general, to my admission that she was then *comparatively* pure. In my CXXth Number, page 500, speaking of the Church of Rome, I admitted, that "she was not then defiled by the absurdity of transubstantiation, and the idolatry of the mass; nor was the worship of images then generally practised; nor were the clergy then forbidden to marry; nor was it then allowed to them to keep concubines; and there are fifty other abominable things which were not then countenanced, but which sprung up in the dark ages which followed, and are now so essentially incorporated with the system that they cannot be separated from it." These words immediately precede, and stand in the same page with those which Juvenis quotes at the beginning of the first paragraph of his letter above cited. He must, therefore, have read them, and been perfectly familiar with them. Whence then is it that he makes no reply, and not even the most distant

allusion to them in his long letter? He finds that I had passed over some things in his former letter; and from this he infers, that I had considered them unworthy of notice, or that my passing them over was "a tacit admission of their being correct." Now this is the fact. I did consider those two or three points in Juvenis's letter, of which I took no notice, either as correct, or not worth the correcting. Juvenis will, therefore, allow me to find that, his passing over the above two or three points about transubstantiation, and the mass, and images, and clerical impurity, is "a tacit admission" that my statement is true; or else that the things are not worthy of notice. The latter he cannot do; for some of the articles here enumerated are the main pillars of Popery. He is then reduced, upon his own principles, to the alternative of acquiescing in my assertion, that the idolatrous and abominable things above mentioned were not known in his church at the conclusion of the fifth century. But what then becomes of his leading doctrine, that the Church of Rome at this day holds the very same faith, and is at this day as pure as she was then? If Juvenis thinks I do him any injustice, in inferring this acquiescence from his silence on the above points, I shall be glad to be informed by a writer so temperate as he is, what he really understands by transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass; upon what authority he worships images; and upon what principle of morality it is considered by his church better for a clergyman to live in secret impurity with a number of concubines, than openly in the state of honourable marriage.

Juvenis lays great stress upon the circumstance of certain Protestant writers having admitted the purity of the church of Rome during the first five centuries. This I consider of no value whatever. There are Protestants who maintain publicly, that the Church of Rome at the present day is sound in the fundamental articles of religion, and who recommend a union between her and the Protestant church of England, though the fundamental doctrinal articles of the latter are as much opposed to those of the former as language can make them; and were indeed originally intended to exhibit a standard directly opposed to the doctrinal errors of Rome. This being the fact, it is not surprising that Protestants should be found who maintain the purity of the Church of Rome, at a period when she was a thousand times less polluted than she is now. But I must tell my correspondent, that on a point of this kind, I pay no more regard to the authority of modern Protestants than to that of ancient fathers; and therefore all that he builds upon their admissions must go for nothing.

It is very possible for a Church to have a sound creed; there may not be one article of her public profession inconsistent with the Holy Scriptures. Thus doctrinally she may appear pure in the sight of other churches; and yet she may be internally a mass of impurity. The Jewish church at different periods of her history, while holding the soundest creed in the world—professing to receive and hold fast the law of Moses, which was dictated by God himself, was yet no better than a body having no soundness in it, but full of wounds and bruises and putrifying sores. There is no heresy so bad as practical immorality; and whatever the creed of a church may be, if the prevailing spirit of its members be infidel or immoral, it is an impure church. That this was the case with the Church of Rome long before the conclusion of the fifth century, I appeal to every history that relates to ecclesiastical affairs during that period.

But that I may not be accused of resting upon mere human testimony, I shall shortly advert to what the New Testament informs us of, with regard to the Christians in Rome. I have already said that we do not find them any where in the inspired record appearing as one organized body, under the title of the Church of Rome; but when Paul wrote his epistle to the Christians there, he had occasion to praise their faith, which no doubt was an acknowledgment of both its purity and stedfastness. But a sad change soon took place. The first fruits dropped one after another into the grave. The emperor Claudius had banished from the city all of them who were Jews by birth, Acts xviii. 2. Many were banished and suffered death in the reign of Nero; so that when Paul came to Rome, at least when he was first called to appear before the emperor, there does not appear to have been a faithful man among all the Christians in the city; at least not one whose faith was strong enough to enable him to stand by the venerable and grievously persecuted apostle in the hour of trial. Like a parcel of cowards they all forsook him and fled. "At my first answer," says he, "no man stood with me, but all men forsook me; I pray God that this may not be laid to their charge," 2 Tim. iv. 16. This is the last apostolic account that we have of the Christians in Rome. It presents them in the light of cowards and apostates; for abandoning an apostle of Christ in such circumstances was little, if any thing, short of abandoning Christ himself. Paul prayed for them that their great guilt might not be laid to their charge. It is hoped the prayer was heard in respect of many of them; but we have no evidence of the restoration of them as a body to that honourable character under which Paul first addressed them, Rom. i. 8. Who then will answer for their purity as a church during the four centuries which immediately followed?

We know upon the authority of the apostolic

writings, that few of the primitive churches maintained purity of faith and practice even to the end of the apostolic age. The whole of the churches in Galatia became corrupted by the leaven of the Judaizing teachers, for which see Paul's epistle to them. The church in Corinth, besides abusing the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, tolerated very gross immorality in one of its members, for which see Paul's first epistle to that church, chapters v. and xi. Of the seven churches in the Lesser Asia, who were addressed by the head of the church, in epistles written to them by the apostle John, only two were found without blame; (Rev. ii. and iii.) all the rest were corrupted less or more, by the admission of erroneous principles, or the sufferance of immoral practices,—the latter being indeed the natural consequence of the former. Now I challenge the Church of Rome to show to the world upon what ground she claims the honour of not having erred, or rather the privilege of being incapable of error, for this is what she would have us believe she possesses. She cannot adduce a divine promise in her favour, which would not equally apply to the churches in Galatia, the church in Corinth, or the seven churches in Asia. When we convict the Church of Rome of gross errors in doctrine, and, if possible, of grosser immoralities in practice, instead of clearing herself of what is thus brought home to her, she shelters herself under Christ's promise to his spiritual body, that the gates of hell should never prevail against it; but the church of Rome has never been able to show, that this applied to her, any more than to the church in Corinth, or the churches in Galatia, and seeing we know the fact, that the gates of hell, or the influence of the devil, did prevail against them, we can see no reason, connected with this divine promise, why the same influence should not also have prevailed over the Church of Rome. It rests with Papists to produce the patent, under the broad seal of heaven, which invests their church with the privilege of indefectability; and until they can produce this, we must be allowed to believe that she is as liable to corruption as any other church that is acknowledged to have become corrupt; we must be allowed to give credit to the unequivocal testimony of history, that she became notoriously corrupt at no great distance of time from the period that other churches became so; and we must also be allowed to believe the testimony of our own senses, when we read the blasphemous doctrines which are taught, and witness the idolatries which are practised by Papists of the present day, which inevitably lead us to the conclusion, that she is the most corrupt communion that ever appeared in the world under the much-abused name of Christian. Juvenis merely hints *en passant*, a doubt whether it be consistent with the promises of Christ, to assert with the Homilist, that the whole of Christendom had been drowned in abominable idolatry, and that for the space of 800 years and more. But before he troubled himself with a doubt upon the subject, he ought first to have ascertained whether Christ had ever made any promise to what he calls, or what the Homilist calls, "Christendom?" There is certainly no such promise in the New Testament, nor any recognition of such a term as a designation of his kingdom; nay, there is no recognition of the thing meant by it, and therefore none of Christ's promises can justly be made to apply to it.

I have no objection to the word "Christendom" when it is used merely to distinguish the countries in which Christianity is generally professed, from those in which Mahomedanism or heathenism prevails. But Christ's spiritual kingdom consists not of all who live in what are called Christian countries; but only of such as are born again,—who are become new creatures through the divine influence of the gospel believed by them. These may be scattered through all the nations of "Christendom," and also among heathen nations. They cannot be all known to one another in this world; but they are all known to him who is their Head. They may be a million of visible bodies on earth, if they were to be counted; but they are all one body in Christ. These with the company already in heaven, are his church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. He will keep every one of them by his mighty power through faith unto salvation. Organized churches, such as those in Corinth, in Ephesus, in Philippi and elsewhere, were visible representations of Christ's spiritual body, or kingdom; but he gave a special promise of perpetuity to none of them; and it is certain that Rome cannot show that ever he made any such promise to her. She has, therefore, no right to argue from his promise to his spiritual body, that such a carnal body of corruption, as she is, shall never fall into error.

No. CXXXII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20TH, 1821.

JUVENIS is beyond comparison the most respectable antagonist who has entered the lists with THE PROTESTANT. I feel pleasure in replying to his objections, because I think he has both understanding to apprehend, and candour to admit the force of certain facts and arguments which I have brought to bear upon the controversy which I am maintaining against his Church. The fragment of his letter which I inserted in my last Number, gives me an opportunity of explaining, and

entering more fully into the discussion of some important points than I have hitherto done, though I may have slightly touched upon them. Of this opportunity I gladly avail myself; and I hope the remarks which I am about to make, in addition to those in my last Number, will not be considered uninteresting or irrelevant.

I had professed myself ready to pay all due respect to the fathers, as witnesses of matters of fact which came under their own observation, so far as they gave a consistent testimony. "This," says Juvenis, "comes at once to the true nature of the question; I cited the fathers not as *judges* or expounders of the sense of scripture, but as witnesses of the belief of the times in which they lived; those times which *are declared to have taught the faith delivered by the apostles.*" Before proceeding farther I must ask, who are they that have declared what I have given in italics at the conclusion of the last sentence? If I shall be referred to Bishop Morton, or any author of his age, or since his age, I must reject him, and all such, as incompetent witnesses. They declare what they have not seen with their eyes, or heard with their ears. They know nothing of the matter but what they have learned from the very fathers, who are themselves adduced as witnesses in the same cause, and they cannot add the weight of a straw to their testimony. If the fathers have written, merely in general terms, that the faith of the apostles was purely taught in their time, it is no more than any cardinal in Rome would assert, and swear to at this very day. We know what would be the value of such an assertion, even when confirmed by oath. The cardinal might sincerely believe what he swore, and the fathers no doubt wrote what they believed to be true: but they merely express what was their own opinion of the matter; and in weighing evidence on such a subject, their opinion ought to have no more weight than that of any Protestant peasant who asserts, perhaps truly, that his minister teaches the faith as it was delivered by the apostles.

If the fathers, instead of barely asserting that the faith of Christ was purely taught in their times, which is in fact asserting no more than that the system which they held was the predominant one;—If, I say, instead of this, they go into details, and give us a summary of the doctrines which were then generally taught, I hold them competent witnesses of the fact, when two or three of them in the same age, agree in asserting it. I hold this as sufficient evidence that such and such doctrines were generally believed, and such forms of worship as they describe generally practised in the ages to which they refer. I made considerable use of this sort of evidence when I attempted to show that transubstantiation was a novelty, by quoting passages from the ancient fathers, which clearly proved that they, and the churches in their time, had no idea of the substance of the bread in the Lord's Supper being converted into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. This sort of argument, however, does not go to prove that transubstantiation is contrary to scripture, (which is proved by other arguments) but merely that it was unknown to the fathers and the primitive churches.

To know what the Church of Rome, or any other church held as matter of faith, in any age subsequent to that of the apostles, is interesting to us merely as a matter of history. That certain articles were believed by the Church of Rome, in the second, third, and fourth centuries, is no evidence that such articles were taught by the apostles, unless we have the apostles' own word for it, in their own writings; and, if we have this, we receive such articles as the truth of God independently of the authority of the church, and whether she believed them or not. From the apostle Paul himself we learn, that a prevalent doctrine, believed and taught in the churches in Galatia, was, that in order to salvation, it was necessary to be circumcised, and to keep the law of Moses. Here is an unimpeachable witness of the fact, that such a doctrine generally prevailed, not near the apostolic age merely, but while many of the apostles were yet alive; but the fact is adduced, not to prove the truth of the doctrine, but to show the defection of those churches from the faith of the gospel. Papists adduce many facts asserted by less credible witnesses, to prove that certain tenets were taught and generally believed, some ages after the apostles had gone to their rest; but admitting the testimony to be true, it proves only that the Christians of those ages had departed from the faith of Christ, not that the tenets so maintained belonged to this faith. When it is ascertained, that many churches departed from the simplicity of the gospel, while they were under the keen discerning eye of the inspired apostles, how much more must not this have been the case, in the course of ages, when not favoured with such superintendence, and when exposed to the silent intrusion, and malign influence of worldly men, who soon began to insinuate themselves into the churches, and who actually filled that of Rome whenever Christianity became respectable in the eyes of the world?

I hope Juvenis, on reflection, will be convinced that there is no wisdom in suffering his mind to be entangled by the traditions of the fathers, which, unless supported by scripture, are absolutely useless; and which, if even so supported, are of little use, because the authority of the word of God is enough without them.

I am sorry, however, to observe that Juvenis, like most persons of his communion, does not seem to regard the scriptures with the respect to which they are entitled. "As the sacred

volume," says he, "in the point in question as well as in many others, is liable to two interpretations, of a meaning directly opposite, what proof, I again ask, can we have which is the true one, but by referring to the belief of the Christian churches in those ages which are allowed to have had the faith in the same purity as it was delivered?" This argument rests upon the assumption of its being *allowed* that there were churches in certain ages after the apostles, who held the faith as purely as the apostles delivered it. This, however, is not *allowed*, but positively denied. There were not many churches that remained pure during the apostolic age; and there is no evidence of *any* having done so for any considerable period thereafter. Therefore, the argument which Juvenis builds upon this assumption falls to the ground.

But I have a more serious complaint against my correspondent. He seems to consider the Bible as inferior, in point of perspicuity, and less to be depended upon, than the writings of uninspired men. It is liable, he says, to two interpretations, of a meaning directly opposite; and his words imply that the writings of the fathers are not liable to this abuse, seeing that from them can be learned without danger of mistake, what cannot be so learned from the Bible. His words must mean this, else they mean nothing in relation to the point in hand. Now I would seriously request the writer of this to reflect deliberately upon what his words imply, and consider whether they do not at least approach to the sin of blaspheming the Holy Ghost. I do not say in that sense in which it is declared that such a sin shall not be forgiven; but they certainly do appear to impeach the power and the fidelity of the Holy Spirit, in dictating to, and guiding the pens of inspired men. I am persuaded this thought never occurred to my correspondent, else he would not have suffered such words to flow from his pen. In him therefore, I hope, it is only a sin of ignorance or inadvertence.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God; and holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. This is the testimony of apostles on behalf of prophets and their writings; and that the apostles themselves wrote under the same influence is evident from Christ's promise of his Spirit to be with them, to lead them into all truth, so that they should infallibly speak and write the truth in his name. Now it would be the greatest blasphemy to say, that the Divine Spirit could not enable these men to write in language at least as plain and perspicuous as other men; and it would be as great blasphemy to say that he purposely dictated language susceptible of a double meaning; for this would be to counteract the gracious design of Christ, who commanded his gospel to be published for the instruction and salvation of the simple, the ignorant, the poor, and miserable. But how could the gospel produce this effect, if it were expressed in language so equivocal as to bear opposite meanings? This is the accusation which Juvenis brings against the inspired writings; and if it were true, it would set aside the authority and use of the Bible altogether.

In another part of his letter, Juvenis writes, "The Bible would doubtlessly be the only rule in matters of religion, if it were sufficiently plain on all points of Christian doctrine; but as unfortunately this is not the case, the inspired writer himself telling us, that there are many parts hard to be understood, which many wrest to their own destruction; and which we ourselves see made to answer the most opposite opinions; in these circumstances, there surely can be no impropriety in referring to the writings of those who lived in purer times," &c. I might here ask Juvenis what he means by *purer times?* I understood him to undertake the task of showing that his church is as pure now as ever she was. If she is not, he admits the necessity of a Reformation, for surely there can be nothing more proper; nay, there can be nothing more imperative on a church, than to return to the purity from which she has departed. But waving this for the present, I return to my correspondent's assertion about the insufficiency of the Bible as a rule in matters of religion. He plainly asserts, that it is not "*sufficiently* plain on all points of Christian doctrine." That is, in plain English, the Bible is not *sufficient* for the purpose intended by it. It is the word of God indeed; for this is not controverted. It declares itself able to make us wise unto salvation, —and to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works; and yet, says Juvenis, it is not *sufficiently plain* on all points of Christian doctrine. It declares itself sufficient for the salvation of sinners and the perfecting of saints; and what more would my correspondent have? If he means that it is not sufficient to make men Papists, it is readily granted; and then I have no more controversy with him on this point. I leave him engaged in a controversy with the Word of God; and woe to the man that striveth with his Maker! I suspect Juvenis, from his handwriting, to be a man of the law. If he should find an Act of Parliament not "sufficiently plain" to guide the decision of the Court of Session in a matter in which his property, or the property of his client was interested, would he not complain bitterly of the stupidity of our legislators? and yet, in matters which affect the eternal salvation of millions of human beings, he coolly declares the word of God not to be "sufficiently plain." This is an impeachment of the wisdom and goodness of his Creator, such as he would scarcely venture to make against a fellow-creature a little above him in civil authority.

The apostle Peter tells us, that in the epistles of Paul there are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned wrest to their own destruction; but these very words of Peter have been wrested more than any other passage in the Bible to the destruction of those who so wrest them. In all their books of controversy,—in all their catechisms,—in almost all the letters which I have received from Papists, and in this one of Juvenis among the rest, these words of the apostle are wrested to support a doctrine which he never meant to inculcate; namely, that the Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith and manners; but that we must add to it, in one form or another, the doctrines and traditions of men. For a full discussion of this subject, I refer the reader to No. XXXVI, page 169, in which I showed that certain things are "hard to be understood," not because the things themselves are unintelligible, but because some men's minds are so occupied with opposite things that they cannot receive them.

I expect Juvenis will reply to what I have said about his blasphemous assertion, that the words of the Holy Ghost are not *sufficiently plain*, by explaining himself thus;—that he did not mean to say that the words of the Bible are not plain enough; but that the things spoken of are so mysterious, and "hard to be understood," that the words used cannot convey an adequate idea of them to our minds. This, in reference to some points, will be granted. The Bible tells us of things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and which have not entered into the mind of man. But surely, if the words of the apostles, dictated by the Holy Ghost, be not "*sufficiently* plain" upon these things, whose words can be so? Juvenis will tell me, that we may come to the understanding of these things by reading the works of certain fathers who lived in purer times, and who have borne witness to the faith of the churches in those times. But if the things themselves were incapable of being so expressed by words as to make men understand them, how came the fathers to express them intelligibly? Where did they find words which apostles under divine inspiration could not find, to make men understand the "things hard to be understood?"

The truth is, the Bible is unspeakably more plain than the plainest and wisest of the fathers. He that comes to it with simplicity and singleness of heart, really desiring to know how he may obtain the pardon of his sins, and the salvation of his soul, shall soon find what he is seeking. Nothing can be plainer than the divine declaration, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—"The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost."—And "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Any one of these three sentences comprises the sum and substance of the whole Bible; and the meaning is so plain that it is impossible for any man who understands the terms, to make the words speak opposite meanings, without an artful and wilful perversion of them. The man, woman, or child, who believes the truth expressed by the above words, shall undoubtedly be saved: and if they are not "*sufficiently plain*," let Juvenis point out a passage in any of the fathers that is more so. Let it be remembered the grand business of a divinely taught religion, is the salvation of the soul. The Bible, from first to last, points to Jesus Christ and to none else; and to say that it is not "sufficiently plain" on this subject, is as absurd, and more impious, than to assert that the sun is not sufficiently bright to give light to the world. The writings of the fathers are full of a vain philosophy derived from the school of Plato, and other heathen sources, by means of which they corrupted the gospel, and prepared the way for all the errors that have defiled the church of Rome for more than fifteen hundred years. Juvenis, and all others of his communion, profess to have recourse to these writers, that they may learn what Christianity is, which is as foolish as to seek for the pure water of a fountain in the muddy streams of a river that has imbibed the filth of all the common sewers of a great city. By filtration, such water may, indeed, be rendered subservient to the ordinary purposes of life; and by a similar process, the writings of the fathers may be made to yield a few drops which manifest their relation to the fountain; but what wise man would be at the pains to filtrate so much impurity, when he has access every day and every hour to the pure fountain itself?

Juvenis represents me as wishing to know what proof there is that the writings referred to are the genuine writings of the fathers? But this is not putting the question fairly. I do not deny that there is as much evidence of the genuineness of Origen's, or Cyprian's, or any other father's writings, as there is of those of Livy and Xenophon. But I asked Juvenis, or rather suggested for his consideration, a doubt, whether the *editions* of the works of the fathers from which he quoted were genuine? And here I must remind him of a little deficiency of that candour which I expected from him. I stated a fact, that his church had mutilated the works of the fathers, by her Index Expurgatorius. He knows the fact as well as I do, else he must be a mere tyro in ecclesiastical history; but he has not the candour to acknowledge it; neither has he the boldness to deny it; but he tries to evade the question, by asking whether the Greek church had none of the writings of the fathers? and whether they would not have been as careful

in preserving them from mutilation, and in being a check upon the Church of Rome, as much in regard to them as with regard to the Bible? Now it is enough for me to reply, that I do not know that the writings of the fathers, at least the Latin ones, were very generally possessed by the Greek churches; but supposing they were so, I do not know, and I do not believe, that these churches considered them of equal value with the Holy Scriptures, or of any value at all, and therefore they might give themselves little concern whether the Church of Rome mutilated them or not. It is a fact that this holy church did mutilate them, and expunge from them those passages which she considered unfavourable to her errors and usurpations. If Juvenis shall venture to deny this, I can refer him to some public libraries, in which he may witness with his own eyes that I speak the truth. But he knows the fact too well to deny it. Then, I ask, why does he put a case with regard to the Greek churches, which is evidently intended to throw a doubt upon the subject, as if he meant to deny it? This is not like the candour which we should expect to find in the advocates of a good cause.

Who the eminent divines of the Established Church, to whom Juvenis refers, are, I do not know; and of the merits of the catechism which he quotes, I am equally ignorant. But if there be a respectable divine of the Church of Scotland, who can seriously adduce the opinions of the Christians of the first ages, to prove the obligation of observing the Lord's Supper till the end of the world, I would tell him, that he practises the folly of those who seek from the living to the dead. The living Saviour commands his disciples to show forth his death *until he come;* and what authority can the opinions of Christians who died seventeen hundred years ago add to this injunction?

Juvenis adheres to his opinion, that the Christians of the first ages living in purer times, must have had better opportunities than we have of knowing the true meaning of the apostolic writings on doubtful points; but he does not reply to the remarks which I made on that subject, which must, therefore, be considered as unrefuted. He shows no reason why we of the present day may not understand a Greek sentence, or any number of Greek sentences, written by apostles in the first century, as easily as any number of Latin sentences written by any of the fathers in the following centuries. We must depend upon writing in either case; and according to approved rules of evidence, the first or earliest writing is most to be depended upon.

Here again Juvenis's good sense leads him to admit that the first ages of his church were "purer times" than the present; but how can he admit this, and deny the necessity of reformation? Luther and other reformers avowed it to be their purpose to return to the purity of the first ages; and every man who admits that these *were* purer ages, ought to applaud the attempt; though the bold undertakers did not succeed in every point, perhaps because they did not go far enough back.

After all, according to Juvenis, it is only "doubtful points," which those who lived in purer times had better opportunites of understanding than we have. But those parts of the Bible which directly regard the salvation of a sinner, and how he shall live to the glory of God, are not doubtful points, but very plain. And those parts which are most difficult or doubtful, regard chiefly the fulfilment of prophecy, which we certainly ought to understand much better than the most enlightened uninspired men of the first ages. Nay, it may be questioned whether the apostles themselves had such an understanding of some of the prophecies which they uttered and wrote, as the weakest Christian has since they have been fulfilled in the rise, and reign, and begun downfal of the Man of Sin. The possession of the prophetic spirit did not necessarily imply a full understanding of what was prophesied; see 1 Pet. i. 10—12, particularly v. 12.

No. CXXXIII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 27TH, 1821.

I HAVE paid my correspondent, Juvenis, the compliment of devoting two Numbers to an extract of a letter from him, and remarks upon it. I think I have replied to every thing in that extract which called for particular notice; but there is a principle avowed in it, which, I think, requires to be discussed by itself; that is, the insufficiency of the word of God, as a rule of faith, worship, and manners. Juvenis repeatedly declares that he does not consider the Bible sufficiently plain to instruct him; and he pleads for the admission of human authority, or human teaching, to make him certain of what he ought to believe, and what to practise in the way of religious worship. In other words, he will not receive the Bible, but in the sense in which certain men who lived hundreds of years ago received it.

This is in fact subjecting the word of God to the authority of man. Those who are thus regarded as judges in the matter, are called fathers, and some of them have the word saint prefixed to their names. It is not pretended that they were inspired men like apostles and evangelists; and yet the Church of Rome sets them as judges over inspired men, insomuch that apostles and evangelists shall be allowed to speak only through their medium; and the words of the divine record shall not be allowed to have any meaning but such as they please to impose upon them.

Juvenis is not one of those who deny that the Bible is the word of God. In arguing with him, I have hitherto proceeded upon the assumption that this was admitted by him; but it is admitted in such a way as to show that it has little authority in his esteem. Every work of God is perfect in its kind, and fit for every purpose intended by it. I take this to be an axiom that does not require to be proved; and no man can deny it without landing himself in atheism. Now, God is said to have magnified his *word* above all his name, Psal. cxxxviii. 2. He has set his seal upon it, and given such displays of himself in it, as he has not done by any other medium, not even by the sun and the moon, which he hath ordained. These perfectly serve the purpose which he ordained them to serve, which is merely of a temporal nature; and shall it be seriously maintained, that his word is not sufficient to serve the infinitely more important purpose intended by it? Yes; Juvenis maintains this, and so far as I know, all Papists maintain it. In their esteem the word of God is not "sufficiently plain" to teach men the way of salvation. It is liable to misconstruction. It is made to speak different and even opposite meanings; and the inference is, that no dependence ought to be placed upon it, except so far as the fathers of the church have given it their sanction.

Now, let Papists cavil and shuffle as they may, this amounts to a virtual denial of the Bible as the word of God. To say that it is so, and in the same breath to say it is not "*sufficiently* plain," is such an impeachment of the divine wisdom and goodness, as we shall never hear but from the most hardened infidel, or from those who, like Juvenis, perhaps, have breathed the atmosphere of infidelity, and have become so familiar with its phraseology, as to make use of it without being aware of its import. Juvenis will spurn the idea of being classed with infidels; and nothing would have induced me to have associated him with them, but his attempt to disparage the word of God, which is most effectually to promote the cause of infidelity.

It does not properly belong to my plan to discuss the subject of the inspiration and divine authority of the holy Scriptures. This has been done of late years, to good purpose, by different authors; and none deserve more honourable mention than two divines of our own city. The names of Dick and Chalmers will instantly occur to every reader acquainted with the literature of the present age; and referring to the "Essay on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures," by the former, and the "Evidence and Authority of the Christian Revelation," by the latter, I might confidently leave that question to the decision of every intelligent and candid reader. I have indeed, in general, proceeded upon the assumption that Papists admit the divine authority of the Bible; but the more intimately I have become acquainted with them, and the more closely I have come to grapple with their secret and avowed principles, I have been the more convinced that I have assumed what is not heartily conceded by them. The complaint of Juvenis, that the Bible is not sufficiently plain, has confirmed what I inferred from the writings of Mr Andrews and his correspondents, (who bewail the dreadful mischiefs which arise from Bible reading) namely, that the Bible itself is regarded by Papists, not with reverence as the word of God, but held in abhorrence as the most pernicious book in the world.

The last named author has repeatedly challenged me, in his "Catholic Vindicator" to tell him how I come to know the Bible to be the word of God; and the train of his reasoning, if such it can be called, is, to show that no man can know this but upon the authority of the Church of Rome. This holy church, it seems, claims the power of deciding infallibly what is the word of God, and what is not; or, which comes nearly to the same thing, she alone has power and authority to declare the true meaning of the Scriptures. In her infallible wisdom, she pretends to prove from the Bible that she possesses this authority, and yet the Bible itself has no authority or meaning but what she is pleased to allow it; which exemplifies the absurdity of proving a thing by itself, or two things mutually by one another. Juvenis is entitled to an apology for classing him with such a writer as Mr Andrews, whose name as an author is not worthy to appear on the same page; but as they are agreed in maintaining the insufficiency of the Bible, which I hold to be virtually the same thing as rejecting its inspiration, I shall, before entering upon another general topic of discussion, devote a Number or two to the answering of the question, how I know the Bible to be the word of God? I shall first, however, give the challenge itself, in the words of the Vindicator, from different parts of his work.

"As the accuser," says he, meaning the Protestant, "speaks positively to the Scriptures containing the word of God, will he permit me to inquire of him how he came by the information, and upon what authority he grounds his assertion? Has *he* been taken into the council of the Almighty, that *he* should know more of his will than other men?" (so it seems other men do not know that the Bible contains the word of God!) "Has *he* been favoured with a revelation from heaven in his private ear? Or has a heavenly messenger been sent to *him*, to inform him that the Bible *is* actually the word of God?" *Cath. Vind.* col. 233. Some of these expressions had been used by me, when inquiring how the Popish priests came to know the mind of God better than other men, *independently of the Bible;*

and here the Vindicator makes use of my words to inquire how I came to know the truth of the Bible itself; from which it is evident that, in his opinion, there is no way of knowing it, but by the authority of his church, or by means of a private communication by an angelic messenger sent from heaven.

The author introduces a long extract from his infallible oracle Dr Milner, intended to show that Protestants cannot be certain with regard to any book in the Bible that it is genuine. The extract concludes thus:—"Granting, for example, that St Paul wrote an inspired epistle to the Romans, and another to the Ephesians, yet, as the former was intrusted to an individual, the Deaconess Phebe, to be conveyed by her to its destination, (Rom. xvi. see Calmet, &c.) and the latter to his disciple, Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21.) for the same purpose, it is impossible for you to entertain a rational conviction that these epistles, as they stand in your Testament, are exactly in the state in which they issued from the apostle's pen, or that they are his genuine epistles at all, without recurring to the tradition and authority of the Catholic Church concerning them," *Ibid.* col. 237. This is an argument truly worthy of a Popish vicar apostolic and bishop of the 19th century. Supposing Phebe to have been the bearer of the epistle to the Romans, and supposing her to have been sufficiently well acquainted with Greek learning, and such an expert penwoman as to imitate the hand-writing of Tertius in the body of the epistle, and of Paul in the salutation, so as to deceive the Christians in Rome, it may be asked, what motive she could have to make her practise such imposition? The venerable vicar apostolic means to insinuate, that for any thing we Protestants know, this said Phebe destroyed Paul's epistle, or having by accident lost it on the way, wrote one out of her own head, and palmed it upon the Christians in Rome as the genuine writing of the apostle, and that this is what we have in our New Testaments at this day! And truly if it were so, I would say that Phebe was a greater woman than the Virgin Mary, or any other woman that ever appeared in the world. But this is an argument, which, from its extreme absurdity, it is difficult to answer. If we were to allow the bishop's doubts in such a case as this to have any weight, we could not be sure of the genuineness of any writing,—we could not put faith in written documents of any kind. But to proceed with the Catholic Vindicator:—

"By what private stamp," says he, "or mark, does THE PROTESTANT learn that the Bible is the word of God? By what influence, and by what means, can he ascertain the accuracy of the Scriptures, but on the *testimony of others*, on the *traditions* of men, as he himself admits in the passage I have before quoted; unless, indeed, as I observed in a former Vindicator, he can show that he has been favoured with a copy from some heavenly messenger, in which case he would do well to present it to the Bible Society, for general distribution, with his own authenticated signature." *Cath. Vind.* col. 261. Here the Vindicator introduces me as admitting that I could not ascertain the accuracy of the Scriptures, but on the testimony of others,—on the traditions of men; and he professes to refer to my own words, which he had before quoted, as containing such admission; but he takes care not to refer to any page of his own work or mine in which such words are to be found; and the fact is, I never admitted any such thing. I do not reject human testimony in weighing what are called the *external* evidences of the authenticity of the Scriptures; but no words of mine express, or even imply such an admission as that which the Vindicator asserts; and this is one of the numberless impositions which he was pleased to practise upon his readers, in order to defend a cause which cannot be defended without having recourse to falsehood and imposition.

The hostility of Papists against the Bible will appear more evidently from the following extract. I had asserted that the Bible contains a complete revelation of the will of God for the salvation of our fallen race;—that it contains a proclamation of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners; and that it ought to be accessible to all men. To this the Vindicator, after quoting our Lord's words (Go teach all nations, &c. Mat. xxviii. 20, 21) replies:—"Now here is no intimation of *reading* in these words of our Saviour, nor can THE PROTESTANT discover that the Son of God ever *wrote* his divine precepts previous to sending the apostles on their commission. Upon what grounds then can he fairly establish his position, that the *Bible* was intended to be *accessible to all men?* It was not accessible to all the Israelites; it was not accessible to all the Gentiles; it was not accessible to all the primitive Christians; it is not accessible to *all* men at the present day; nor will it be accessible to *all* men in future ages, notwithstanding the active but ill-judged labours of the Bible Societies to disseminate it. 'For,' says an article in *The Times* London Newspaper, of the 9th of April last, 'it is a curious fact, that supposing the British and Foreign Bible Society were to distribute as many copies of the Scriptures *each year*, as they have done during the last *twelve years*, wherein 1,675,994 copies have been circulated, it would still take *four centuries* to supply each individual in the world with a copy; and this is taking it for granted that the inhabitants of the countries called Christian are already supplied.' By this, (says the Vindicator,) the reader will see the groundlessness of the charge of *withholding* the Bible from the people, brought by

THE PROTESTANT against the Church of Rome, seeing that it is an act of impossibility to supply all men with copies of it, were she so inclined. Consequently, if restricting those from reading the Bible, who are likely to *pervert* the sense of it to their *own destruction*, which is all the fathers of the Council of Trent meditated, in the before-mentioned decree, be 'the same thing as granting permission to creatures to *hear* what the Almighty *speaks* to them;' if the *Bible* contains 'a *complete* revelation of his will for the salvation of our fallen race;' if 'it is a *proclamation* of grace and pardon to the very chief of sinners;' (what nonsense?) God himself must stand accused by THE PROTESTANT of denying the use of the Bible to the common people, and preventing 'fallen and miserable creatures from hearing what he says to them,' which I apprehend comes nearer to blasphemy than the words of my correspondent before alluded to, seeing he has ordained that the greater portion of mankind, from the creation to the present day, have been, are now, and will be deprived of the supposed blessing of *reading* this wonderful Protestant *panacea*, not only from their inability to procure a copy, but also from the want of a knowledge of letters." *Cath. Vind.* col. 240.

The above are the sentiments of the champion whom our Glasgow Papists engaged to defend them against the exposure which THE PROTESTANT was making of their Antichristian principles. They must of course be held as the sentiments of our Papists themselves until they disavow them. This is a fair specimen of Mr Andrews' mode of reasoning. He has scarcely a paragraph that contains better logic. I shall not analyze the passage at present; but I request such of my readers as have leisure, to try what they can make out of it. One thing appears certain upon the very face of it, that the circulation and general reading of the Bible is regarded with dread and abhorrence by our modern Papists, whatever some credulous Glasgow Protestants may say to the contrary.

I shall give an extract or two more from the Vindicator before I proceed to a particular reply; but I am afraid some of my readers will regard these quotations, which speak in such terms of the holy Scriptures, as no better than the filth of the Inquisition, with which I have lately treated them *ad nauseam*. I had said that the apostles committed to writing what was dictated by the Holy Ghost; and that the word of God thus written, they threw upon the world, and the providence of him who gave it, to supply the place of their voice, after they should be dead. To this the Vindicator replies:—"Now the transactions here related must have occurred near 1800 years ago; but what other evidence of his senses can THE PROTESTANT produce, as a voucher for this statement, than the Papist for his belief in transubstantiation?" THE PROTESTANT never spoke of the evidence of his senses in this matter; but the Vindicator assumes that he did, and proceeds upon the false assumption. "Did he *see* the Holy Spirit guide the pens of the writers? What evidence of his senses has he to produce, that the apostles wrote the books of the New Testament, or that they were written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit? A Bible is placed before him, which in itself is a mere book; *how* then does he know that it is a divine book? I have shown that this book is liable to be corrupted—that it has been corrupted—that the unfaithfulness of the Protestant translations is notorious, not only for the multitude, but the grossness of their infidelities: how then can he assert upon the evidence of his senses," (which he never did) "that the *Bible* IS *the word of God*, which is immutable, and not subject to variation? 'Heaven and earth shall pass away,' says our Saviour, 'but my words shall not pass away.' We have the evidence of our senses that the translations of the Bible by Protestants vary with each other, and in many places even to the perverting of the meaning: by *what* means then, I call upon my adversary to state, is *he* enabled to prove that the Bible is the word of God, according to the *evidence of his senses?* How can *he* verify the genuine from the adulterated version?" (This is another question, artfully thrown in to lead away the reader's mind from the main point, about how we come to know the Bible to be the word of God.) "He says, the apostles committed the word of God to *writing*, because their living voice could not reach the millions of men scattered over the face of the earth, and therefore they were inspired to write the *whole* truth of God for the salvation of sinners and the edification of those who, by means of it, should be saved from their sins. This word, thus written, *they threw* upon the world. Now the concurring testimony of all ages contradicts this assertion of THE PROTESTANT, as I have shown in my 17th Vindicator, col. 263, by proving that the millions of men scattered over the face of the earth, were favoured with the truths of the gospel by the *preaching* of men, who succeeded the apostles in their ministry, and not by the *written* epistles which some of the latter left behind them. But if it was the intention of our divine Saviour, that his words should be thrown promiscuously upon the world, after the death of the apostles, how did it happen that only *five* of them, who were personally chosen by himself, left written documents behind them? Two of the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, were written by men who were not members of the sacred college; and one of them, St Luke, acknowledges that he wrote from *hearsay*. What evidence then has THE PROTESTANT to show other than his bare assertion, for the accuracy of his

statement? Again, he says, they committed the word to writing, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who guided their pens as he did their tongues, to declare the WHOLE TRUTH of God; and yet one of the apostles, St John, concludes his gospel with this truly important declaration, well worthy the consideration of those who contend that *the Bible, and the Bible only*, is their rule of faith, namely, 'there are also *many other things which Jesus did*, the which, if they should *be written every one*, I suppose that even *the world itself could not contain the books which should be written.*'" —*Cath. Vind.* col. 326—328.

I suppose ordinary readers will not be able to perceive what relation these words of the apostle John have to the subject; or why the words which Jesus spoke, and which his apostles wrote, should not be the only rule of faith, in connection with those of Moses and the prophets, because *all* the things which Jesus *did* were not written down.

As I cannot conveniently enter upon an answer to the challenge of the Vindicator at the conclusion of a Number, I must reserve it for my next: and I shall conclude the present one with a specimen of the manner in which the translators of the Bible into English are said, according to Mr Andrews, to have corrupted the word of God; and by means of which, to use his own language, they have made it "the word of the devil," see *Cath. Vind.* col. 282. His remarks refer chiefly to the translations made in the reign of Elizabeth; and his first complaint is that the word "Catholic," which is a Greek word, signifying universal, or general, has not been retained in the title of certain epistles, but has been translated into English, as the *general* epistle of James, &c. This, it seems, is a grievous corruption of the New Testament. The Vindicator finds that it would not have served the purpose of the Reformers to expel the word "Catholic" from the New Testament, if they allowed the word "Church" to remain; therefore, he finds that in the edition of 1560, the word church never appeared, but congregation was uniformly used. He does not know, I suppose, that the Greek word εκκλησια literally signifies congregation as well as church; and that the words are synonymous. Be this as it may, the latter word "church" was restored to its place by the translators of our present authorized version; and therefore our English Bible is not corrupt in this respect. The following are the very words of the Vindicator, in reference to other corruptions:—"As they obliterated the *Catholic Church*, so did they also the name of *priest*, turning it into *elder*, and the *priesthood* into *eldership*. As in St James v. 14, 'If any be diseased among you, let him call for the elders of the *congregation*.' (Bible 1560.) Acts xiv. 23. 'When they had ordained them *elders by election* in every *congregation*.' (Bible, 1560.) These words, *by election*, were thrust into the text by Tindal, in King Henry VIII.th's time, and retained in it by Cranmer, and all the pretended reformers of King Edward VI.th's reign: so here in Queen Elizabeth's Bibles, as may be seen in these editions of 1560, 1577, 1579, 1598, 1599. Nor were they obliterated till King James I. made a new translation."—*Cath. Vind.* col. 286. Let it be admitted that the words "by election" were an unnecessary supplement, the thing was corrected by the translators of the present version, and ought not now to be laid to the charge of English Protestants: but when did the Church of Rome ever correct a mistake into which she had fallen? Other great corruptions alleged against our translators are, that they have used the word *gift* instead of *grace* in several places; that in reference to Christ's "benediction or consecration of the holy sacrament," instead of *blessed or blessing*, the words "gave thanks" are used. Instead of "confess your sins," our translators have said "acknowledge your faults," which is another great corruption, and tends to set aside the sacrament of confession. *Repentance* has been put in the place of *penance*. "To dishonour and disgrace our blessed Lady the mother of God," says Mr Andrews, "they turn the angel's salutation, St Luke, i. 28, which was, *Hail, full of grace*, into *Hail, thou art freely beloved.*" Instead of *idols*, our translators have inserted *images*, in a number of passages, which is another horrible corruption. Other corruptions are the use of the word *grave* instead of *hell* in some passages; *ordinances* and *instructions* instead of *traditions*; *love* instead of *charity*. For *sacrament*, they have substituted *mystery*; for *baptism, washing*; for *angel, messenger*; for *apostle, ambassador*; for *Christ, anointed*; for *Holy Ghost, holy wind*.

The above is a complete catalogue of the corruptions which our modern champion of Popery has been able to muster, in his 18th Number, to discredit our English translation of the Bible, and prove it to be not the word of God, but "the word of the devil." In some subsequent Numbers he gives a few more cases of equal but not greater importance. I cannot imagine a greater compliment to our translation than this. In most of the cases, what he calls corruptions and mistranslations, are really true renderings of the original Greek; but though it were otherwise, the things are so unimportant, that the mistranslations, had they been such, could have led no man into error, either in doctrine or practice. And we may be sure that had the Vindicator, or his oracle and patron, Bishop Milner, been able to point out any really mischievous errors in our translation, it would have been done. Any biblical scholar may be able to point out more important mistakes than any of the above, in the best translation of the Bible that was ever made, not except-

ing *the infallible* Vulgate; and yet no one of these mistakes,—not even the whole taken together, will be found to affect any Christian doctrine or ordinance of Christian worship.

No. CXXXIV.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3D, 1821.

PAPISTS maintain that we do not know the Bible to be the word of God, but upon the testimony of the Church of Rome: but this church is so much given to lying, that I would question the truth of any thing that was made to rest upon her sole authority. Liars are suspected even when they speak the truth; and if the authenticity of the sacred writings depended upon the assertion of the Church of Rome, I suspect there are many who would reject them on that account alone, without inquiring into the merits, or considering the excellence of the writings themselves. This, however, would not be fair. The writings of the apostles were possessed by the churches in general at a very early period. The Church of Rome, like other churches, came into the possession of them; and it is granted that she preserved them in a Latin version, locked up from the view of the profane vulgar, for several hundred years. Some of her refractory children, such as Wickliffe and Luther, compelled her at last to acknowledge that she had such writings in her possession. They had seen them; they began to give versions of them in the language of the common people; and the church at last was obliged to bring them out to public view, but, at first, in a Latin version only, with an authoritative canon, declaring this to be equal to the Greek original. And, from the circumstance of having been so long in the undisturbed possession of the book, she began to claim it as her own, and so gave it out as her own; and hence it is that she now pretends to dictate with supreme authority with regard to its meaning, and even whether it be the word of God or not.

This reminds me of what was remarked of Phebe in my last Number. She is said to have been the bearer of the epistle which Paul wrote to the Christians in Rome. Now, supposing she had kept the epistle in her own possession for a great number of years, and had at last, in her old age, after Paul was dead, brought it forth to public view; and supposing she had insisted upon the believers in Rome receiving it upon her bare word, what does the reader suppose would have been the consequence? The Christians would probably have felt very indignant; they would have expressed great displeasure against the said Phebe, for having kept them so long in the dark with regard to such a valuable document; and they would, perhaps, have told her that she had done so ill, by keeping back the letter, that they would not take her bare word for any thing. They take the letter however; they examine the seal, and the hand-writing of Tertius, with whom some of them had been acquainted, and the hand-writing of Paul himself in the salutation, which was his token in every epistle; and, above all, they examine the contents, and compare them with other writings of the same apostle, and with what they had heard from his own mouth; they unanimously conclude that the epistle is the genuine production of him whose name it bears, and they receive it as such. Phebe might boast that it had been received on her sole authority; but this would have exposed her to the derision of every Christian in Rome, and would have rendered her own Christianity somewhat doubtful. Now, admitting the highest that the Church of Rome can justly claim on this subject, she was merely for a time one of the depositaries of the scriptures; and when she was pleased, or rather compelled, to bring them forth to public view, she could add nothing to their authority, any more than the bearer of a letter can add to the authority of its contents, of the authenticity of which the person addressed is, on other grounds, perfectly satisfied.

These remarks, I hope, will be considered a sufficient reply to what Papists advance with regard to their church being invested with the power of deciding infallibly what is, and what is not, the word of God. If they could show that the Church of Rome had received some special grant of authority on this subject, from the Head of the church, it would become every Christian to submit to it: but as nothing of the kind has been shown, I shall continue to consider the decision of the Church of Rome of no more weight than the opinion of Jack or Tom, or any self-sufficient pedant who may pretend to understand all mysteries, and to possess all knowledge.

The works to which I referred in my last Number prove, in the most convincing manner, according to the laws of moral and literary evidence, that the Holy Scriptures are what they profess to be; namely, the testimony of God, conveyed to men by the ministry of his accredited ambassadors. The arguments of such authors are sufficient to silence every objector; to prevail upon every candid mind to give the Bible a fair hearing, by perusing it with serious attention; and if this does not lead to an acknowledgement that it is the word of God, the failure will be found to arise, not from the want of evidence, but from a certain indisposition of the mind and heart, by which many disqualify themselves from attending to the evidence which is presented. And it is possible for a man to be overcome by such evidence, so far as to acknowledge the Bible to be the word of God,—to have a rational

conviction that it is what it professes to be,—and yet, in an evangelical sense, not to "know the truth;" or be able to satisfy others, or even himself, when he is required to say upon what grounds he *knows* the Bible to be the word of God. The Catholic Vindicator seems to believe that no man can know this, unless he were to receive a Bible directly from the hand of his Maker, or see the Holy Spirit guide the pens of the men that wrote it; for which, see my last Number. It is not probable that any thing that I can write will have much weight with such men as he; but for the information of others, I shall proceed to show how any man may, and how every Christian does, know the Bible to be the word of God, independently of the authority of any man, or of any church, in the world.

Men are the offspring of God, and his workmanship; and he has endowed them with certain faculties, by which they are enabled to perceive his work where it appears before their eyes, or is presented to their minds. I grant that by sin these faculties have become extremely depraved; insomuch, that it is doubtful whether they would be able, without revelation, to discover, from the works of creation, that there is a God. It is true, indeed, that most, if not all the savage tribes that have yet been discovered, have some rude notions of a Supreme Being who made all things; but no man can say how much this is the effect of traditionary communication, handed down from age to age. This tradition may have sprung originally from a divine revelation, the light of which was not suffered to be entirely extinguished among the heathen: and where it existed in the faintest degree, men would acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being, and regard the works of creation as a proof of it, though they should not have been able by means of them to make the original discovery.

Be this as it may, I consider myself entitled to take advantage of the enlightened state of society with which it is my happiness to be connected, and within the sphere of which this controversy is carried on. No man can apply his mind to the study of astronomy, or any branch of natural science taught in our schools, without perceiving abundant demonstration of the existence of a Supreme Intelligence—a Being of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power; insomuch, that it is reasonably doubted whether there be such a creature as a speculative atheist in the kingdom. Now, I do not hesitate to affirm, that if any man will apply himself as honestly and sincerely to the study of the Scriptures, as scientific men apply themselves to the study of science, he will find the Bible demonstrate itself to be the word of God, as clearly as the solar system demonstrates itself to be the work of God. By honesty and sincerity in this connection, I mean, that persons applying themselves to the study of the Bible be no more indisposed to the knowledge which the Bible teaches, than they are to that which astronomy teaches:—in other words, that they be ready to give as cordial a reception to the truth in the one case as in the other.

I am aware that such an honest, sincere, favourable disposition of mind towards what the Bible teaches, does not universally, or even generally, exist with men who are favourably enough disposed towards what natural science teaches. Creation presents the Divine Being in certain characters or attributes; the Bible presents him under the very same characters, with the addition of certain others, which do not appear from the works of creation. Now, when the human mind comes into contact with those attributes which are exhibited in the Bible only, it feels such an opposition to its own state and character as to be hurt and offended; and, in thousands of instances, repelled from the study of a subject so disagreeable. It will be understood that I am speaking of the human mind as a *carnal mind*. How it became such is not the present question. I stop not here to show that it is so naturally. I claim only to have it admitted, which I think none will deny, that men in general are *practically* carnal; that is, they are sinners: and having this conceded, I plead the fact of a certain innate revolting of the human mind against those traits of the divine character which are discovered only in the Bible, as a proof that the Bible has proceeded from a pure and holy Being; from a Being whose character is the reverse of what we see to be the character of carnal men; that is, from God himself: and thus we come to know that the Bible is the word of God, from the circumstance of its being the very thing which, above all others, provokes the enmity of the carnal mind.

I grant that this is not an argument calculated to impress the mind of an untutored savage; and perhaps it may have little weight with our almost equally untutored Papists. But I consider myself as addressing wise men, who are able to judge of what I say. Suppose, then, I am in possession of a cabinet of the most curious workmanship; that I alone, as I suppose, am in possession of the key; that the wards of the lock are so complicated, that I can defy the world to open it; and that, in fact, it is found impossible to gain access to it without the real key:—I have not said or supposed from whom I received this cabinet, but merely supposed it in my possession. Suppose then, farther, that a stranger comes to me, with a key in his hand that opens it at once; and that he tells me that he received the key from the very person who made the cabinet and constructed the lock, I feel myself constrained to believe the testimony of this stranger; his report brings with it such evidence that no reasonable man can refuse to yield to it.

Now, without pursuing the figure farther, I affirm that this cabinet is my own heart. I defy the whole world to have access to it, or to know what is in it; but when I read the Bible, I find it tells me what is in my heart. I know then, that He who made the cabinet made also the key: in other words, that the author of my being is the author of the Bible. The woman whom Christ met at the well in Samaria, argued upon the most philosophical and rational principles, when she said, "Come, see a man who told me all things that ever I did; is not this the Christ?" She had been reminded of certain events in her own history, which she believed no living creature knew; hence, she was constrained to acknowledge the divine inspiration of the person who had honoured her with an interview. Upon the same principle, any man who will carefully apply his mind to the reading of the Scriptures, will find them a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. They will tell him what is in his heart, and thus prove themselves to be the word of God. If Mr Andrews shall say, that this is nothing to him; that it does not convince him that the Bible is the word of God; I have only to reply, that his conviction is not the work which I undertook. The question was not how *he* might know, but how *I* know, the Bible to be the word of God. I have here told him a part, and I shall tell him more before I have done: and if he does not shut his eyes against the truth, he may know it as well as I.

Independently of the saving knowledge of the truth of divine revelation, which is the effect of a divine influence on the heart, and which can be produced by nothing short of this influence,—there are certain rational considerations which may, and ought to produce a rational conviction of the truth. On this subject, I gladly avail myself of a passage in the introduction to a pamphlet just published, by Thomas Erskine, Esq. Advocate, entitled, "Remarks on the Internal Evidence of the Truth of Revealed Religion." I have never met with any work that comprises, in so small a compass, so complete an answer to the question which I am attempting to answer; namely, How we know the Bible to be the word of God. If any of my readers shall be induced, from this short recommendation, to procure and read the work, I am persuaded they will thank me for it. * As a specimen of his mode of illustration, and as bearing directly upon the point in hand, I quote the following:

"When we are once convinced of the existence of a cause, and are acquainted with its ordinary mode of operation, we are prepared to give a certain degree of credit to a history of other effects attributed to it, provided we can trace the connection between them. As an illustration of this, I shall suppose, that the steam-engine, and the application of it to the movement of vessels, was known in China in the days of Archimedes; and that a foolish lying traveller had found his way from Sicily to China, and had there seen an exhibition of a steam-boat, and had been admitted to examine the mechanical apparatus of it,—and, upon his return home, had, among many palpable fables, related the true particulars of this exhibition; what feeling would this relation have probably excited in his audience? The fact itself was a strange one, and different in appearance from any thing with which they were acquainted. It was also associated with other stories that seemed to have falsehood stamped on the very face of them. What means, then, had the hearers of distinguishing the true from the false? Some of the rabble might probably give a stupid and wondering kind of credit to the whole; whilst the judicious but unscientific hearers would reject the whole. Now, supposing the relation had come to the ears of Archimedes, and that he had sent for the man, and interrogated him; and, from his unorderly and unscientific, but accurate specification of boilers, and cylinders, and pipes, and furnaces, and wheels, had drawn out the mechanical theory of the steam-boat, —he might have told his friends, 'The traveller may be a liar, but this is a truth. I have a stronger evidence for it than his testimony, or the testimony of any man. It is a truth in the nature of things. The effect which the man has described is the legitimate and certain result of the apparatus which he has described. If he has fabricated this account he must be a great philosopher. At all events, his narrative is founded on an unquestionable general truth.'" Pages 2, 3.

The application of this to the point in hand is extremely easy. Archimedes was a mathematician. He was acquainted with the operation, and could comprehend the result of certain mechanical powers. There were many things connected with mechanics which he did not know, for they were not discovered for ages after his time: but supposing them to have been discovered, and reported to him, he was in the knowledge of certain fundamental truths, which enabled him to decide, with infallible certainty, that certain causes put into operation, would produce certain effects; and supposing him to have received information of certain results which he had not thought of before, but demonstrably proceeding from established principles, he would believe the report, independently of the character of the medium through which it was conveyed to

* There is an excellent work by Dr Owen on the same subject, entitled, "The Reason of Faith in the Holy Scriptures;" of which an edition was published in Glasgow, in 1800. Like the other writings of that eminent divine—indeed, like most writings of his age—this work wants compression; but it will richly repay the labour of a patient reading.

him. If the reporter were an honest man, he might, if he pleased, throw the weight of this into the scale of evidence; but it would add nothing to the fulness of his conviction.

Now, there are fundamental principles in morals and religion, believed by those who understand them, as firmly as any mathematical truth whatever. They are not demonstrated to the eye by visible representations, but the impression of their truth upon the mind is as distinct as if they were. One of these principles is, that a pure and perfect system of legislation cannot proceed from an impure source. Suppose, then, a man as well acquainted with the law laid down in the Bible, and the whole procedure of the lawgiver therein related, as Archimedes was with the mechanical powers (and surely there are many men in the world of whom this may be predicated), such a man would most undoubtedly conclude and declare, that this is a system that could not emanate from the father of lies: that being a system of perfect purity and equity, it must have proceeded from the Father of Lights, whose word it professes to be. Suppose he is told that this book was concealed for many ages by the Church of Rome; that now she has allowed it to see the light, because she has been compelled to do so; that she says we must believe its authenticity upon her bare word, for we can have no higher authority for it; and that she has practised so many impositions upon the world, and told so many lies, that we ought to be cautious with regard to what she tells us, and look upon this book with some degree of jealousy;—suppose all these things to be objected against the Bible, the intelligent student of its contents would reply, I do not care a straw for what the Church of Rome may say either for or against this book; it proves itself to be of divine origin by its incomparable purity, sublimity, and harmony. It is, in short, the very thing that such a corrupt and impure body as the Church of Rome would wish to keep out of view, because it testified against her impurities: and the fact of her having concealed it until its publication was extorted from her, is an evidence that there is a divinity in it with which her carnality did not choose to come into visible contact.

After all, the knowledge of which I am speaking must be matter of individual consciousness. Every Christian must know experimentally that the Bible is the word of God, else he cannot enjoy the peace and comfort which it imparts to all who really know the truth. The sun in the heavens is known only by his own light; and He who made the sun is known only by his. The Holy Scriptures are that light by which alone God makes himself known as the Saviour of sinners; and by the illumination of his Spirit, he makes the light of his word as evident to the heart and conscience of them that believe, as the light of the sun is to them that see.

When a sinner becomes seriously concerned about his character, state, and prospects; and when, in such a state of mind, he reads the Bible he finds, at first, that it is all against him: by the holy law of God he is convicted and condemned; and he is conscious of a power and divinity in the word of condemnation, that makes him *feel* that it is the word of God. But the Holy Ghost, who has thus convinced him of sin, may be graciously pleased to convince him also of righteousness; that is, by the gospel show him the way of salvation, which is fully made known in the Scriptures. The sinner so convinced will recognize this to be the word of God, for he perceives in it that which answers the demands of the law, which condemned him. There is a power also in this word that proves itself to be divine. It removes the sentence of condemnation: and he who was before under a fearful apprehension of suffering the punishment of his sins, sees now all his sins taken away by the sufferings of the divine Saviour, as related in the Holy Scriptures.

From this there arises a peace and joy in believing, of which no unbeliever can have any conception. It is a matter of individual consciousness. A Christian, under the broadest possible view of his own guilt, and with the fullest conviction that God hates sin with a perfect hatred, is yet enabled, under the influence of the gospel, to enjoy perfect peace even in the prospect of death, judgment, and eternity, because he knows that Christ hath made peace by the blood of his cross. This he enjoys as his own peace; he has a personal individual interest in it. This is conveyed to his mind by the word of the gospel; and this he knows to be the word of God, from the effect which it produces in him, and has upon him in the whole tenor of his life and conversation.

That must be of God which is the instrument of making men like God; that is, which turns them from sin to holiness. Every sinner who has been so turned from his sins unto God, possesses a consciousness of the power of the word, which weighs more in his mind than a thousand arguments drawn from the external evidence of the truth of the Bible. His consciousness will not be held as sufficient evidence to others that the Bible is the word of God; but if he was formerly a notoriously wicked person, and if he is now a sober and holy man, devoting his time and talents to the good of his fellow-creatures and the glory of God; and if it is manifest that the change was produced by the Bible, every candid person who shall know the fact will be constrained to acknowledge, that truly the Bible is the word of God. I have put this case hypothetically, but there are many Christians alive whose history would demonstrate the fact that I

mean to establish; namely, that the Bible proves itself to be the word of God, by affording peace to the troubled conscience; by teaching and enabling men to forsake a life of sin, and to live a holy life, and to rest in the full assurance of a blessed immortality.

No. CXXXV.

SATURDAY, February 10th, 1821.

In my last Number but one, I gave a catalogue of what the "Catholic Vindicator" calls corruptions of the Bible by Protestant translators; which corruptions, however, do not appear to have been discovered by himself, as he gives them on the authority of Ward, who was just such a Catholic vindicator in the 17th century, as Andrews is in the 19th; with this difference, that the former seems to have had more learning than the latter. As a companion to this catalogue of Protestant corruptions, or mistranslations, I shall insert here some curious information relative to the Popish mode of ascertaining the true meaning of passages of Scripture which have been differently translated. For this, I am indebted to a reverend gentleman of the established church in the sister island, who refers to a book which I have not seen.

"I spoke," says he, "of the *Bellum Papale*, by Dr James, Bodleian librarian, a century back. If you can get the book, and his defence afterwards, they will give you much information on the state of the Scriptures after the Council of Trent. After the decree of that council, that the Vulgate edition was the only true, genuine, and canonical copy of the Scriptures, and that none other should be read or acknowledged by the faithful, Sixtus V. wished to publish an edition; but he found all the copies in such a state of corruption, that he declared them to be any thing but the Scriptures. He set at work with his learned men, cardinals, doctors, &c. &c.; revised and corrected every page, which was collated again and again, with all the most approved copies. He himself carefully examined every page before it was printed; and afterwards, when the book was printed, he went over it, and, where there was an error, amended it by pasting words over words, and sentences over sentences. He then published it with a bull, declaring it, after a long preamble of all the pains and labours of doctors, &c., the only true and genuine Scriptures; and denouncing with the greater excommunication, any person who should dare to change the smallest particle, *in minima particula*, not even to be absolved by the Pope. There was infallibility enough here to make light darkness, and darkness light; and this infallibility remained during Gregory's, Urban's, and Innocent's reigns, for near three years, (short reigns they were,) until Clement VIII. was raised to the chair: but he being a Pope himself, was not afraid to take the bull by the horns, and turn it over to the Index Expurgatorius, where it was quite harmless; for he boldly declared, in the face of the greater excommunication, that it was not *in minima particula* (*i. e.* small matters) in which Sixtus' Bible was erroneous, but in 2000 principal errors, and innumerable smaller ones, which he would not mention, lest it should produce too much scandal; he condemned it, and published the present Clementine edition. So much for the infallibility of the Popes; for the preservative care of the Scriptures by the church that is the pillar and ground of truth; and the purity of the only genuine copy of the word of God."

I shall finish my miscellaneous matter for the present, with the following letter from a correspondent in Ireland:—

TO THE PROTESTANT.

Sir,—Having lately read in your Paper, your just conclusions as to the effects which must follow the granting of promises of pardon and indulgences, by Popes and priests, to men, on the mere private acknowledgement of past crime, and a *promise* of future amendment, without any idea of that inward change of heart, producing heartfelt grief for, and real detestation of sin,—and those purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, inseparably connected with the Scripture promises of pardon, upon the footing of what Christ has done and suffered;—and, as facts are the best proofs of positions, I shall state, from my own knowledge, some of those effects which are the result of such pretended remittance of sins. Living some years ago in a small town in the south of Ireland, and being intimately acquainted with the parish priest, and with others, both priests and laity, of the Roman Catholic communion, I could not be unacquainted with many of their practices, and their system of worship. As some of your English readers are not acquainted with many circumstances relative to the system of Popery in Ireland, it being more *unfettered* here than in England, I shall first give you some account of those things they call Stations for Confessing, and conclude with other miscellaneous matter.

It was formerly the custom, at whatever house these stations were held, to require that a dinner be provided for the priest: and as the host would not set the priest down by himself, it was always the practice to invite fifteen or twenty of the neighbouring farmers, and their wives, who were expected to attend at confession, and who would ask them in return. I have frequently seen purchased for these occasions, meat, several gallons of whisky, &c.,

and always a bottle of wine for the *priest's own drinking*. This, you will say, was paying pretty well for the honour of his company: but this was not all; there was a tax of five shillings on the landlord for saying the mass, who was made to believe that a temporal and spiritual blessing would follow. Besides this, it was expected that each confessed person would pay something for absolution.—For causes best known to themselves, these dinner parties were, of late years, changed for breakfasts; which were more convenient for the priest, as he had to return home, when these stations were held in the country, perhaps some miles, and he might not so clearly see his way. Some simple people have said, that they were changed to do away those drunken revels which always followed these dinners; but this was not the case, as the following facts will show. I lived opposite to an industrious couple of the Romish religion, the man a cooper by trade, and his was one of those houses set down in the priest's book for a station (for the priests like to follow industry, hoping to partake more largely of those temporal blessings which may rationally be expected from it): I had, therefore, frequent opportunities of observing the effects of station confessions at this man's house. I have seen some of the company invited come out quite intoxicated; and on asking how they could get so beastly drunk, they stammered out that they were only at a station.

As the priest is seldom ready before twelve o'clock, these breakfasts usually commence about that time. The bill of fare is as follows: tea, a hot griddle-cake, butter, eggs, &c. &c., with *decanters of whisky*, placed on the breakfast-table: and as the Irish have a great affection for the *native*, as they call whisky, these decanters are frequently replenished, and the feast prolonged for the remainder of the day. It may be said that this is an unfair construction put upon the society of fifteen or twenty persons, invited to meet the priest at a station breakfast; that although some may outstep the limits of sobriety, the rest should not be charged with it; that these poor souls, for ought I knew, were, after pardon received from the priest, making pious resolutions of future amendment—laying down plans for moralizing their relatives and acquaintances—or devising how they may promote the moral and religious education of the rising generation, by the introduction of the Bible into schools, as the great and only fountain of divine revelation to man; showing him his lost estate both by nature and practice, and the necessity of coming to God for real pardon, peace, and holiness;—and that, at all events, surely their drinking bouts could not be fairly charged upon the priest. Whoever argues thus, does not know what Popery is. How sure its doctrines lead to licentiousness; how cruel and intolerant are its principles; and how much opposed to every effort to promote the moral and religious education of the poor children in its communion, I shall hereafter show: indeed, with them the proverb, that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion," is held as true, and more current, than any of the Proverbs of Solomon.

But to return to the subject of the stations —The writer was present at the settlement of an account with the spirit-dealer, for the whisky drank at but *one* breakfast station for confession at his opposite neighbour's house, where the whole company, men, women, and children, could not have exceeded twenty-four persons; when the bill, admitted to be correct and paid for, was seven half gallons of whisky, at 16*s.* per gallon; a liquor considerably stronger than either brandy or rum. It may be objected, that this was too particular a case to be taken for a general rule; and that the master of the house might be a very dissipated character himself, and have been too pressing with his guests. With regard to this man's general character, he passed among his neighbours for an industrious, sober man, in general: and as to his character with the priest, I assure you that both he and his wife were in several *holy orders*, as they are called in Ireland. So that taking this man's character, I am convinced that I take a standard much too high as an example of the good effects following confession stations; for were I to select those stations which are held at publicans' houses, it would far exceed what I have detailed.

It is the practice for the priest to publish from the altar, at certain periods of the year —I believe before Christmas and before Lent —that he will hold stations for confession at certain houses, then and there named. These houses are selected without previous liberty obtained from the owners, perhaps lest they may make objections, which many of them would most certainly do, if not thus publicly given out from the altar. The individuals thus selected make the necessary preparations (a general bill of the fare I have already presented to your readers): and as it has been a prevailing opinion from the time of the Jews, that the publicans (formerly tax-gatherers) were the greatest sinners, and consequently required most mending, I have observed that they are more frequently selected: nay, I have observed that those who have most business are particularly selected by the priest; it being reasonable to suppose, that the chief amongst the publicans must be chief amongst the sinners. As the liquor on these occasions is drawn from the cock, it is not so easy to calculate the expenditure; but as they ask their best customers, it would be natural to believe that the landlord is not backward in recommending his liquor, nor his guests in trying its strength, not having the usual reckon-

ing to pay, and having previously quit scores with the priest.—As it may be alleged that the priest does not countenance these practices, I shall mention a fact. A female, invited to one of these confessional coteries, mentioned to some others how very polite the priest was at breakfast to the woman, pressing the bashful ones to take *whisky in their tea.* "Faith," says her husband, "it was very easy to prevail on them to take it, and for him to offer what was not out of his own pocket." The wife replied, "You dare not tell him so at your next confession."

Thus you may see, Sir, how much the moral principle is degraded by such a system, and even by the priests; a system which holds out to its deluded followers a yearly, or half-yearly, acquittal for sin. Well may that truth applied by our Saviour to the Scribes and Pharisees, be applied to them: "Ye encompass sea and land to gain one proselyte; and when ye have gained him, ye make him twofold more a child of the devil."

That this system is equally opposed to every attempt to promote the moral and religious education of the poor children, I shall show by the following fact. A country gentleman of my acquaintance, of landed property, often deplored the wretched state of ignorance and wickedness in which his tenants' children were brought up; and more especially the profanation of the Lord's day, by every species of mischief, plundering orchards, breaking down young trees, gambling, dancing, drinking, &c. —conceived that some good might be done if these children could be brought into a Sunday school, and kept from idleness. Accordingly he sent and received from the Hibernian School Society, sets of Moral Lessons for Children; he provided a house with two rooms; one for boys, the other for girls; and at no inconsiderable expense, had every thing prepared for opening the school on the most *liberal* plan; and lest the *Bible* should give any offence, it was not to be introduced. Having thus prepared his plans, he desired his tenants to send their children there for two hours every Sunday morning, and the same in the evening. Sunday morning came, and about sixty of the finest open-faced children attended, all anxious to learn to read. Information of this soon reached the priest's ears. He immediately *cursed* from the altar every person who would presume to send a child to the school to be instructed by a heretic; and fearing this would not deter them, he declared he would not give the *rites of the church* to any person when dying, who would, after this injunction, attempt to send a child there. Thus was an establishment, calculated merely to convey moral instruction, with the knowledge of reading and spelling, broken up: and although the gentleman himself waited on the priest, and assured him there was not the least wish to proselyte a single child, requesting he would personally visit the school, and begging the co-operation of any of his flock who would attend,—the priest was inexorable, and told him, he could not consent that Protestants should interfere with the education of his people. I could adduce many more instances of the uncongenial nature of Popery, to every thing connected with the improvement of the degraded condition of the poor in that community, in this kingdom. They act on right views of the subject, no doubt; because it is impossible that the Roman Catholics, as a body, could be so *priest-ridden,* if the scale of moral and intellectual improvement were advanced. Masses are so common in Ireland, that the price of them is very cheap, considering the advantages stated to be received from them. Now, a pious son of the church can get a *promise* from the priest of saying as many masses for the souls of his dear relatives in purgatory, as will bring them clear and clean out, at half-a-crown each mass: for it is laid down as an invariable rule, that to make a mass efficacious, it must be paid for. Indeed, the priests are willing to say masses over the *brute* creation; as in cases of murrain among cattle, the rot among sheep, and the measles, &c. among pigs. I dare say you will hardly credit this; but I assure you, I knew of masses being said over a *parcel of pigs* who had got some distemper!

Having alluded to the orders instituted amongst the Romish laity, I shall endeavour to give you some idea of them. From amongst the most devoted to the priest, and of those most frequent at masses, stations, &c., the priest selects a certain number of both sexes, who, on payment of certain fees, and the performance of certain ceremonies, are decorated with the badges of the particular orders they are initiated into: such as the Order of the Virgin, (one of the highest, if not the highest,) the Order of St Bridget, of St Francis, St Benedict, &c. &c. These badges, or amulets, are worn inside, out of public view; and as they are first consecrated by the priest or bishop, the favourite devotee thinks him or herself placed under the immediate protection of that saint as a titular deity. These fraternities make a collection among themselves for particular masses, on these saints' days. I saw one of the rituals of one of these orders, which stated, "That as nothing in heaven or in earth was so meritorious in the sight of God as the celebration of the mass, in each of which the sacrifice of Christ is as truly and really performed as when he died on Calvary; and as the frequent repetition of the same was recommended and enjoined to all the faithful, it seemed good to the bishop to create and appoint a certain confraternity of holy brothers and sisters, in such a place, under the patronage of such a saint," &c. &c.: next followed

the rules. These fraternities are not confined at all, or prevented from carrying on their trades and several callings. But although the above is stated to be the ostensible cause for forming these fraternities, yet there are private rules and instructions given to them, by which they are bound to be under the immediate direction, and in strict obedience to the priest; to inform him of every thing done in his parish, which affects himself or the Roman Catholic cause; and, in general, to be the *tale-bearers* of the parish. They thus act as so many emissaries or spies, and are a great restraint on the people. Woe betide the person who dare speak disrespectfully of the priest, even if he should deserve it; or who attempts to read the Bible, or to eat meat on a fish day (but he may get drunk as often as he pleases, without any reprimand). The account is brought in triumph by one of these his emissaries, and the party accused immediately cited, and condemned to pay a fine, and undergo a heavy penance; which if he should refuse, he is threatened with *excommunication*, and the thunders of the church. I never knew an instance of resistance to such penance by the poorer sort, although I have amongst some few of the rich and more independent: and I have observed, that, in the latter cases, the priest did not follow up his threat.

But this is not all the service required from these confraternities. They are required to offer themselves to attend the sick Protestants, and the poorer classes particularly. If their services be received, they are directed to try every persuasive: first, by seeming compassion for their souls; and, if that is not strong enough, then by promises of *temporal* assistance; next, by endeavours to frighten them by frightful tales of apparitions, visions, &c. &c., of the damned spirits of Protestants, or the revelations of saints, particularly the Virgin. In the meanwhile, the priest's housekeeper is seen frequently calling to know how the patient is, and bringing tea, whey, &c.; although, if the patient prove finally obstinate in refusing the priest's assistance, he may starve for him. The consequence is, as you may suppose, that, in many cases, they thus succeed, and then trumpet their success through the different parishes. Many other causes contribute to their success; sometimes the want of a resident clergyman of the Church of England; and the natural bias of the unregenerate mind to lean to Popery, on the opinion that good works, with a little assistance, will help them into heaven. The Papist even dares to tell them, that though men may live Protestants, they wish to die Papists. Thus, they sometimes prevail by assiduity, affected kindness, and constant application, with the poor dying patient, who often does not know the principles of the new religion he is introduced into, and when his strength, and often his faculties, are exhausted. I shall now give you one example out of many. A poor Protestant, in the above town, was dying; his daughter having previously married a Papist, and turned to mass, exhorted, and pressed, and entreated him to have the priest sent for, but all to no purpose. His Bible was then taken from him, as that was supposed a hinderance. Next, his own daughter took the bed her poor dying father was lying on from under him, saying to him, that straw was good enough for a heretic to die on. Every attempt was made by some of the fraternity, brought in by the daughter, to cajole or frighten him into a compliance, but all to no purpose. He begged a Protestant neighbour, who accidentally called to see him, to whom he related the above, (and who informed the writer,) to sit by him; the poor man saying, that he did not know what they might do to him before he died. This man sat beside him until he became speechless, and was in the agonies of death. He could bear the scene no longer. You may reasonably conclude he would now be allowed to die in peace; the Protestant neighbour at least thought so, and left him; but no! Papists are not so easily foiled. A messenger was now sent to the priest, who was waiting up at night to be called, to say that now the coast was clear. He comes and speaks to the man in the agonies of death, and asks him if he will die a good Catholic? No answer. He baptizes and anoints the man in this state; and, taking him by the hand, desires him to give a proof of his dying in the Catholic faith; and he calls out, O how he squeezes my hand! The fraternity publish this *conversion*, as they call it, with many things connected with it, which had no foundation in fact.

I said the religion of Papists was intolerant and cruel. The above specimen will confirm this sentiment: and this is only one instance out of many of the practices which Papists are convicted of. It was of no consequence what may be the feelings of the dying man under the above operation, or *whether he had any feeling at all:* dead men cannot tell tales; and therefore they may invent as many stories of conversion of Protestants as they please.

J. A.

The above presents Popery in a truly fiend-like character. Under the influence of this delusion, filial affection, and every other amiable affection of human nature, is set at defiance. No matter what the living or the dying may suffer, in body or in mind, if the cause of holy church be promoted, and if the priests can persuade people to believe their lie. A man who submits to have the consecrated oil applied to parts of his body by the hand of a priest, or whether he submit to it or not, if it be but applied, as in the above instance, is understood to die in the true faith, and the devil can have no power over him; whereas, with-

cut such anointing, he would be in danger,—nay, would certainly be lost. This will form the subject of the next, and some following Numbers.

No. CXXXVI.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH, 1821.

AT the beginning of my last Number, I gave an extract of a letter which I had received from a clergyman of the established church, in Ireland, relating to the miserably corrupted state of that edition of the Holy Scriptures, which the Council of Trent declared to be the only authentic and true version. The following is another extract from the same letter, which will serve to introduce the next general head of discussion.

"But the ceremony of anointing," says my correspondent, "has done more mischief here than any other tenet, if I may except the claim of Peter, and of one church; for the epistle of James seems to make it so completely an ordinance of the church, that when it is read, and the words (chap. v. 14, 15,) put strongly to the consciences of dying Protestants, it has caused multitudes of them to send for a priest, fearing to die without the *benefit* of it. Were it to end here, it would not be a matter of much consequence, as an unbeliever may as well be deceived by that, as by the partaking of bread and wine, which is the *viaticum* of all the Protestants, who know not the truth as it is in Jesus. But the system among them is, when an ignorant dying Protestant is worked on by a Popish friend, and they are ever on the watch for such, and that a priest is sent for, if he finds the person under any alarm, and the conscience weak, after he has spoken for some time, he says, that he will not absolve, or administer the holy oil, unless not only the dying person is baptized into the church, but also the whole family; and this, too, often succeeds, and is the principal cause of the sad relapse to Popery, which has been so great within thirty years back, that more than two-thirds of the lower orders of the southern Protestants have gone over to the Church of Rome." This short and interesting statement, by a native Irishman, and a minister of the established church, who knows his country well, and has travelled over a great part of it, might lead to many serious reflections; but I have used it only as an introduction to the subject of Extreme Unction, which the Church of Rome puts in the list of her sacraments; and by means of which, along with her other impositions, she deceives so many souls to their destruction.

I shall, as usual, lay down the doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting this sacrament, in the very express words of her own approved authors, including the canon of the council of Trent.

Quest. "What," says Bishop Hay, is the end and design of the sacrament of extreme unction? *Ans.* The Council of Trent declares it in these words: 'Our most merciful Redeemer, who desired that his servants should at all times be provided with wholesome remedies against all the darts of their enemies, as in the other sacraments he gave Christians the greatest helps, to enable them to pass their lives in a Christian manner, and free from any grievous spiritual detriment, so he hath fortified the latter end of our life with the most powerful protection of the sacrament of extreme unction. For, though our adversary seeks, and seizes, during our whole life, every possible occasion of ruining our souls, yet there is no time wherein he more vehemently exerts all his strength and art to ruin us entirely, and destroy, if possible, our confidence in the mercy of God, than when he sees the last moment of life approaching.' *Sess. XIV. in doct. de Extr. Unct.* By this we see, that the intention of our blessed Saviour, in instituting this sacrament, is to be the means of fortifying our souls against all the violent attacks and snares of our spiritual enemies at our last moments, and to enable us to make a holy death, and secure a happy eternity.

"*Quest.* Does the devil attack souls with more violence than ordinary in their last moments? *Ans.* He certainly does so, as this general council declares, and as experience itself assures us." [The grave bishop does not say how *he* knew this by *experience*.] "For though, at all times, he goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, 1 Pet. v. 8, yet he redoubles all his force, and all his art, when we come to our last moments, knowing that if he can gain us then, we will be his for ever; but if he lose us then, he loses us for ever; according to that of the Revelation, when St John heard a loud voice, saying, 'Wo to the earth and to the sea, because the devil is come down to you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time,' Rev. xii. 12. When the soul is in her last agony, hovering betwixt time and eternity, and on the point of leaving the body, the devil then knows there is but a short time to stay, and therefore he redoubles all his assaults against her; for, as another scripture says, 'There are spirits that are created for vengeance, and in the time of destruction they will pour out their force,' Ecclus. xxxix. 33; like a king, who, being at war with his enemies, when he comes to a decisive battle on the event of which his crown depends, calls out all his army on that day, and exerts the utmost of his power in order to insure the victory. Now, when the poor soul comes to this last and dreadful battle, what can she do?—if left to herself, she will surely per-

ish. This our blessed Saviour well knowing, was pleased, out of his infinite goodness, to institute the holy sacrament of extreme unction; by which he purifies the soul, still more and more, from all the remains of sin that may be in her, and which would give the devil more power and advantage over her; and he also raises her up above her own strength, endowing her with power from on high, to enable her to fight manfully against all the assaults of Satan, and come off with the victory.

"*Quest.* Is extreme unction, then, a true and real sacrament of the new law? *Ans.* It is, and has all the three things necessary for that purpose.

"*Quest.* 4. What is the outward visible sign used in extreme unction? *Ans.* It is the anointing the different organs of our senses with holy oil, blessed in a particular manner by the bishop for this purpose, accompanied by prayer.

"*Quest.* 5. What is the inward grace this brings to the soul? *Ans.* Both the sanctifying grace of God, by which any stain of sin that may be in the soul is washed away, and forgiven; and also the actual grace of God, by which the soul is fortified and strengthened to resist all the assaults of Satan in her last moments. It also sometimes brings health to the body, when Almighty God sees that to be expedient for the good of the soul.

"*Quest.* 6. How is this outward action a sign of inward grace? *Ans.* The oil with which the sick person is anointed represents the grace of God, which is poured down into the soul; and the prayer used at time of anointing, expresses the remission of sins thereby granted to the sick person; for the prayer is this, 'By this holy unction, and his own most pious mercy, may the Almighty God forgive you whatever sins thou hast committed *by the sight*,' when the eyes are anointed; '*by the hearing*,' when the ears are anointed, and so of the other senses.

"*Quest.* 7. Where is the sacrament laid down in the Holy Scriptures? *Ans.* It is explained at large, in all its parts, and commanded to be used by the holy apostle St James, in these clear and express terms: 'Is any one sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.' See here the outward action of the sacrament, *anointing with oil, accompanied with prayer;* the inward grace immediately follows, 'and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and, if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him,' James v. 14. 'Our Lord shall raise him up' above his own strength, fortifying his soul with his assisting grace; and, 'if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him,' by the sanctifying grace of God, which will wash and purify his soul from all the stains of sin that may remain in it, so that he may appear with joy before his Lord." *Sincere Christian Instructed*, Vol. II. Chap. xxv.

The next question and answer relate to the effects of this sacrament; and then we have a repetition of the same things over and over again, under about half a dozen more questions and answers, in which the principal thing to be noted is, that this sacrament is to be administered by the priests of the church, and that this is a branch of the priestly office.

After reading the above exposition of the Romish doctrine, one of the first reflections which will occur to the intelligent reader, will be, what a strange idea must papists have of the state of a dying Christian! The bishop may be allowed to speak mere harmless nonsense, when he adduces his own *living experience* to show what is the state of *dying* persons, and what are their peculiar sufferings and temptations; but when he represents a dying Christian as assailed by all the power and craft of the devil; when he, at the same time, represents the soul of such a one under a *female* character, enabled by power from on high to fight *manfully* against all the assaults of Satan; and when it is made to appear that this power is imparted by means of the application of oil, blessed by a bishop, to the eyes, ears, nose, &c. of the dying person, the thing assumes too much of the ludicrous to admit of its being regarded as a divine ordinance, or even of having its absurdity seriously exposed.

A blind man will not talk long about colours, or a deaf man about music, until he make it appear that he knows little or nothing of what he is talking about. This remark will be found to apply to what Bishop Hay has written, —nay, to what the Council of Trent has decreed about the state and condition of a dying Christian. I do not profess, like Bishop Hay, to speak from experience on this subject; but I know from the Holy Scriptures, that Christ does not leave his people, in their last moments, to fight with the devil in their own strength, or in the strength of consecrated oil, applied to different parts of their bodies by a mere creature like themselves. Those who believe in Christ—that is, those who are really Christians—are kept by the mighty power of God, through faith unto salvation. Their whole Christian life is a state of warfare against sin, and Satan, and the present evil world; and although the contest does not finally terminate till death, there is no scriptural reason to conclude that it is necessarily, or even usually, most severe at the approach of death. It will not be denied that many Christians have been filled with dismay when they contemplated the near approach of the last enemy; but it is certain that others have waited his approach with the utmost composure, and even with a degree of triumph which appeared strange to persons in good health. In the degree of peace and

comfort which Christ is pleased to impart to his people in the hour of death, he dispenses to every one according to his own good pleasure; but one thing is certain, they shall all be conquerors, and more than conquerors, through him that hath loved them; and they shall be able to say, "Though I walk through the valley and shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me, and thy rod and staff they comfort me."

When a Christian comes to die, he is not entering upon a scene entirely new to him. From the hour of his first believing, he became dead to the world, and the things of the world. It became part of his daily exercise to realize, by familiar contemplation, his transition from this world to the next; and his every-day reflections, so far as he is enabled to live up to his new character and state, are reflections suitable to the last day and hour of his life. Committing the keeping of his soul to his Creator in well-doing, every day, he fears not that he will be left alone to fight with his enemy the devil, when he comes to his last day; and when that day does arrive, he feels not the want of any new operation or process to pass upon either his soul or his body, to prepare him for death. He stands complete in his Saviour's righteousness; and knowing in whom he has believed, he commits his soul to him, in the sure and certain hope of being found with him in peace when he shall appear to judge the world in righteousness.

But the Popish doctrine represents a dying Christian in a state quite new, and as unprovided for, as if it had been unexpected. The Council of Trent speaks of the powerful protection of the sacrament of extreme unction as necessary to fortify the latter end of our life; and it is to be used only when that period is understood to have arrived. Christ appointed no means of fortifying the soul at the end of life, but such as a Christian ought to make use of every day of his life, because he requires his people to consider every day as if it were their last: but the Church of Rome has a sacrament intended for the dying only, and which she applies for the salvation of persons, many of whom never thought of salvation before; who were living in sin, and who hope to be saved from its punishment by the virtue of this sacrament, which, like all the rest, is sold to them for money. In this article alone, though there was nothing else against her, the Church of Rome appears in a character so diabolical, as to point her out as the very Antichrist; the blasphemer of God, and the destroyer of the souls of men.

Christ gives his people the most ample assurance of his presence and protection in the most critical circumstances, which, no doubt, include those incident to our last moments. "Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I *am* thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burnt; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee;" Isa. xli. 10, and xliii. 2. Thus he assures his people, that, in every trying hour, he will be with them, so that no plague shall befal them, or evil come near them. Christ took our nature, that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage; Heb. ii 14, 15. The Christian believing this, can say, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ;" 1 Cor. xv. 56—58. Such are the views of death which a Christian learns to entertain according to the word of God; and every example which the Bible furnishes of the last hours of holy men, corresponds with this representation. But the Church of Rome represents the last hours of her Christians as invariably, if not necessarily, a period of the most dreadful alarm, and of the most severe conflict with the devil. When his strength is gone, and when just a-dying, the Papist has to encounter all the power and craft of the devil, raised to their highest degree of excitement; he must, in short, enter the lists with Satan, as if he were his equal in strength; and he is not taught to seek assistance from any higher power than a fellow-creature, with a phial of consecrated oil, which he believes to be sufficient to frighten the devil away from him. Every child who understands the terms must see, that the religion which teaches this is not Christianity, but a mere, and a very absurd, modification of heathenism.

According to the Popish doctrine, as laid down by Bishop Hay, when a Christian comes to die, it is still doubtful whether the devil shall have him or not. Whether he shall go to heaven or hell, must depend upon his being able to "fight manfully" against the devil, and that, too, when he is in the agonies of death; and this ability to fight manfully is made to depend upon his being previously anointed with the holy oil; this depends upon the intention of the Bishop who consecrated the oil, and of the priest who applies it; and having gone round this circle, we arrive at the point to which every popish ceremony tends, namely, that the salvation of a Papist depends entirely on his priest. All that Christ did and suffered for the salvation of sinners, goes for nothing with a Papist, unless his priest be allowed to have the honour of making it available. Thus, extreme unction is not a vain ceremony, or a mere absurdity, which, when it has excited a

sufficient degree of ridicule, may be left to the peaceable enjoyment of those who are in love with it. It is in itself a real Antichrist. It occupies the place of Christ in the ministrations of Popish priests, and in the thoughts of dying Papists. Christ himself is the only ground of hope in the hour of death. He is as accessible at the last minute of the eleventh hour, as he is in the first hour; and it is the duty of every Christian who may be called to attend the dying-bed of a sinner, to tell him of Christ as the almighty and the only Saviour, who is able to save unto the uttermost all that come to God by him: and this truth brought to his ears, *may* be so imprest upon his heart by the Holy Spirit, as to effect his conversion. I do not say it *shall* be so; for, in general men are left to die as they have lived; but I say, it *may* be so, because Christ has not instructed his servants to prescribe limits to the exercise of his mercy towards sinners in the present life. But the Popish doctrine of extreme unction leaves Christ quite out of the view of a dying sinner; and the priest, and the anointing, are put in his place. Accordingly when a Papist is supposed to be dying, his great, his only concern, is to have the priest, with his holy oil; and to have this applied to all the members of his body, by means of which he may have committed sin; and to the organs of sight and hearing, by which sin may have found its way into the heart. Here Christ is not thought of at all. The priest and the oil are the saviour in which he confides. He ventures his eternity upon a deception; goes down to the grave with a lie in his right hand; and, while he perishes, the guilt of his murder lies at the door of the church that deceived and ruined him.

Bishop Hay has ventured to quote one passage from the Bible, and another from the Apocrypha, to support his view of the state of the souls of Christians in their last moments. The former is Rev. xii. 12: "Wo to the earth, and to the sea; because the devil is come down to you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time." It did not suit the bishop's purpose to give the true meaning of the passage, and to show what the earth and the sea have to do with the state of an individual Christian at the hour of his death; and, in general, it will be found, that when a Papist has recourse to the Bible, it is for the purpose of misapplying and abusing it. The words seem to refer to the great wrath of Satan, when he perceived the progress of the gospel among the nations of the world, which, through the influence of the truth, were about to throw off his yoke: and, no doubt, his wrath will be more manifest than ever, when the nations shall throw off the yoke which he has long bound about their necks, by the instrumentality of the Church of Rome. "Wo to the earth and to the sea;" that is, the kingdoms of the world, more particularly of Europe, when this shall happen! for the devil will not likely quit the throne which he has occupied for many hundred years, without such a struggle as will shake all the kingdoms of the civilized world to their very foundations. The more I see or hear of the devil raging among the Papists; that is, the more falsehoods I hear them propagating against the government that tolerates and protects them; the more I hear them crying out, that they are objects of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people;—the more convinced I am, that the devil has begun to suspect that his reign is drawing to a termination; nay, I believe, he knows the fact; and in his great wrath, he will, no doubt, muster all his forces for the contest. He will have all the Papists, and an innumerable host of infidels, and merely nominal Christians, on his side. These have all along been opposed to the spiritual kingdom of Christ in the world; some of them have been more, others less conspicuous, in the ranks of opposition: but if it be so, as I suppose it is, that the reign of Antichrist—that is, the reign of the devil upon the earth—is now to be of short duration, the adversary will muster all his hosts for the battle; then, "wo to the inhabitants of the earth, and of the sea!" for then shall be days of tribulation such as the nations of Europe have never yet experienced.

Real Christians would be apt to despond with such a prospect before them, and to fear that the church of Christ would perish in the conflict: and indeed she would, if HE were not in the midst of her, and if his almighty power were not pledged for her preservation; but God is the refuge and the strength of his people. He will preserve them. He will disperse his enemies like chaff before the wind. He will consume the Man of sin with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of his coming. He will establish his reign over the whole earth, and make his church an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations.

I have been led into this short digression, by Bishop Hay's absurd misapplication of a prophetic passage of the Revelation. In my next Number, I shall resume the subject of extreme unction.

As for the bishop's quotation from the Apocrypha, "There are spirits that are created for vengeance," &c., I do not profess to understand its meaning, or to know whether it has any meaning at all. I rather suspect that it has none: but whether it be so or not is of no importance, seeing the writer of the book called Ecclesiasticus, is no higher authority than Bishop Hay himself.

No. CXXXVII.

SATURDAY, February 24th, 1821.

In my last Number, it was laid down upon the authority of the Council of Trent, as adduced and expounded by Bishop Hay, that a Christian in his last moments is, more than at any other period of his life, exposed to the rage of the devil. It is the *Romish* Christian of whom the council and the bishop are speaking; and I more than suspect, that the worst thing the devil can do to such persons, in the hour of death, is to let them alone, and leave them to the priests, who will do his work more effectually than he could do by appearing in his own person. If it were true that the devil really made an assault upon dying persons; that he reminded them of their sins, and filled their minds with alarming apprehensions of the coming judgment; some of them might be led to think of the gospel which they had heard or read, and might even flee for refuge to the hope which it sets before them, and so they would be saved from the wrath to come. But the worst possible state of a dying sinner is to be without alarm; to think that he is at peace with God, when he is an enemy of God. There is delusion enough in the heart of every unregenerate man to think this of himself, if there have been nothing particularly atrocious in his conduct; as if it were not so, the Church of Rome steps forward with a pretended sacrament, called extreme unction, by which she professes to give peace to the conscience of the dying sinner, and thus, as I have said, she does the devil's work most effectually,—so that he has no occasion to come down with great wrath, as Bishop Hay would have us believe, as if it were to torment his subjects before the time, or engage in a personal contest with them. It was the curse of the false prophets of old, that they healed the hurt of the Lord's people slightly; that is, they applied as a medicine what could not cure their wound, but gave only a momentary relief. The Romish priests are in the same condemnation, under circumstances of more heinous wickedness; for their pretended sacrament diverts the mind of a dying sinner from the only efficacious remedy; and after teaching him to trust in a lie, they sell him, for money, perhaps an hour of peace, to be followed by an eternity of unspeakable misery.

It is time now to enter upon a serious examination of the arguments by which the Church of Rome maintains her dogma about extreme unction. It must be allowed, that there is something in the sound of the words of the apostle James that seems to give countenance to the Popish practice; and hence it is, that, as a correspondent says in my last Number, ill-taught Protestants are easily imposed upon, and persuaded to submit, in their dying hours, to have themselves anointed, under a sort of half persuasion that the thing can do no harm, and *may* do them good. But we ought to remember, that it is not the sound of certain words, taken out of their connection, by which we are to understand what the Holy Spirit says in the Scriptures. It is the meaning of the words, taking in the whole of what is said upon any particular subject, by which our faith and practice are to be regulated. The words, James v. 14, 15, are, in our translation, "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let him pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Here we certainly have "sickness," and "sending for the elders," (or priest as the Douay version has it). Here we have "praying over the sick person," and "anointing him with oil," and "saving him," and "raising him up," and "having his sins forgiven." Taking these expressions in this detached manner, the Church of Rome would seem to have more foundation for this sacrament, than for almost any other of her impositions: and yet, the arguments deduced from them have no more weight than that of a bacchanalian, who should plead for the lawfulness of getting drunk, from certain words in the prophecy of Jeremiah; "Drink ye, and be drunken; and fall, and rise no more." Chap. xxv. 27. *

Anointing with oil was a ceremony in common use among the Jews. It was divinely appointed to be applied to persons who were set apart for certain offices; and the application of it was often, if not usually, followed by a miraculous change in the character and conduct of those to whom it was applied. It was after being anointed with oil by Samuel, that Saul manifested those new traits of character that gave rise to the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" It was after Jehu had received a similar anointing, that he displayed his zeal for the Lord of hosts; though it does not appear that either his zeal, or Saul's prophesying, was really sanctified to the service of God in a spiritual manner. The sign, however, was a common one, by which a divine and miraculous influence upon the body, or the soul, or both, was pointed out. This appeared by what the apostles did, when Christ first sent them out to preach the gospel. He gave them power, on that occasion, over unclean spirits, to cast them out. He gave them power also

* These words are really in the Bible, and certainly they have a strange sound when detached from the context; but if any person will read the whole passage, he will see that the words have no relation to persons getting drunk, but to certain national judgments, by means of which, people should be so overwhelmed and stupified as to resemble the state of drunken men.

to heal the sick. This was certainly a miraculous power; and we are assured, by the divine record, that it was connected with the anointing with oil. "They cast out many devils, and *anointed with oil* many that were sick, and healed them." Mark vi. 13. It does not appear very clearly to us, what connection there was between the anointing and the healing, but it was enough for the time then being, if it had a signification calculated to make an impression upon the minds of the Jews, or to illustrate any part of their ritual.

The power of casting out devils, and healing the sick, and even raising the dead, was continued to the apostles after Christ had gone to heaven; and there were others admitted to a participation of some, at least, of these powers. The apostles had not only received the heavenly unction themselves, but they had also the power of imparting the Holy Ghost to those on whom they laid their hands for that purpose. Persons thus endowed would become, by the choice of their brethren, elders of churches, just as those who were first chosen to the deacons' office are declared to have been men full of faith and of the Holy Ghost.

James addressed his epistle to Christians who were Jews by birth. It was inscribed to the twelve tribes which were scattered abroad: and he informs them that the divine influence with which persons of their nation had been favoured from the beginning, was still continued in the persons of men who were their overseers in the Lord, who were endowed with certain miraculous powers; and that the exercise of these powers was accompanied by the ancient sign, that of anointing with oil. However unimportant this ceremony may appear to us, it would have great significance in the mind of a Jew, as reminding him of many important events in the history of his nation, and of the most distinguished persons who had belonged to it, and especially as reminding him of the grand promise, which had been the hope of his fathers, of the coming of Him who is called the Messiah, or the Anointed One.

The apostle James, addressing Christians and churches whose elders, overseers, or bishops, (for it makes no difference which word we use,) were the first fruits of the preaching of the apostles among their brethren according to the flesh, and who had received the extraordinary gift, or power, of working miracles,—exhorts his brethren to take the benefit of this extraordinary power while it was continued among them; just as he would have advised any Jew, in the time of Christ's personal ministry, if in sickness, to apply for healing to the Master, if he had access to him; or to the disciples, if he had not: for they, in their Master's name, "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them."

The *saving* of the sick, in the words of the apostle James, evidently means the *healing* of them, or the removing of their disease, whatever it might be; for it is immediately added, "The Lord shall raise him up," that is, from his sickness. Here, then, it appears, that the thing prescribed by the apostle was essentially different from the Popish sacrament of extreme unction. This is never administered but to persons supposed to be at the point of death. It is not intended for healing them, or raising them up to health, but to enable them to go down to the grave fighting manfully with the devil.

If there were powers and privileges belonging to the primitive churches, while under the oversight of men endowed with miraculous gifts, I am inclined to think there were also diseases connected with that state, which were inflicted as a visible testimony of divine displeasure against certain transgressors. The church in Corinth had sinned grievously in their abuse of the Lord's supper; and, "*for this cause,*" says Paul, "many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." 1 Cor. xi. 30. These words, I think, throw some light on those of James. He speaks of sickness, in connection with having committed sins; and of healing, in connection with having sins forgiven. Now, we know, that when Christ cured men's bodies, he usually pardoned their sins too; and the words of the apostle James establish the same connection; which seems clearly to intimate, that the anointing and the healing, where the former was practised and the latter effected, were a fulfilment of what Christ promised to his apostles when he was about to leave them. Mark xvi. 17, 18, "These signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues: they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; *they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.*" Here Christ does not say to his apostles, *you* shall do so and so, as if they were to have exclusively, the privileges mentioned. He speaks of them that should believe their testimony; *they* shall cast out devils; *they* shall speak with new tongues; *they* shall take up serpents; *they* shall not be hurt by any deadly thing that they may drink; *they* shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. All these things belonged to the state of the church, while under the oversight of men miraculously endowed; and such were the elders of whom James speaks, in the passage on which the Church of Rome builds her sacrament of extreme unction. If I shall be asked to show why the priests of the church have not now the same powers, I shall, in reply, ask them to show me if they can cast out devils, and handle serpents, and drink poison without being hurt by it, and heal the sick by laying their hands on them. If they can do these things, then

they may practise the sign of anointing, with which they were connected; if they cannot perform the things, they had better let the sign alone.

Here the trickery of the priests appears in a very striking light. They know that the cure of men's bodies is a thing that men can judge of. This, therefore, they do not pretend to do by their sacrament, though it is the very thing to which the anointing of the apostle James refers; but no man can see whether or not their anointing produces any effect upon the soul; this, therefore, is that which they say is done. It takes away the stain of sin from the soul, and fortifies it with divine grace; which cannot be an object of sense, therefore the priests are secure from detection. If it should at any time procure bodily health, it is only by accident: and as the priest does not promise this, he is not liable to have his power called in question. But let us hear what Bishop Hay says on this subject. After explaining seven different things which are effected by extreme unction, he proceeds:—

"*Quest.* Are all these effects certainly produced by the grace of this sacrament? *Ans.* All those which regard the soul never fail to be produced by the grace of this sacrament, unless the sick person put a hinderance to them by his indisposition; for the Scripture expressly affirms, that when it is administered, 'Our Lord shall raise him up, and his sins shall be forgiven him.' So that God, who is faithful to his word, will never fail, on his part, to bestow these graces on the sick person, if he be properly disposed to receive them; and the more perfectly he is disposed, the more abundant portion he will receive of them. But what regards the health of the body is not always granted, being only an accidental effect, and not essential to the sacrament, and is only given when the good of the soul requires it."

Thus, it seems the virtue of this sacrament depends entirely upon the disposition of the person to whom it is administered; and the degree of the benefit is according to the perfection of the disposition of the dying person. I grant, that even a divine ordinance will not benefit a man who is indisposed to it: but if extreme unction could be of any use at all, it ought to be without regard to disposition; for persons in the agonies of death are in general incapable of disposing their minds one way or another, or of being certain how, or in what degree, they are disposed; so that though this sacrament is declared never to fail in its effects upon the soul with but one exception, no man can be sure that the exception does not apply to him. "The grace of this sacrament," therefore, turns out to be no grace at all. It gives no security to any dying person that *he* shall be saved; so the priests and their holy oil are the most miserable of all comforters. Nothing can give true peace to the soul, in life or in death, but a believing view of the death of Christ, by which the sting of death is taken away: and every thing that tends to divert the mind from this point is of the devil, though it should be an attempt to define too minutely what is meant by a *believing view* of Christ's death; * by perplexing themselves about which, men may have their minds diverted from Christ himself, as much as by the imposing rite of anointing with holy oil, by priestly hands.

The following extract will show still more distinctly, what a broken reed Papists have to depend upon, when they put their trust in this sacrament. It is, in fact, of no avail without another sacrament which must go before it, except in certain excepted cases, which must be extremely perplexing to a dying person, if he is able to attend to the subject at all. The fourth of the seven effects of extreme unction, is expressed by Bishop Hay as follows: "It also cleanses the soul even from the guilt of mortal sin, *in certain circumstances*, where the sick person cannot have recourse to the sacrament of penance; for, where this sacrament of penance *can be had*, it must *always be applied to*, for the remission of mortal sin; but in dying persons it may sometimes happen that this cannot be done. As, for example, if their mortal sins were not forgiven in confession, for want of proper dispositions, though unknown to the person himself; or were committed after being at the sacrament of penance, but had quite escaped his memory; or, if being suddenly deprived of his senses, he could not confess them, but had a sincere sorrow for them. In these, or such like cases, even the guilt of mortal sins will be cleansed from the soul, by the grace of extreme unction." Here are so many *ifs* and *buts*, to use a vulgar expression, that no man can be certain what benefit he will derive from this sacrament, or even from that of penance, or whether he will derive any benefit at all from one or both of them. One is apt to conclude from this, that what has been called in Scotland the "glorious

* It is unquestionably of great importance to think and speak correctly about believing in Christ, as well as upon every other religious subject; but I have seen persons, both in health and in sickness, who seemed to have more anxiety about *believing rightly*, than about believing the *right thing*. But unless Christ, and him crucified, be the chief, I had almost said the exclusive object of contemplation, we shall derive little benefit from analyzing the exercise of our own minds with regard to him. I do not say that this is unnecessary or unimportant; but it ought to be secondary and subordinate. The mind that is exercised chiefly about Christ, will come to understand the nature of its own exercise; but the mind that is exercised chiefly about its own operations, may never come to the knowledge of Christ; and in this way, Satan may deceive souls to their ruin. A man may have his eyes open towards the most beautiful object in nature, but he will derive no pleasure from it; nay, perhaps he will not really see it, if he is thinking only of the faculty of vision. So it is possible to fail of believing in Christ, while thinking and disputing about the nature of believing.

uncertainty of the law," has been transferred to the Popish gospel: for, as the priests are the sole expounders of this gospel, which, in their phraseology, is called "the new law," they are able to extort immense sums of money from dying persons, and their friends, in order to obtain a favourable interpretation of all the doubtful points, which can easily be made to apply to the case of any man that ever lived or died. I request my readers to view Popery in the light of extreme unction alone, as thus expounded by a late Scottish bishop, and let them say, if it does not exhibit a system of opposition to the gospel of Jesus Christ, as prominent and mischievous as Antichrist can possibly be.

I shall conclude this subject, by showing that this pretended sacrament is a mere novelty of the dark ages, and that it was entirely unknown to the Christians of the earlier ages. I have already shown, that the words of the apostle James relate to the healing of the sick, or their restoration to health; and that, therefore, they furnish no authority for anointing the dying, solely with a view to their death. We read of many instances of persons being anointed, while in sickness, during the first four or five centuries; but all these instances seem to have been connected with the hope of restoration to health; and there is reason to think that the practice was superstitiously continued, after the miraculous power of healing had ceased: but as a sacrament, to be administered to the dying for their spiritual benefit, we read nothing of it for the first thousand years of the Christian era. There is not the least mention of it in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, or Cyprian, or any of the writers of the first three centuries, who yet discourse frequently and plainly of the discipline and sacraments of the church; and therefore it was not known to them. Neither was it known to the fourth century, which afforded so many Christian writers, since not one of them mentions it, not even when writing of the sacraments and rites of the church. Epiphanius treats largely of the doctrine, and discipline, and rites of the church, in his work against heresies, but not a word of extreme unction. The counterfeit Dionysius, in his Ecclesiastical History, lays down, with wonderful particularity, all the mysteries of the church, from the baptism to the burial of the faithful; but of extreme unction he is altogether silent. And so is the author of "Apostolical Institutions," in his eighth book, in which he undertakes to declare all ecclesiastical forms whatever.

The literature of the first six centuries consists, in a great measure, of narratives of the life and death of many extraordinary persons and eminent saints; yet there is not the least intimation that any one of them underwent the process of extreme unction. I have before me above a score of names of great persons, whose biography is furnished, with less or more minuteness, by Eusebius; but not one of them is said to have been favoured with this sacrament. St Augustine writes many things of his excellent mother, Monica, but nothing of her being anointed; and the biographer of St Augustine himself, is equally silent with regard to him.

Now, this seems extremely strange and unaccountable, had such a sacrament been then known in the church; especially when we consider that, in later ages, the writers of the lives of the saints seldom *omit* the circumstance; but usually give it as a prominent part of their history, that they had received anointing of the holy oil. I have before me also a list of great men of whom this is recorded, among whom I observe the angelic doctor St Thomas Aquinas, and the no less famous St Dominic, founder of the Inquisition, and of the order that bears his name. No other reasonable account can be given why this, so very material a circumstance, should be perpetually omitted in describing the deaths of the ancient Christians, and hardly ever omitted by Roman writers of later times,—but that as the thing itself is now constantly practised in the Church of Rome, so it was utterly unknown to the ancient church.

From the fifth to the ninth century, the biographers of distinguished persons very frequently mention their receiving the eucharist, never that they received extreme unction, before their departure out of this life; which is proved by many instances out of Bede and Surius. But had extreme unction been used in those times, no reason can be given why the mention of this should be perpetually omitted, which is surely as worthy of being remembered as the other. See these things more in detail, and an immense mass of matter on the subject in general, in the Preservative against Popery, folio, vol. ii. Tit. vii. pp. 72—101.

No. CXXXVIII.

SATURDAY, March 3d, 1821.

Having despatched the subject of extreme unction, I should now proceed to the next general head of discussion, which falls to be the history and character of the Jesuits. Here I could find matter enough to fill some volumes; but I shall, as usual, endeavour to compress it, as far as is consistent with giving a fair view of the subject: and, before entering seriously upon it, I shall introduce some miscellaneous matter connected with it.

In the following extract of a letter from a gentleman in England, to his friend in Ireland, both The Protestant and the Jesuits are in-

troduced. I do not know the name of either the writer or the *writee*, (if I may be allowed to coin a word, which will be understood by my mercantile readers, as well as those in the law profession,) but the extract was forwarded by a person of the first respectability in Ireland, to a gentleman of this city, with a request that it should be communicated to THE PROTESTANT. I am perfectly satisfied with the negative praise of being *no bad* reasoner; but I am mortified to think that there are Popish champions for whom I am "far from being a match;" I mean, with the word of God in my hand; for I have no other weapon, and I confess myself to be nothing without it. The extract is as follows:

"The writer of THE PROTESTANT is a clear-sighted, energetic penman, and no bad reasoner; but I assure you, my dear Robert, he is far from being a match for the Popish theologians who have lately thrown down the gauntlet, such as Berrington, Thake, Lingard, &c. &c.: to remove the impressions likely to be made on the more reflecting part of the community, by such writers as these, would require the talents and erudition of a Sankey or a Magee; and, in my opinion, no time should be lost. It is now, I believe, five years since Berrington and Thake published their joint work, entitled, 'The Faith of Catholics supported by Scripture, and by the writings of the Fathers of the Greek and Latin Churches, during the first five centuries,'—and yet no Protestant divine has attempted to answer it. The Roman Catholics have increased in this country (England) within the last thirty-six years, especially since the establishment of the Jesuits at Stoneyhurst. They are very numerous in Scotland; and, I may say, multitudinous in the districts of London and Lancashire: especially the latter, where the Jesuits are most favourably received. They are likewise to be found in considerable numbers in Yorkshire, Wiltshire, Warwickshire, and Staffordshire. About thirty years ago, they were found, by actual computation, to amount to 69,376; they are now computed, by their own writers, to amount to about 500,000: * and I feel persuaded, that this number will be doubled in a very few years. Indeed, I think no person can entertain a contrary opinion, but one who is totally incapable of foreseeing the effects naturally producible by the various existing circumstances, calculated to promote this increase. Their colleges, schools, &c. have been increased from three to fifty; and their chapels from a small number to nine hundred: their clergy are exceedingly numerous—many of them supported by old rent-charges on the estates of noblemen—have small congregations, and, consequently, much leisure, which they never fail to turn to account in the way of making proselytes, either by writing or conversation. The rural people of England, of the lower order, when not under the superintendence of evangelical clergymen, are easily entrapped by artful Jesuits: witness the almost incredibly numerous conversions in Lancashire; many of the higher orders, as was lately intimated to me by a most sensible and pious person who knows them well, are not indisposed to the religion of the Church of Rome. The Jesuits have several newspapers, and many periodical publications, either partially or wholly under their control. Their affectedly liberal sentiments; their professedly exclusive hatred of dissenters, methodists, &c.; their insinuating, affable, conciliatory, submissive conduct; their decorous manners, conviviality, and diversified learning,—have given them a footing in almost every society where true religion does not predominate, and quieted the apprehensions of thousands. When all this is considered, and when it is recollected that no Protestant converted to Popery can ever after be reclaimed—being either persuasively or authoritatively restrained from perusing such controversial works as might tend to refute the sophistry by which he was ensnared—is there not abundant reason for apprehending, that the growth of Popery here will be, at least, as rapid as I have said, if not much more so; is it not then the duty, the bounden duty, of every true follower of Christ, not only to deprecate, but to endeavour to become instrumental in preventing its growth? Vital Christianity and Popery are naturally repulsive; they never can be amalgamated; they are essentially incompatible; they are as opposite as the poles. The latter, supported as it has been by the utmost exertions of human ingenuity, and, indeed, peculiarly captivating to all whose minds are not preoccupied and impressed by the word of God, presents an almost insuperable barrier to the extension of the pure religion of Jesus. Inveterate heathenism may be overcome by vital Christianity: this, I trust, we shall soon, with the divine blessing, see proved in Hindostan. Philosophical infidelity may be overcome by it: this was proved during the three first centuries, at Athens, Alexandria, and Rome; and has been farther proved, in individual instances, in our days.

"But what has been the progress of vital Christianity, in opposition to Popery, throughout Europe, since the establishment of Loyola's fraternity in the sixteenth century? There have not been wanting, in every country, intrepid followers of the Lord Jesus, ready to address their Popish opponents in the words of

* This is the number estimated by the Papists themselves; and their propensity to overrate their strength is well known. The writer, in part of a sentence which I have omitted, gives it as his opinion, that they are much more numerous; in which, however, I think he must be mistaken: and the reason why I do not insert his own words, is, that I do not choose to give currency to a statement which I consider greatly exaggerated. PROT.

St Paul to the sorcerer Elymas—"Oh, full of all subtlety," &c. "will you not cease to pervert," &c.: but how far have they been instrumental in bringing from darkness to light? Vital Christianity, thanks be to God, begins to dawn on the Popish states of Germany; but see how the clouds of Popery are thickening around it, by the never-ceasing wind that blows from the Vatican. It once slightly dawned in Spain and Portugal, but it has long since been invisible there. Unassisted man may despair of rendering vital Christianity triumphant over the idolatry and other abominations of Popery; but my Bible inclines me to cherish a persuasion, that man will not much longer be unassisted in the glorious work; the arm of the Lord seems to be actually abroad; and it is the duty of his people to seize the present opportunity to fight in his cause. Papal darkness is fast overspreading the land; but as, in the natural world, darkness is the harbinger of light, so the darkness I have been lamenting may soon be succeeded, and, I believe, will be succeeded, by an unprecedented blaze of light."

Every Christian will readily say Amen to these highly important remarks, and truly Christian anticipations. I feel myself at one with this writer, in almost every thing that he has said; and I should be much obliged to him if he would inform me where I may find these wonderful champions of Popery, who cannot be successfully opposed but by men of such talents as Magee, who is well known to be one of the first literary characters of the age. One who does not pretend to much learning, beyond what a mercantile education furnishes, might reasonably be excused from entering the lists with authors, with whom none but such literary and controversial giants as the Bishop of Raphoe are worthy to contend; yet, if any one will tell me where Berrington, and Thake, and Lingard, are to be found, I shall be glad to try a hand with them. I do not mean to set out a Quixotting, to break a lance upon their skulls, or to have one broken upon mine; but if any person will send me, or tell me where I may procure their books, I shall try their strength. I have read or heard somewhere, of the name of Lingard; but Berrington and Thake never met my eye or my ear before. I have read and heard much of the great and "unanswerable Milner, than whom a more firm and orthodox divine never breathed," according to Mr Andrews, and I have found no difficulty in answering some of his sophisms and blasphemies; so that I should have no apprehension of a defeat when contending with meaner men.

The remissness of our Protestant divines is truly deplorable, if they have suffered such a work as the above writer mentions, to remain five years without attempting to answer it; especially if it be so formidable as it is represented. As I am not what the schoolmen would call a "theologian," it is not to be expected that I should be able to grapple with such a work in true theological style; but taking a plain common-sense view of the matter, I venture to undertake the refutation of it before seeing it. It contains the principle of its own destruction in its very title: "The Faith of Catholics *supported* by Scripture, *and* by the writings of the Fathers of the Greek and Latin Churches, during the five first centuries." An arch that rests one end upon a rock, and the other upon sand, will be swept away by the first flood that assails it, as completely as if the foundation had been sand at both extremities; and so shall the system of religion that is built partly on divine, and partly on human authority. The boasted system of Berrington and Thake is *supported* equally by Scripture and by human writings. Such a system the Head of the church disclaims altogether. It cannot be His religion; for he commands his disciples to call no man on earth master; that is, to acknowledge no authority but his own in matters of faith and worship. "The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver;" and whatever He is to his people, he is that exclusively. He admits no partnership in authority, any more than in worship: and the very attempt to associate the writings of men with the word of God, in support of a religious system, is such a disparagement to the divine word, as is equal to a rejection of it. Thus, I convict the system of Berrington aad Thake of opposition to the religion of Christ, from the very title of their book; and if I shall have the good fortune to procure the book itself, I have no doubt I shall be able to confirm the verdict, by a hundred instances of opposition to the doctrine of the Bible. I shall confine myself to writers of the first century, leaving all the rest of the five to them; though, by their mode of expression, it may not be easy to say which of the five should have the precedence, seeing they are all *first* centuries; and they may urge a claim for precedence on behalf of any one of the five that suits them best. To put the matter, therefore, beyond a doubt, I shall keep by the apostles, and leave the whole host of the fathers to them.

I suspect that there are many of the lower, as well as of the "higher orders," in England, who "are not indisposed to the religion of the Church of Rome;" because it is a system which supplies, by a few ceremonies, the place of that change of heart, and reformation of life, which are essential to true Christianity, but to which men in love with sin are ever indisposed. The religion that encourages men to continue in sin, from a persuasion that they can obtain absolution from a priest, for a few shillings, commends itself to wicked men of all ranks; and it wants nothing but general respectability

and popularity, to make it very generally embraced. I lately expressed my opinion, that the reign of Antichrist was drawing towards its termination: but this is perfectly consistent with the fact, that Popery is greatly on the increase. It may even obtain a temporary re-establishment in Protestant countries; but this will only be giving the Man of Sin a momentary elevation, that he may fall with the greater violence, like a great millstone cast into the sea by the hand of a mighty angel.

From the above extract, we see what the Jesuits in England are doing. They are proceeding like their master, "with all subtlety." To the high churchman they profess, what, I believe, they really feel, great abhorrence of dissenters: and to the dissenters they use soft words and fair speeches, calling them "our dissenting brethren," with a view to bespeak their aid in obtaining what they call "Catholic emancipation;" giving them reason to hope, that when they have got into Parliament, they will procure the same benefit to dissenters in general. And, strange as it may seem, there are some birds so simple as to be caught by this chaff; as appears by a petition to the House of Commons, by some Independent dissenters in the west of England; who humbly entreat the "honourable house to take into consideration the claims of our Catholic brethren for universal emancipation, and to extend *to them* those rights and immunities to which they are justly entitled, as a loyal and pious portion of the British empire." Thus, having asked for the Papists that "to which they are *justly entitled*," the petitioners modestly, and as if it were a secondary matter, entreat, of the "candour and *bounty* of the house, the extension of civil immunities, and political honours, to all the subjects of the crown of Great Britain, without respect to their religious opinions." In plain English, these Independent Protestant dissenters demand for Papists as a *right*, what they themselves are willing to receive as a matter of *bounty*;* and it is a bounty that they shall never receive from a Parliament containing Popish members. These would kick away the ladder that raised them to place; they would throw their whole weight into the scale of any intolerant party that does, or may hereafter, exist in the established church, and the severities of Bonnar and Laud would be acted over again. This our dissenters would find out when too late to help themselves; as would also certain leading men in our Scotch establishment, who at present cannot understand why we should apprehend any danger to arise from granting to Papists all that they demand.

But to return to the English Jesuits: they become literally all things to all men, that they may gain some. They can be grave with the serious, and lively with the gay; pray with the pious, and scoff with the profane; they can fast with the abstemious, and drink with the drunken; not that they themselves are in the habit of getting drunk, like the priests of meaner order in Ireland and elsewhere. The Jesuits are too good politicians to let themselves down to the derision of the people by such beastly manners; but they know how to indulge persons, whom they are striving to gain, in all manner of conviviality, though it should reach to the greatest degree of excess. They will modestly hint that such things are not right, but they know all the excuses that good-fellowship suggests; they will allow them all the weight to which they are entitled; they will make the most ample allowance for time, and company, and circumstances; insomuch, that no man shall need to feel much anxiety on account of his irregularities, seeing the priest connives at them; and, at any rate, can grant absolution when it is necessary. Thus, the Jesuits are most pleasant companions; and Popery is the most delightful religion in the world: no wonder that menof pleasure, of all ranks, should be ready to fall into it.

A correspondent has favoured me with a long letter on the character and principles of

* Perhaps justice to the parties requires that I should give the petition entire. I shall, therefore, bring it in here. It is, besides, a document worth preserving in such a work as THE PROTESTANT. It is introduced in the Orthodox Journal for July last, by the editor, in the following manner; "We copy, with sincere satisfaction, the following petition of the dissenters of Cockermouth, in favour of civil and religious liberty."

"*The humble Petition of the undersigned Protestant Dissenters, of the Independent denomination, residing in the Town and neighbourhood of the Borough of Cockermouth,*

"SHEWETH,—That, with confidence, relying on the justice and liberality of the British senate, your petitioners beg leave humbly to lay before your honourable house the unmerited stigma which has long been impressed on a body of subjects, whose loyalty and fidelity have yet been constantly demonstrated. That, in the imposition of civil disabilities upon account of religious opinions, your petitioners deprecate an infringement of the primary law of mental freedom; the right of each to worship God according to the unbiassed dictates of his conscience. That, considered apart from the great law of native freedom, the present restriction of the Catholic Christians is evidently injurious to the best interests of the country, by the partial exclusion of men of integrity from offices of state; and by causing dissensions and invidious distinctions between the several denominations of religious creeds in the British empire, at a time when the prevalence and triumph of deism and infidelity demand the united energies of all persuasions in the defence of truth. Nor can the limitation of religious liberty be defended on the ground of policy, since loyalty and attachment to the constitution of the land were declared, on inquiry, by the Catholic universities of Louvaine, Douay, Alcala, Salamanca, Valadolid, and the Sorbonne, to be incumbent on those who profess the communion of Rome; and the antiquated absurdity of their keeping no faith with heretics, has been positively and indignantly disavowed by the college of cardinals *de propaganda*, under the immediate sanction of Pope Pius VI., as well as by Catholics of the united kingdom.

"That your petitioners should consider themselves unworthy the names of Protestants and Dissenters, could

the Jesuits, from which I give only the following extract, as I cannot afford room for the whole in the present Number :—

"I could wish, now that you candidly confess that you see the danger of conceding to the Papists those high places of power and trust, from which, in consequence of direful necessity, they have been excluded, that you had shown, at some length, the obviously infallible results of such concession. It is, in some measure, to remedy this inadvertency, or neglect, that I now address myself to you.

"I confess that my feelings were so shocked by the horrible story of the Inquisition seraglio, that I could not compose my mind to sleep during the whole night after I read it. It appears to me to tally so completely with the doctrine of the Jesuits, that it is lawful to destroy females that have it in their power to expose the wickedness of the priests, that I feel the fullest conviction, that these villanies have been for many ages practised, on a large scale, wherever circumstances favoured it. For, let it be observed that Loyola's rules for the Jesuits did not originate with himself, but were drawn out and compendized from the standing morality of the Popish communion. In proof of which, it is only necessary to notice the readiness and alacrity with which some outrages upon common sense and decency were at once received, and the irresistible power and efficacy with which they became established, wherever the Romish superstition prevailed."

The writer proceeds to show how Jesuitism co-operated with infidelity in originating the French Revolution; and how it is partly, if not wholly, chargeable with all the miseries that followed; for much of the philosophical infidelity with which Europe was annoyed about the middle of the last century, may be traced to the morals taught and practised by the Jesuits, and other Popish absurdities and abominations. The advocates of the Jesuits, in the present day, stoutly maintain, that they are the best supporters of thrones; and that, if the order had not been suppressed, the French Revolution would not have happened. To prove a negative is indeed a bold undertaking; but Popish writers have, in general, little to do with *proof*. With them *assertion* is enough; and I have learned, that the more strongly they assert any thing, the more ought they to be suspected of falsehood.

No. CXXXIX.

SATURDAY, March 10th, 1821.

In my last Number, I gave an extract of a letter relating the great activity of the Jesuits in England, their success in making proselytes to Popery, and the culpable supineness of the Protestant clergy, who are suffering their people to be deceived and ruined, without making any vigorous effort to defend the truth, and impede the progress of error. There are, however, a few honourable exceptions.

---

they for one moment deny to Anglicians and Romanists, that sacred liberty which they hold to be the birth-right of man, and for which our fathers suffered by the prison, the axe, and the faggot!

"That your petitioners, therefore, beg leave humbly to entreat your honourable house to take into consideration the claims of our Catholic brethren for universal emancipation, and to extend to them those rights and immunities to which they are justly entitled, as a loyal and pious portion of the British empire; and thereby to conciliate the affections of a large proportion of his Majesty's subjects, in these portentous times of political ferment.

"That while your petitioners pray your honourable house to grant that liberty to the Church of Rome which is the right of Englishmen, the distinction which severs the Protestant dissenters from the great body of the people, cannot but excite them to entreat, of your candour and bounty, the extension of civil immunities, and political honours, to all the subjects of the Crown of Great Britain, without respect to their religious opinions—since a loyal and constitutional disposition has ever been characteristic of those men, to whom the historian * attributes the preservation of that liberty, which should ever be dear to the freemen of Britain!"

There is so much in the style and manner of the above that resembles the writings of Papists, that I suspected it to be a piece of Jesuit manufacture; in which, however, I did them injustice for once; for on application, by letter, to a gentleman in Cockermouth, I had the mortification to learn that it was a *bona fide* petition of the persons whose designation it bears. The gentleman to whom I wrote, handed my letter to the gentleman who was the author, and had been the chief promoter of the petition; and from him I received a polite and prompt reply, acknowledging and justifying the procedure on the ground of its being a petition for "universal emancipation," not that of Catholics only. But it does not appear to have been so understood by Mr Curwen, who presented it to the House. In his letter, acknowledging receipt of it he says, "The truly Christian and enlightened sentiments your petition expresses, accord with what I have ever felt upon the subject. *Mr Grattan's motion shall have my cordial support.*" Now, Mr Grattan's motion was not for "universal *emancipation*," but for that of *Papists only*: and suppose Papists were as harmless, and loyal, and pious, as the Independents themselves, to give them precedence and priority in admission to places of power and trust, would be making an unjust and invidious distinction, to which no one sect is entitled more than another, and certainly Papists least of all, from their well-known hostility, not merely to another faith than their own, but to the *persons* of those who refuse to embrace their errors, and practise their idolatries and superstitions.

Candour requires me to express my conviction, that the Independents in Cockermouth, in honest simplicity, make use of the language furnished for them by Popish writers, about the declaration and disavowal of the "Catholic universities," and of "the college of cardinals *de propaganda*," but if they were as well acquainted with Popery as their fathers of the 17th century were, they would use very different language; and they would, perhaps, not even desire political power for themselves, if it was to be at the dreadful risk of having Papists brought into power along with them. The wolf may tell the sheep that he has laid aside his claws and his teeth, or that he never had any; and that, therefore, they may safely break down the fence and let him into their fold; but they would be silly sheep, indeed, that would believe his fair speeches, and comply with his request.

* Hume, vide Hist. of Eng. V. p. 189, 8vo, 1763.

In particular, the Editor of the "Protestant Advocate," a clergyman in Essex, has distinguished himself as a staunch defender of the Reformation. His motto is, No peace with Rome:—no compromise:—no truce with the insidious Jesuits, whose wily arts he well knows,—"arts which caused them to be expelled from all the Popish states in Europe scarcely fifty years ago," when they found an asylum in the heart of England, where they continue to this day, increasing their numbers, and extending their influence. The Protestant Advocate not only wields his own pen to great purpose; but he does what in him lies to rouse his brethren to exert themselves in the cause of Christianity against Antichrist. His efforts have not yet produced the desired effect among the established clergy in Lancashire, where their labours are most wanted; but he makes honourable mention of some dissenters in that county who have taken up the cause, and are pursuing it with vigour. A society was lately formed there for the defence of Protestant principles, which circumstance was communicated to me, first by a private letter from Preston, and afterwards by a printed circular, detailing the design and object of the society. As I think this letter will be interesting to my readers, I shall insert it here. It is inserted also in the Protestant Advocate for December last.

"PRESTON, *Nov. 27th*, 1820.

"SIR,—The unceasing efforts of the Romish priesthood and their adherents in this county to extend their influence, and to make proselytes of the ignorant and unwary, cannot, we presume, have altogether escaped your notice, though perhaps you may not be fully aware of the extent of the evil.

"In Preston, the proportion of the Roman Catholics is unusually great, and its proximity to the Jesuit college at Stoneyhurst, (an institution, the influence of which on the surrounding country is most powerful and pernicious) renders it more easy for the leaders of the Catholic body to PRACTISE AND PROSPER here. They already possess two large chapels, which are filled by crowded congregations, and have erected a spacious school, which, in various ways, is made subservient to the grand design of proselyting to the Church of Rome. For several years past, lectures on the distinguishing tenets of Popery, which have been attended by great numbers of Protestants of different denominations, have been delivered by one or other of their priests, thrice a week during Lent, in their principal chapel; the great object of which is to represent the Church of Rome as the only ark of salvation. Experience proves that such a representation has its influence on weak and uninformed minds.

"Very little opposition has hitherto been made to these attempts of the Roman Catholics to propagate their principles in this town and its vicinity. One vigorous effort of the late curate of our parish church appeared to have a beneficial influence. With a view to confute the errors of the Romish church, he delivered a course of lectures on Sunday evenings, which were very numerously attended, and which induced the priests to propose a truce, engaging that they would omit their usual lectures in Lent, if he would suspend his attacks on their system: and for one year these conditions were observed. The above clergyman, however, having left Preston more than three years ago, the Lent lectures have been renewed with greater zeal than ever; and as there does not appear any probability that a similar attempt will be made in the same quarter to resist these bold attacks on the Protestant religion, there seems to be a very urgent call on others to employ effective means for this purpose.

"It has therefore been thought expedient by several friends to general Protestantism, that a course of lectures in opposition to the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion should be delivered at some place of worship in this town, by able and zealous ministers from various parts of the county; to commence early in the ensuing year, and to be continued once a fortnight during three or four months. And that at the same time the very popular and useful tracts edited by Mr M'Gavin, a respectable merchant in Glasgow, under the title of 'THE PROTESTANT,' should be put into general circulation.

"It is hoped that this attempt will not be considered as entirely a LOCAL business: but that it will be generally countenanced by all zealous friends to the cause of truth throughout the county; and that beginning as it were at the centre, the impulse will be felt on all sides, and lead to similar efforts wherever they may appear to be necessary.

"Conceiving that the intelligence contained in this circular will not be uninteresting; and that so far as circumstances may admit, you will be disposed to co-operate with us,—we have taken the liberty, Sir, to address these lines to you.

"Signed on behalf of the society for the support and diffusion of Protestant principles in Preston and its vicinity,

"W. M. WALKER,
"W. HOPE, } Secretaries."

List of Subjects proposed for the first course of Lectures

1. The Claims of the Church of Rome examined.
2. Scripture, not Tradition, the Rule of Faith.
3. The Pope not the Head of the Church.
4. On Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

5. On the Seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome.
6. On the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.
7. On Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead.
8. On Justification by Works, the Merits of Saints, and Works of Supererogation.
9. The Duty of Separation from the Church of Rome.

By a letter received from the Secretaries a few days ago, I have the pleasure of learning, to use their own words, that "the lectures here against Popery, as detailed in the circular we had the pleasure to hand you, are very well attended: and the tracts meet with a ready and extensive sale." I have the pleasure to learn also that these said tracts, or paper Protestants, have already excited great wrath among the Preston Papists; and certain steps have been taken, preparatory, I presume, to an attempt to put them down by force of law, seeing they cannot meet them on the ground of reason and argument: at least I cannot otherwise account for the fact, which has come to my knowledge, of two Papists, with a legal adviser, going before a magistrate in Preston, and making oath that they had bought No. I. and II. of THE PROTESTANT from the bookseller, Mrs Agnes Walker, of that town, which two Numbers they had appended to their affidavits. Perhaps, indeed, it was merely an attempt to frighten the good lady from selling the work; and the fact confirms a statement by the author of the History of the Jesuits, that "such is the influence of the Jesuits in Preston, that the Protestant booksellers are afraid to sell publicly, or expose for sale, any books against Popery; and yet there is a Popish bookseller in the town, whose windows and shop are crowded with all the poison of Popery," vol. i. page 335. This is the manner in which Papists propagate and defend their principles, while under civil disabilities: we may then form a judgment of what they would do, if possessed of power. Circumscribed as their influence is, they are able by means of it, to obstruct the exercise of free discussion, in places where they have become numerous; and should the period ever arrive when such men shall get into parliament, or even into the magistracy of such a town as Preston, it will be seen what havoc they will make of the boasted liberties of Englishmen.

With all their boasting and bluster, the Jesuits (for the name is proper to the English Papists in general,) are the greatest controversial cowards in the world. This is evident from their conduct in Preston. When they supposed there was no Protestant clergyman that would be at the pains to enter the lists with them, they boldly proclaimed the peculiarities of their system, and attacked the established religion, which they held up to the scorn of the ignorant and besotted multitudes who listened to their harangues; but whenever a Protestant clergyman took up the cause, and had begun to turn the tide of public opinion against them, they begged for quarter. They know perfectly well that argument is not a weapon for them. By bold assertion and downright lying, they will succeed for a time, where no opposition is made; but let the question be brought to the test of plain fact and of common sense, and there is not a Papist in the world who will be able to maintain his ground for five minutes.

Had the Preston Jesuits been really convinced in their own consciences that their cause was good, they would not have proposed such a truce as that mentioned in the letter above inserted; and had the curate of the parish been duly impressed with the importance of the questions at issue, he would not have consented to the truce which was proposed. No doubt the priests of Diana, and of other idols, would gladly have purchased the silence of Paul with regard to Jesus of Nazareth, at the expense of not praising their *holy* images while the apostle remained among them; but had such a proposal been made to him, he would have spurned it with holy indignation:—"We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard," would have been his reasoning for continuing to preach the truth, whether men would hear, or whether they would forbear. I speak this upon the supposition that the idol priests had proposed a truce to him; but what would any man think, if he were told that Paul had made such a proposal to the idol priests?—If he had said,—Cease to inculcate the worship of Jupiter and Diana, and I shall say no more about Jesus Christ, what could any man infer, but that he felt no real interest in Christ or his religion? Yet this is the very thing that our Preston Jesuits did. They will maintain, that theirs is the only true religion, and that ours is a false one; and that the one is as much opposed to the other, as the worship of Christ is to the worship of an idol: and yet they, who thus claim to be of the only true religion, voluntarily proposed to give up the public defence of it, if the professors of a false religion would give up the defence of theirs! This is the fidelity of modern Jesuits to their *holy* church, which is the mother and mistress of all churches! The fact, however, is a striking one, and an encouraging one to all who undertake the exposure of Popish error, idolatry, and superstition. It is an admission, and a public acknowledgment by the leading Papists themselves, that their cause cannot be defended by fair argument, that it shrinks from public discussion, and that they are content to hold their faith in secret and in silence, where there are men able and willing to expose the deformity of the system when it is obtruded upon the view of the public. I re-

collect, that soon after my controversy with the Papists commenced, and while it was confined to the Glasgow Chronicle, a sort of roundabout proposal was made, that if I would give it up, my opponents would do the same; but I felt no inclination to accept the proposal. I had not, like Hannibal, taken an oath of perpetual hostility to Rome; but I had by that time seen enough of her abominations to determine me to persevere in laying them open to the view of the world, that my highly favoured country might at least be warned of the danger of cherishing in her bosom the most insidious enemies of both her civil and religious privileges. And I soon found that no truce was necessary. My opponents have left me in undisputed possession of the field for a long period. Not one of them has the courage to draw a pen in defence of their *holy* and *infallible* church. Let the society in Preston persevere, and they shall have the same triumph. Let them not relax their efforts for a single day. Let them hold up to the world, by preaching and writing, the true system of Popery in its naked deformity. Let them exhibit in plain, intelligible, and forcible language, its ridiculous fooleries, its monstrous absurdities, and horrible impieties, and I venture to predict that the Jesuits, though not ashamed, for that they cannot be, will be glad to hold their peace, and wait a more favourable opportunity for putting forward their claims to public notice.

The vast wealth of the Jesuits' college in Lancashire has enabled them to extend their influence over a considerable part of the county; and from the little opposition they have met with, their impudence has become equal to their influence. "The influence of the Jesuits in the adjacent country is incredible. The Manor and surrounding district being their own, they are more or less the accredited heads of the neighbourhood; they are at once bold and indefatigable in making proselytes"—"Before the establishment of this college, there were not half a dozen Papists about Stonyhurst, but now the greater part of the population in that part of the country are Papists, to the amount of many thousands. From this Jesuits' college all the Roman Catholic chapels in that part of the kingdom (which are nearly as numerous as the Protestant churches) are filled with priests of the order of Jesuits, though they are unwilling that it should be known that they are any other than ordinary Romish priests. There are several Jesuit priests stationed in Preston, who frequently travel from thence to Ireland; and, since the last peace, they have great intercourse with France, and other parts of the continent."—

"The subtlety with which the Jesuits insinuate themselves into Protestant families of fortune is very remarkable, but quite in unison with their whole history: there is scarcely a single Protestant family of respectability which is not in a greater or less degree under the influence of the Jesuits. The bishop of the diocese himself has not escaped the vortex of their influence; and a relative of his, who is a beneficed clergyman, at no great distance from the college, is openly boasted of by the Jesuits as their patron and ally; to this list may be added some of the established clergy of Preston and its vicinity. The Jesuits rule the magistrates of that place and the Mayor himself is in their interest." *History of the Jesuits, London*, 1816, Vol. 1. pages 344—345.

The following will show the countenance which they receive from Protestants in Manchester, in the same county:—"On the 27th of September last, a magnificent chapel, dedicated to St Augustin, was consecrated with high mass at Manchester. After consecration there was a public dinner, when, among other toasts, were drank, 'Our *Protestant* friends, who have so liberally and generously contributed to the erection of St Augustin's chapel.' Then, 'The Protestant visitors who attended St Augustin's, and those who now honour us with their presence.'" And we are told that a "Mr Wm. Townend (perhaps a misprint for Townsend, in a very appropriate manner, returned thanks on behalf of himself and the other Protestants alluded to; and with the liberality worthy of a Christian whose faith is built on rational principles, gave credit to those whose mode of faith was different, though drawn from the same source. It was a gratification to him to have witnessed the sight which had occupied his attention this day, and he hoped that the difference in the modes of faith would never be a barrier to prevent Catholics and Protestants stepping forward to promote the welfare of a fellow-creature." Such it seems is the state of favour with which Papists are regarded in Manchester, that Protestants contribute to build their chapels, grace their consecration by their presence, and then honour the triumph of Popery by attending a commemorative dinner, where they receive compliments from the Jesuits for their *liberality*, and express the gratification which the superstitious and idolatrous consecration of a Popish chapel has afforded them. The Jesuits would no doubt affect to be greatly delighted with such an effusion of Protestant liberality as the above; but they would despise both the speech and the speaker in their hearts. They are acute enough to perceive that he is not truly a Protestant who can speak of his own faith and that of Rome as drawn from the same source, and, "built upon *rational* principles:" and in their own minds they would set him down as belonging to the infidel school, though they would profess to regard him as an enlightened and liberal Christian. I am far from saying or insinuating that Protestant

principles are *irrational*, though they have neither their origin nor foundation in reason, but in divine revelation; but while Popery sets all sense and reason at defiance, and does so openly and avowedly in some of her fundamental doctrines, the Jesuits could not without gross hypocrisy acquiesce in the very liberal declaration of Mr Townsend.

While such sentiments as this gentleman avows prevail among Protestants, who would not be alarmed by the increase of Popery? Merely nominal Protestants, like Mr T. are already Papists at heart; and, as it is to be feared, the number of such is not small, in both England and Scotland, we have reason to fear that whenever it shall become necessary for every man to take a side, the Church of Rome will muster on her side the greater part, if not all those who do not particularly interest themselves in religious matters. Such persons look upon the care of their souls as a painful drudgery; and they are very willing to pay a reasonable commission to any man who will take the work off their hands, and be answerable for them. The Romish priests offer their services for this very purpose. They make themselves responsible for the salvation of every soul that confides in their spiritual powers. By their sacraments, they can regenerate, and even absolve the vilest sinners without putting them to the painful necessity of hating sin and loving holiness. Now this is such a convenient system of religion, that every unregenerate man who can prevail upon himself to believe in the power of the priests, will most heartily embrace it; and therefore as I have often said, whenever Popery shall become fashionable, and popular, the greater part of our fashionable population will fall into it.

Mr Townsend seems to have been put forward, or to have thrust himself forward, on this occasion, as the organ of Manchester Protestants; and if it be lawful to use the language of merchants on so grave a subject, I would say, if such be the sample, what must be the state and character of the stock? Mr T. speaks of the difference between his own religion and that of Papists, as only different modes of faith:—He "gave credit to those whose mode of faith was different, though drawn from the same source." It is really very difficult to speak of nonsense in a sensible manner; and therefore, I may be excused, if I shall not be able to apprehend and illustrate distinctly what the speaker means. By "modes of faith," I suppose is meant, if the phrase mean any thing, different ways of believing some truth or some falsehood. I know the phrase has been sanctioned, *consecrated*, if you will, by a Popish infidel:—

"For *modes of faith* let graceless zealots fight:—
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

But Alexander Pope's faith was not founded on the word of God; and though this celebrated aphorism of his, taken in the most favourable light, expresses a mere truism, * it is not of authority enough to impart sense to nonsense. They must be "graceless zealots" indeed who fight about "modes of faith;" that is, the manner in which they should believe, without knowing what it is that they are to believe.

Now I shall agree with our Manchester Protestants so far as to admit, that the difference between the Protestant and Popish *mode of faith* is not worth disputing about, unless we take into account the *object* of faith. If, for instance, the question be, How, or in what mode we shall believe that the Virgin Mary hears, and is able to answer the prayers of millions of worshippers;—how, or in what mode we shall believe that a divine power resides in holy images and holy relics;—how, and in what mode we shall believe that what we see to be a wafer is the God that made us;—how, and in what mode we shall believe that a fellow-creature, and one whom we know to be a sinful creature, has the power of absolving us from our sins;—how, and in what mode we shall believe in the divine efficacy of the sacraments of penance and extreme unction, so as to assure us of salvation by their means:—If, I say, the question be, What is the mode or manner of our faith with regard to these, and all such things; that is, whether we believe them with a great faith or a little faith; a *believing* faith, or a *doubting* faith, I shall cheerfully admit that the thing is of no importance whatever. All the supposable modes of faith about such objects are not worth disputing about, or of being compared with one another.

But if the question be with regard to any matter of divine revelation,—such, for instance, as the divine testimony about Jesus Christ as the only Saviour of sinners, I think there is no room for "modes of faith" in relation to it. Those to whom the truth is presented in the Bible, either believe it or they do not. If they believe it, they become Christians in the Bible sense of the word; if they do not believe it, they are not Christians; that is, they have no interest in Christ; but continue in their sins, though they may be called by his name. This

* That his faith cannot be wrong whose life is in the right, is undoubtedly true, though not in the sense intended by the poet. He meant to represent a man's faith, or "mode of faith," as of little importance, provided his life were good, which he supposed it might be, whatever might be his faith, which is a great and dangerous error. For a man's life to be right requires entire submission of heart and conduct to the will of God; now this is His will that we believe on him whom he hath sent. Without this, a man's life cannot be right, however blameless or even benevolent it may appear before the world, for he is destitute of the principle from which alone obedience, acceptable to God, can proceed: but with this faith in Christ, both a man's heart and life will be right before God, and his conduct before men will make it appear that his faith is genuine.

is the order which Christ himself has established:—"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," John iii. ult. And there can be nothing more just and proper, than that one who does not believe a message of good news should derive no benefit from it, especially when his disbelief implies a malignant rejection of the good thing contained in the message. This good thing is the gospel, which is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation; and though there is no merit in the belief of it, it is the established order in the divine administration, that he who believes it shall be saved. Now we read nothing in the Bible of different modes of believing, or "modes of faith," which is the same thing. There are some strong, and some weak in the faith; but this does not imply different modes of faith, any more than a state of childhood and a state of manhood suppose different modes of existence.

A friend has kindly handed me the Popish book mentioned in my last. The true title of it is, "The faith of Catholics *confirmed* by Scripture, and *attested* by the Fathers of the five first centuries." The authors are Benington and Kirk, not Thake, as the word seemed to be in the manuscript.

No. CXL.

SATURDAY, MARCH 17TH, 1821.

THE impudence of the Jesuits appears in the very name which they assume. Other Orders are content to be called after the name of their respective founders, such as St Francis and St Dominic; but nothing less will please the disciples of Loyola than the name of Jesus, who was so named because he was to save his people from their sins. The system of Jesuitism is founded on falsehood, and supported in every department of it by imposition, part of which consists in giving the best names to the worst things, and thus a confraternity, established for the purpose of opposing truth and maintaining error and idolatry, acted quite in character when they called themselves "the Society of Jesus."

This society, which was formed for the express purpose of opposing the Reformation which had begun under Luther, originated with a Spaniard of the name of Ignatius Loyola. He had been a soldier, and had seen a good deal of service. He was of a romantic and enthusiastic cast of mind, and had his imagination heated by reading the lives of saints and heroes, particularly the Adventures of Amadis de Gaul, which makes such a conspicuous figure in the exploits and adventures of the far-famed Don Quixote; and the effect upon the mind of Ignatius seems to have been in reality, what it is fictitiously represented to have been in the case of the renowned Knight of La Mancha. Ignatius hesitated a long time before he could determine whether he should become a knight errant, or a saint errant; but considering at length that he was lame of one leg, from a wound which he had received in the wars, and was in consequence unable to make an upright knightly figure among ladies of quality, he resolved to abandon the path of military glory, and follow that of St Francis, and other great fathers of the church. Still however he had a hankering after the practices and the rules of knighthood, one of the most essential of which is, that he should have a lady of incomparable beauty, who should be the object of his devotions, and who should receive the glory of all his victories and triumphs. It cost Don Quixote a whole week to satisfy himself that Dulcinea del Toboso was a fit object for him; but we are not informed how long it took for Ignatius to fix his mind upon the Virgin Mary. This, however, was the result of his cogitations; for he prostrated himself one night before her image, and consecrated himself to her service, and that of her Son; vowed inviolable fidelity to her; made her his protectress, and ever after esteemed himself bound to her by all the laws of knighthood.

This solemn engagement made it imperative on him to knock any man on the head who should speak a word in disparagement of any of the real or supposed qualities of his mistress: and he had soon an opportunity of proving his fidelity; for riding on a pilgrimage to Montserrat, he fell in with a Moor, who stoutly disputed with him the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin; and history saith, that the Moor had the better of the argument. It immediately occurred to Ignatius that he ought to kill him; but as the Moors were stout and warlike men, it perhaps occurred to Ignatius, that unless he received assistance from the Virgin or some other saint, the Moor might kill him. He rode on, expecting some revelation or impulse, but nothing of the kind was forthcoming. At last, the Moor's path separated from his; and he, receiving no revelation from above, resolved to seek one from below, namely, from the ass that walked under him; * for he laid the bridle loose upon the beast's neck, resolving within himself, that if the ass took the same path with the Moor, he

* I hope no Papist will accuse me of profane levity for supposing that inspiration might enter into such a saint as Ignatius from below, through the medium of his saddle; for let it be remembered, it is the only way that infallibility finds access into a Pope. It is all communicated from the chair of St Peter, when, with due solemnity, he has set himself down upon it.

should follow and kill him; and if he took the other path, he would consider it as a supernatural intimation not to shed blood at that time. Happily the ass turned away from the road the Moor had taken, and Ignatius was prevented from committing murder, or being murdered, for it has never yet been proved which of the two would have happened. The writers of his life call this a miracle; and it is indeed as good as most of the incidents which Papists call miraculous. See Extracts from his Life by Bohours, in a work entitled, *The Enthusiasm of the Church of Rome*, 4to, p. 29.

My readers will probably be of opinion that such a mad enthusiast was more fit for bedlam, than for being at the head of a powerful sect that was destined to govern the greater part of the civilized world, and even to establish a great empire among the savages of South America. Ignatius at first found some difficulty in getting his order established. The Pope himself was at first unfriendly to the measure; but "Loyola removed all his scruples by an offer which it was impossible for any Pope to resist. He proposed that besides the three vows of poverty, chastity, and monastic obedience, which are common to all the monastic orders, the members of his society should take a fourth vow of obedience to the Pope, binding themselves to go whithersoever he should command for the service of religion; and without requiring any thing of the Holy See for their support. At a time when the papal authority had received such a shock by the revolt of so many nations from the Roman Church; at a time when every part of the popish system was attacked with so much violence and success, the acquisition of such a body of men, thus peculiarly devoted to the See of Rome, and whom it might set in opposition to all its enemies, was an object of the highest consequence. Paul, instantly conceiving this, confirmed the institution of the Jesuits by a bull; granted the most ample privileges to the members of the society; and appointed Loyola to be the first general of the Order. The event hath fully justified Paul's discernment in expecting such beneficial consequences to the See of Rome from this institution. In less than half a century, the society obtained establishments in every country that adhered to the Roman Catholic Church; its power and wealth increased amazingly; the number of its members became great; their character and accomplishments were still greater; and the Jesuits were celebrated by the friends, and dreaded by the enemies of the Romish faith, as the most able and enterprising order in the church.

"The constitution and laws of the society were perfected by Laynez and Aquaviva, the two generals who succeeded Loyola, men far superior to their master in abilities, and in the science of government. They framed that system of profound and artful policy which distinguishes the Order."—"From their first institution they considered the education of youth as their peculiar province; they aimed at being spiritual guides and confessors; they preached frequently in order to instruct the people; they set out as missionaries to convert unbelieving nations. The novelty of the institution, as well as the singularity of its objects, procured the Order many admirers and patrons. The governors of the society had the address to avail themselves of every circumstance in its favour, and in a short time, the number as well as the influence of its members increased wonderfully. Before the expiration of the sixteenth century, the Jesuits had obtained the chief direction of the education of youth in every Catholic country in Europe. They had become the confessors of almost all its monarchs, a function of no small importance in any reign, but under a weak prince, superior even to that of minister. They were the spiritual guides of almost every person eminent for rank or power. They possessed the highest degree of confidence and interest with the papal court, as the most able and zealous champions for its authority. The advantages which an active and enterprising body of men might derive from all these circumstances are obvious. They formed the minds of men in their youth. They retained an ascendant over them in their advanced years. They possessed at different periods the direction of the most considerable courts in Europe. They mingled in all affairs. They took part in every intrigue and revolution. The general by means of the extensive intelligence which he received could regulate the operations of the Order with the most perfect discernment, and by means of his absolute power could carry them on with the utmost vigour and effect."

"Unhappily for mankind, the vast influence which the Order of Jesuits acquired by all these different means, has been often exerted with the most pernicious effect. Such was the tendency of that discipline observed by the society in forming its members, and such the fundamental maxims in their constitution, that every Jesuit was taught to regard the interest of the Order as the capital object, to which every consideration was to be sacrificed. The spirit of attachment to their Order, the most ardent perhaps that ever influenced any body of men, is the characteristic principle of the Jesuits, and serves as a key to the genius of their policy, and to the peculiarities of their sentiments and conduct.

"As it was for the honour and advantage of the society, that its members should possess an ascendant over persons of high rank and great power, the desire of acquiring and preserving such a direction of their conduct, with greater

facility, has led the Jesuits to propagate a system of relaxed and pliant morality, which accommodates itself to the passions of men, which justifies their vices, which tolerates their imperfections, and authorises almost every action that the most audacious or crafty politician would wish to perpetrate."—"They have published such tenets concerning the duty of opposing princes who were enemies of the Catholic faith, as countenanced the most atrocious crimes, and tended to dissolve all the ties which connect subjects with their rulers." *Robertson's Charles V.* Book VI. I refer to this elegant historian for a more particular account of the principles on which the society was founded; and the power, influence, and wealth which it acquired.

After this short sketch of the Order by a Protestant historian, it is but fair to insert what their own writers have to say in their behalf. It is admitted on all hands, that the great object of the institution of the Jesuits was the overthrow of the Reformation. The following extract from VILLERS will set this matter in its true light. I quote from a recent publication—"The History of the Jesuits," vol. i. p. 371—374.

"The sixteenth century saw LUTHER and LOYOLA arise almost at the same moment: the one in the north, the other in the south, of Europe; the latter, a Spaniard, appeared to be a natural product of the soil and spirit of the country where he was reared. A century earlier, he would probably only have founded an Order, like so many others, a fraternity of worshippers of the Virgin, to whom his devotion was particularly addressed. The religious innovations, however, which then threatened the existence of the Romish Church, gave to the enthusiasm of the pious and warlike Ignatius another direction. He conceived the idea of a sort of spiritual crusade against heresy. His scheme was eagerly adopted at Rome after some hesitation; and the design was seriously formed of converting the new society into a formidable phalanx, which might be employed against the boldest champions of the Reformation. To the reaction, therefore, excited by that event, may be ascribed the origin of the Society of Jesus. It may be satisfactory to read the words of TOLLENARIUS, in his *Imago Primi Seculi Soc. Jesu*, p. 19.*

"In the same year 1521, LUTHER, with consummate wickedness, openly declared war against the church:—wounded in the fortress of Pampeluna, renovated and strengthened by his accident, IGNATIUS raised the standard in defence of religion.

"LUTHER attacks the chair of St Peter with abuse and blasphemy: IGNATIUS is miraculously cured by St Peter in order to become his defender. *

"LUTHER, tempted by rage, ambition, and lust, abandons the religious life: IGNATIUS, eagerly obeying the call of God, quits the profane for the religious life.

"Luther, with the guilt of sacrilege, contracts an incestuous marriage, with a virgin of the Lord: IGNATIUS binds himself with the vow of perpetual continence.

"LUTHER despises all authority of superiors: the first precepts of IGNATIUS, full of Christian humility, are to submit and obey.

"LUTHER, like a madman, declaims against the Apostolic See: IGNATIUS every where undertakes its defence.

"LUTHER withdraws from it as many as he can: as many as he can, IGNATIUS reconciles and restores to it.

"All the devices and efforts of LUTHER are directed against it: IGNATIUS consecrates to it, by a special vow, all his own labours, and all those of his companions.

"LUTHER has stripped the sacred rites of the church of all their venerable solemnity: IGNATIUS studies to procure them reverence.

"The Sacrifice of the Mass, the Eucharist, the Virgin Mother of God, the Guardian Angels, and the Indulgences of Popes, which LUTHER attacks with so much fury, are the objects which IGNATIUS and his companions exert themselves continually to celebrate with new inventions and indefatigable industry.

"To LUTHER, that disgrace of Germany, that Epicurean Swine, that curse of Europe, that monster destructive to the whole earth, hateful to God and man, &c., God by his eternal decree has opposed IGNATIUS.

"In truth, the new society acquitted itself faithfully in the new service to which it was destined from its origin. A great number of Catholic associations and fraternities, to which the general movement of the human mind gave rise at that period, appeared and eclipsed one another without glory—like those meteors which shine for a short time in the atmosphere, and leave no trace behind them. The Society of Jesus, however, rose above the horizon, like an awful comet, which scatters terror among the nations. While it was scarcely yet established, it rendered important service to the Holy See, during the sitting of the Council of Trent, and powerfully influenced the decrees of that assembly. The ancient Orders, especially the Mendicant, conceived great envy against these new-comers, who set out with so

* *See* Steinmetz's *History of the Company of Jesus* vol. iii. p. 556.

* There is a little mistake here; for Ignatius was not properly cured at all. His leg was never made straight, which, as we have seen, was the reason why he despaired of making a genteel figure among ladies. Now we never read in the Bible of miraculous cures being incomplete; and we may very reasonably conclude, that the apostle Peter had no hand in the setting of this saint's leg, which was done in such an insufficient manner.

much celebrity, and attracted all consideration and all favours. This emulation redoubled the activity of all such as were not Jesuits, and in particular of the Dominicans, who wielded in a more terrible manner than ever the sword of the Inquisition, entrusted to their hands. The Jesuits however outstripped all their rivals, acquired the unlimited favour of the Pontiffs, and an immense power through the whole Catholic world. To them, and to the Popes, missions were the same as colonies to political governments, a source of wealth and power."

The reader will perceive that a great part of the above is a panegyric upon the Order of Jesuits and their founder; and their excellence is represented as consisting almost exclusively in the support which they have afforded to the Church and See of Rome. Every one, therefore, who believes the Church of Rome to be Antichrist, (and what Protestant does not?) must be convinced that the Jesuits are the active agents of the prince of darkness—the sworn enemies of real Christianity, and of every real follower of Christ: and it must necessarily follow, that wherever they have power and influence, these will be exercised to put down the religion of the Bible, and establish idolatry and superstition in its place. They are actually under a solemn vow to effect this by all possible means; and their efforts are the more likely to succeed, from their affected liberality, and plausible manners, and from their taking care never to divulge their real and ultimate design in any measure which they take to obtain a footing and extend their influence in Protestant countries.

No other Order in the Church of Rome increased with so much rapidity to wealth and power, or made such a figure in the world as the Jesuits. "When Loyola, in the year 1540, petitioned the Pope to authorise the institution of the Order, he had only ten disciples. But in the year 1608, sixty-eight years after the first institution, the number of Jesuits had increased to 10,581. In the year 1710, the Order possessed 24 *professed* houses; 59 houses of probation; 340 residences; 612 colleges; 200 missions; 150 seminaries and boarding schools; and consisted of 19,998 Jesuits." *Robertson's Charles V.* Book VI.

These were actually so many incendiaries sent forth to embroil the nations of the world —to set them, and to keep them fighting with one another. From being the confessors of kings, and of their mistresses, and of ministers of state, they became acquainted with the secrets of every cabinet. These were communicated to their general at Rome, who was either a tool of the Pope, or had the Pope as a tool of his; and thus he had the command of a machine by which he could influence, and often even guide the measures of every court in Europe, * except those who had renounced the Pope, and thrown off his yoke; and even some of these were more influenced by the Jesuits than the world knew at the time. Their influence in England was most pernicious, and was uninterrupted from the accession of Elizabeth to the revolution in 1688; for it was their incessant plotting against the life and government of that princess, that laid her under the necessity of having recourse to certain rigorous and arbitrary measures, which considerably diminish the respect due to her memory, and laid the foundation of those discontents which agitated the country during the reign of succeeding princes. In Elizabeth's time, it was the practice of Jesuits to assume the character of zealous Protestant preachers; and thus to insinuate themselves into the confidence of the people, that they might the more effectually practise their treasonable arts. I shall at present relate only one instance of this, which may be verified by reference to the registry of the Episcopal See of Rochester, in the book which begins, Anno 2 & 3 Phil. & Mar. and continued to the 15 Eliz. I abridge the narrative from a volume entitled, "Foxes and Fire-brands," † the title of which seems to have been intended to point out the character of the Jesuits.

In the year 1568, one Thomas Heth came to the Dean of Rochester, and pretending to be a poor minister, requested the dean's influence with the bishop for some preferment. The dean very properly desired to hear him preach before he would recommend him. Accordingly he did preach in the cathedral church; and while doing so, on pulling out his handkerchief, he pulled out also a letter which, unobserved by him, fell to the bottom of the pulpit, and was afterwards picked up by the sexton, and carried to the dean. This letter was addressed to Heth, under the name of Thomas Fine, and subscribed by Samuel Malt, a notorious English Jesuit, at that time in Madrid. The entire letter is given in the work before me, from which it appears that money had been sent along with it, to be distributed by Heth wherever he thought it might be done to advantage. The writer acknowledges having heard of his popularity as a preacher, and advises him to persevere, with certain cautions not to overdo the work; and he is encouraged by the information that three of his brethren had been sent into Germany, to sow dissension among the heretics there. This letter being shown to the bishop, he ordered Heth to be apprehended; and he was brought to an examination, in which he shuffled not a little. "After his examination," says my author, "it was resolved to send to Heth's

* *D'Alembert* compared the society to a naked sword, the hilt of which was at Rome.

† Written by Robert Ware, 1682—9.

lodgings, at the Queen's Arms in Rochester, where, upon search, in one of his boots were found his beads, and several papers, among which was a license from the fraternity of the Jesuits, and a bull dated the first of *Pius Quintus*, to preach what doctrine that society pleased for the dividing of Protestants, particularly naming the English Protestants by the name of heretics. In his trunk were found several books for denying baptism to infants, with several other horrid blasphemies, which being brought before the whole assembly then present, the bishop adjourned the court, appointing another day for farther investigation, till they had acquainted her Majesty and her honourable council with these passages, and sent for farther instructions how to proceed in the affair. In the meantime Heth was committed a close prisoner, and manacled, till order came from the board."

When Heth was called again into court, the bishop addressed him in a very solemn manner, pointing out the wickedness of his conduct. It appeared by the evidence of the persons with whom he had lodged, that, in order to remove suspicion of his being a Jesuit, he spake against that Order; and by his own confession, it was his practice to preach against Rome, by which he knew he would readily command a hearing; yet all this was with a view to subvert the Reformation and restore Popery. The poor man suffered the reward of his treachery by being three days exposed on the pillory at Rochester, and being subjected to other cruel indignities, which I would not wish the most wicked Jesuit of the present age to suffer. He was condemned to perpetual imprisonment; but he died in the course of a few months. Here I cannot forbear quoting the concluding part of the bishop's address to the court, on the conviction of this Jesuit, as the words seem not inapplicable to our own times. "Therefore, my brethren, consider the condition of your souls. If you start aside once from your principles, having the right way so plainly set before you, you will not only run into Popish slavery again, but be in peril of a total confusion of soul and body; *and if Rome get once her foot upon these dominions again*, not only yourselves and your children, but your princes and nobles shall become slaves to her idolatry."

No. CXLI.

SATURDAY, March 24th, 1821.

My last Number gave a short sketch of the rise, progress, character, and power of the Jesuits. I might go a great deal more into detail in these matters; but this is the less necessary, seeing a work has lately been published, which affords the most ample information on the subject. It is entitled, "A History of the Jesuits: to which is prefixed, a Reply to Mr Dallas' Defence of that Order," in two volumes, London, 1816. Who Mr Dallas is, I do not know, but from the extracts of his work, which are given in the reply, I suppose he is himself a Jesuit. He does, in a most Jesuitical manner, slur over every thing that militates against the character of the society, and endeavours to make them appear the most meritorious body that ever was in the world. The task which he undertook was sufficiently arduous, and one in which no ordinary man could be expected to succeed; and Mr Dallas himself found it impossible to succeed in it, without applying a spunge to almost all that has been written for two hundred and fifty years on the ecclesiastical, and even the civil affairs of Europe, except what was written by the Jesuits, and their admirers. This is one of the ways in which Papists endeavour to screen themselves from the scorn and contempt of the world. They deny every historical fact recorded by Protestant historians that bears the least reflection upon their Church; and though the names of fifty witnesses were adduced, all must go for nothing, because they are enemies of the "Catholic faith." This, in the opinion of the Jesuits, disqualifies any man from giving a true or credible testimony; and thus, by denying the truth of all history, except what it suits himself to admit, Mr Dallas finds the Jesuits a most meritorious, and much injured body of men.

I come now to relate the story of the decline and fall of this powerful body, together with their recent restoration by the present Pope, and before I have done with them, I may give a sketch of their morals from their *Secreta Monita*. "Though the power of the Jesuits had become so extensive, and though their interests generally prospered during a period of more than two centuries, their progress was by no means uninterrupted; and by their own misconduct, they soon excited the most formidable counteractions. Scarcely had they effected their establishment in France, in defiance of the parliaments and universities, when their existence was endangered by the fanaticism of their own members. John Chastel, one of their pupils, made an attempt upon the life of Henry IV.; and father Guiscard, another of the Order, was convicted of composing writings favourable to regicide."

"Their power was brought to a very low ebb, when the war of 1756 broke out, which occasioned the famous law-suit that led to their final overthrow. By that time the society had indicated many symptoms of decay, both in point of talents and activity, and had rendered themselves at once contemptible and odious. They had disgusted the court by their scruples, irritated the philosophers by their clamours,

exasperated the other religious orders by their persecutions, and alienated the public by their long and insolent domination. A reasonable pretext was all that was wanted to put down a sect, which had long ceased to be either popular or formidable. The opportunity was soon furnished by their own imprudent obstinacy. The war recently commenced, had occasioned great losses in their trade with Martinico, (for the Jesuits were merchants upon a very great scale) the weight of which would have fallen in part upon the society's correspondents at Lyons and Marseilles. The merchants, however, alleged that the Jesuits in France were responsible for the debts of their missionaries in America, and insisted upon being indemnified from the funds of the Order. The claim was resisted and a law-suit commenced, which the Jesuits, by virtue of their privilege, removed from the provincial parliament to the great chamber at Paris. This measure rendered the dispute, and their defeat, subjects of more general notoriety. They were condemned to pay large sums to the adverse party, and prohibited thenceforth from meddling in commercial concerns. The sources of their wealth were thus diminished, and their enemies encouraged to renewed attacks. The questions at issue in the commercial dispute, had given the magistrates a plausible occasion for demanding to inspect the constitutions of the society; and in a luckless hour for themselves, they consented to produce their books. The parliament instantly saw, and seized the advantage which they had gained, and resolved to effect the destruction of the Order."

"In March 1762, the French court received intelligence of the capture of Martinico by the British; and dreading the storm of public indignation, resolved to divert the exasperated feelings of the nation, by yielding the Jesuits to their impending fate."—I must confess that this itself was very like a Jesuitical trick. It would have been more honourable for the French government to have condemned the Jesuits upon the ground of their own demerits, than to have made them a sacrifice to appease popular clamour; but this is a point which Papists may settle among themselves. "On the 6th of August, 1762, their (the Jesuits') institute was condemned by the parliament, as contrary to the laws of the state, to the obedience due to the sovereign, and to the welfare of the kingdom. The Order was dissolved, and their effects alienated. But still the members, though no longer dressed in their religious habit, continued to hover about the court; and, had they preserved their original cautious and prudent policy, might have succeeded in recovering their privileges. But former successes inspired them with a fatal confidence. One of the archbishops, indignant that the parliament should presume to dispense with ecclesiastical vows, issued a mandate in favour of the Jesuits; and the fathers were accused of having employed themselves too industriously in the circulation of this paper. The parliament took the alarm, and pronounced a decree, that every Jesuit, whether professor or novice, should, within eight days, make oath that he renounced the institution, or quit the kingdom. In a body whose moral principles were so relaxed, and whose members, while it existed, scrupled no subtleties in promoting its interests, it is a remarkable circumstance, that, as secularized individuals, they acted in this instance with strict integrity, and refused the alternative of the oath. They were, therefore, ordered to quit the kingdom, and this judgment was executed with the utmost rigour. The poor, the aged, the sick, were included in the general proscription. But in certain quarters where the provincial parliaments had not decided against them, Jesuits still subsisted; and a royal edict was afterwards promulgated, which formally abolished the society in France, but permitted its members to reside within the kingdom with certain restrictions.

"In Spain, where they conceived their establishment to be perfectly secure, they experienced an overthrow equally complete, and more unexpected." "The example of the king of Spain was immediately followed by Ferdinand VI. of Naples, and soon after by the princes of Parma. They had been expelled from England in 1604; from Venice in 1606; and from Portugal in 1759, upon the charge of having instigated the families of Tavora and D'Aveiro to assassinate king Joseph I. Frederick the Great of Prussia was the only monarch who showed a disposition to afford them protection; but in 1773, the Order was entirely suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. who is supposed to have fallen a victim to their vengeance. It was long a current story at Rome, that this Pontiff was accustomed to withdraw in the course of the grand mass to take some refreshment; and that a young priest, on one of these occasions, brought chocolate to his holiness, and immediately withdrew; that the proper officiating priest soon after appeared with another cup, the Pope shook his head, as conscious of having received a fatal potion; that he pined from that day of lingering disease which reduced his body to the appearance of a skeleton; and that he was known to have said, in allusion to the secret cause of his death, 'I am going to eternity, and I know for what!'"—*Edin. Ency. Art. Jesuits.*

"The history of the Jesuits, from the period of their suppression to their revival by the present Pope, lies within a very narrow compass. That they have by any means ceased to exist as individuals, although they have done so as a body, will hardly have been imagined for a moment, even by those who possess the fewest means of information on the subject.

They have still survived, in obscurity—the ghosts of their departed greatness—in reduced numbers—with diminished resources, and an exhausted credit; hating, indeed, to look back upon their former flourishing condition, but not without hope that, so long as Popery should maintain her footing in the world, and especially, if ever she should resume any considerable portion of her ancient power, they could not fail to be recognized by all who were not thoroughly acquainted with their history, as the most vigilant and active friends of the Church of Rome. The event has shown that they have not been disappointed. In spite of all the quarrels of that Church with the Jesuits; in spite of the mutual struggle for pre-eminence which has been ever maintained between them; their agency is still too important to be overlooked or despised by that mystical woman of the Apocalypse, who has her seat upon the seven mountains. There is still too much in common between the two systems: their corruptions are too nearly allied, and their interests too closely interwoven, to render it a matter of small import whether the Jesuits shall be again invoked by Papal Rome as her auxiliaries, or not: the influence of light in the world is too strong—the diffusion of the Bible has become too general—and the increase of true religion, in consequence, is too certain to permit a church which loves darkness rather than light, to neglect all the means which lie within her reach, to establish and perpetuate her own system of ignorance and error, by those friends and agents, whose interests are in the main identified with her own.

"The present Pope could not be ignorant that the same causes which led to the formation of the society, were at this moment in active operation throughout the world, and therefore appeared to require the application of the same remedy. 'The Order of Jesuits,' says Villers, 'the most important of all the Orders, was placed in opposition to the Reformation, and it acquired a preponderance proportioned to the enormous mass which it was intended to counterbalance.' It is with reference to the same great object of *opposing the Reformation*, that the present Pope has declared that he should 'deem himself guilty of a great crime towards God, if, amidst the dangers of the Christian Republic,' (in other words, the cause of Popery), 'he should neglect to employ the aids which the special providence of God had put in his power, and, if placed in the bark of St Peter, and tossed by continual storms, he should refuse to employ *the vigorous and experienced Rowers who volunteer their services!!!*' It is in vain that the advocates of his holiness will contend that he desired the aid of the Jesuits against infidelity; for where is the danger to be apprehended from infidelity now? It is against the Protestant Church and cause that the Jesuits, those '*experienced Rowers,*' have now embarked afresh, and it is chiefly with reference to their assistance in making head against the vessel of the Reformation that the Pope has availed himself of their services."—*Hist. Jesuits*, vol. ii. p. 395.

It is not difficult to perceive that the Pope, by the restoration of the Order of Jesuits, meant no favour to those Protestant powers, particularly Great Britain, who had been the chief instrument of his preservation, in the days of his humiliation, under the iron yoke of Buonaparte. It belongs to the nature of Popery not to feel grateful for favours received from heretics. The fact is, there is nothing that heretics can confer upon Papists that will be considered as a favour. Papists consider themselves the lords of the soil wherever they have at any time had an establishment; and whatever service Protestants may render them, it is never considered as a favour, but as a debt which was justly due. Thus for all the kindness which was exercised in making provision for Romish priests in this country, on the breaking out of the French Revolution, when they were banished from their homes, we have been requited by an establishment of Jesuits in the heart of the country; and, as if this were not enough, his holiness issues a Bull restoring the Order, which in every country in Europe, had been suppressed as an insufferable nuisance, to all their former powers and privileges, that they may promote Popery in England, and wherever else they may obtain a footing. The Pope will say that this is for the good of those countries, and of England in particular, and thus he may acquit himself of the charge of ingratitude; but persons who understand the subject will consider the affected benevolence of his holiness, as resembling the good will of a wolf, who has a great affection for a flock of sheep.

The Pope says he would think himself guilty of a crime if he were not to enlist, in the service of the Church, those "experienced Rowers, who volunteer their services;"—that is, who offer themselves voluntarily, to go into all the world, particularly into Britain and Ireland, to endeavour to overturn the Protestant religion, which is the same thing as true Christianity, and to establish, instead of it, the abominable superstition and idolatry of Rome. This is the object of these "experienced Rowers." The society was originally formed for the express purpose of putting down the Reformation; and its restoration, after being dormant for half a century, is for the purpose of extirpating what remains of real Christianity in Protestant countries.

Much as England was annoyed by the Jesuits, in the reign of Elizabeth, and for nearly a century thereafter, the impression of the evil is almost effaced from our minds. We

have seen little of the Order with our own eyes, and we have felt little of their impertinent interference in our personal and domestic affairs; and therefore, we are apt to think lightly of them, as no more dangerous to our peace and comfort than those ideal beings the Brownies and Fairies, of whom we used to read and hear wonderful stories in our childhood. But persons who live nearer the seat of their power, and who have perhaps personal recollections of what they were in the days of their glory, feel more acutely on the subject of their restoration. This appears from the following fact, which I give from the Orthodox Journal, for October 1818, the editor of which is the avowed panegyrist of the Jesuits:—

"The most gratifying information we have to communicate this month to our readers, and to every friend of religion and virtue, is the restoration of the learned and eminent society of Jesuits in the canton of Friburg, in Switzerland, which example Soleure is expected to follow. The particulars of this pleasing intelligence will be found in the annexed article, extracted from the foreign papers." Then follow the particulars, relating to the establishment, privileges, and provision which the canton makes for the society: after which we have the following information:—"The Paris papers of the 18th instant, state, that 'the discontent at Friburg was so great, in consequence of the resolution of the great council for restoring the Jesuits, that several of the inhabitants are preparing to abandon the country, and to emigrate to America.'" The alarm excited in the minds of these honest Friburgers was perfectly natural, considering the well-known character of the men who were to obtain a legal establishment among them, with many great privileges, and much wealth, which would be employed to bring every family and every individual into bondage; but the *Orthodox* editor, who seems to be a Jesuit himself, treats their fears in the following taunting and unfeeling manner. "Surely there must be something tremendously hideous and terrifying in the visage and character of a Jesuit, that these Friburgers prefer abandoning their relatives and country rather than behold the countenance of one of these monsters." Surely, I say, it is so, there is something tremendously hideous, not in the countenance, but in the character of "these monsters" of deceit, and this is not the less terrifying that it does not appear in the countenance, but lies hid in the heart, which is full of rancour and hatred of the truth, and of those who profess it; and will show itself in active hostility, whenever there is a favourable opportunity.

But, says Mr Andrews, "to what part of America these Jesuit haters mean to brush, the French journalists have not informed us. If they go to the United States, they will verify the old proverb, 'out of the frying-pan into the fire;' since there is not a state, we believe, out of the whole thirteen, in which the Jesuits are restricted from exercising their extraordinary and useful abilities. The American government, soaring above that narrow and grovelling passion which rules the enemies of the Jesuits, have granted to their college of Georgetown, in Maryland, all the privileges of a University; a favour highly creditable to the bestowed, and honourable to the bestowers." Thus it seems the Jesuits are spreading over the face of the earth like locusts; and wherever they shall make a lodgement, they will have a most deadly influence on all that is vital and sound in Christianity.

The editor of the Orthodox Journal is evidently the advocate and organ of the Jesuits in England; and since I have a volume of his work before me, I shall give a quotation which lets us into the secret of the manner in which the Jesuits satisfy their consciences that they may lawfully take the oath of supremacy; that is, swear that the king is head of the Church of England. The words are those of a correspondent; but the editor gives them without animadversion, from which we may infer that the sentiments are his own, and those of the body whose cause he advocates:—

"Our hopes in the last Parliament, (that of 1819) are entirely blasted; but we ought not, therefore, wholly to despair, but make one noble effort yet, by the next session. In order to render our endeavours the more hopeful, let us be as *condescending* as possible, and conscience will in *any wise allow*. You seem afraid, had Lord Grey's motion succeeded, that some of our great ones might, without scruple, acknowledge the supremacy. But why not within the proper sphere? What harm can be therein? Our kings have always, since Harry's days, claimed it; their Church all along owned it in them, and I think we have no reason or motive to dispute it; for it is entirely a matter of indifference to us who is head of that Church, or whether it have any such or not. Harry himself, much less his successors, never pretended supremacy in the Catholic Church diffused over the world."—"The bishops of Rome have alone claimed invariably this supremacy over the whole immense Catholic body, and their title has been most authentically owned and confirmed in all ages," (which is a most impudent falsehood.) "As to his (the king's) being head of his own English church, no Christian or Jew can dispute: and, therefore, we ought most readily to allow that supremacy to all its extent. It is only his grace of Canterbury that has any colour or pretence to dispute the matter with the monarch, but for us we have

none. When the happy day comes that will unite our kings and subjects to the church and faith of his and their pious ancestors, then will we salute him as one of the first sons of that church, and hail him with the glorious title of its true defender, a grander title, in my opinion, than any conferred by Rome on any other monarch, because owning him the supporter of the Christian, Catholic, faithful, and Apostolic Church over the whole world. And who could better discharge that high commission, than he who can send forth at his pleasure invincible English fleets, brave Scottish Highlanders, and valiant Irish hearts of oak, to defend the holy faith over all the globe? Let us, in the meantime, *condescend* in every thing we can, and thus form a political union, which is all that can be expected, or rationally wished for."—*Orth. Jour.* Sept. 1819.

This writer tells plainly what are the hopes and anticipations of all the Papists in the empire, though they do not all think it expedient to speak so plainly out. He expects that the king of Great Britain and Ireland, and all the people, shall be reconciled to Rome. Our happy and free constitution shall then be subverted, and our sovereign converted into an absolute monarch, for he shall then dispose of our fleets and armies "at his pleasure;" and he shall send them forth "to defend the holy faith all over the globe;" that is, to fight the battles of the Pope, and compel all men, at the point of the bayonet and the mouth of the cannon, to submit to the holy See. There will be no need of a parliament then, to give counsel and grant supplies, for the pleasure of the sovereign will be enough to raise money, as well as to direct its expenditure. A council of Jesuits will be placed round the throne; and every thing shall be done according to the good pleasure of the Pope and his college de propaganda. If the subject were not too serious for ridicule, I would say it is truly ludicrous to hear men talk of securing the Established Churches of England and Scotland, and in the same breath to propose to admit into power over them, men who, like the Jesuits, avowedly live for no other object but to promote the cause of the Pope, and to procure the establishment of the Church of Rome upon the ruins of all other churches and states in the world.

No. CXLII.

SATURDAY, MARCH 24TH, 1821.

SINCE the publication of my 139th Number, I have received a letter from Preston, which has a just claim to early insertion, though it should break for a moment the connection of my subject. In the circular letter of the society, lately formed there, there is a sentence which led me to infer that the curate of the parish had consented to the truce proposed by the Popish priests; and supposing this to be a fact, I made some remarks which bear more heavily upon that reverend gentleman than the case seems to have warranted. I am indebted to Messrs Walker and Hope for the following correction of that mistake:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

Preston, March 12th, 1821.

SIR,—In your Number of March 10th, you have reflected on the conduct of the late curate of this parish, as if he had made a kind of unholy league with the enemies of the Protestant faith. And as a passage in our letter seems to have occasioned your remarks, we wish you to correct this idea. That gentleman had sufficient reasons for suspending his lectures, but he never made peace with Rome. In the extract which you have made from the history of the Jesuits, published in London, in 1816, their influence as it respects the magistrates and clergy of Preston, even at that period, is, we believe, much over-rated; and at the present time we are happy to say, that we have reason to regard our magistrates as impartial men, and the established clergy as proof against the wily art of Jesuitism. We remain, Sir, Yours, &c.

W. M. WALKER.
WM. HOPE.

It always gives me pain to think that I have mistaken or misrepresented any man, or body of men; but the pain in the present instance is more than counterbalanced by the pleasure of being informed, upon good authority, that matters are not so bad as I supposed.

I proceed now to give a view of the moral system of the Jesuits, from their own SECRETA MONITA. The reader will find an account of this work, and how it came into the hands of Protestants at p. 141. The Jesuits of the present day will disavow it, though it does not contain one rule which the society has not been known to put in practice, when they had the means and the opportunity. The first chapter regards the manner in which they are to conduct themselves when they begin any new foundation, which contains no small portion of *Jesuitism*. The following is the second, and some other chapters entire:—

Chap. II.—In what manner the Society must deport, that they may work themselves into, and after that preserve a familiarity with princes, noblemen, and persons of the greatest distinction.

1. Princes and persons of distinction every where must by all means be so managed, that we may have their ear, and that will secure their hearts; by which way of proceeding, all persons will become our creatures, and no one

will dare to give the society the least disquiet or opposition.

2. That ecclesiastical persons gain a great footing in the favour of princes and noblemen, by winking at their vices, and putting a favourable construction on whatever they do amiss, experience convinces; and this we may observe in their contracting of marriages with their near relations and kindred, or the like. It must be our business to encourage such, whose inclination lies this way, by leading them up in hopes, that through our assistance they may easily obtain a dispensation from the Pope; and no doubt he'll readily grant it, if proper reasons be urged, parallel cases produced, and opinions quoted which countenance such actions, when the common good of mankind, and the greater advancement of God's glory (which are the only end and design of the society,) are pretended to be the sole motives of them.

3. The same must be observed, when the prince happens to engage in any enterprise, which is not equally approved by all his nobility; for in such cases he must be egged on and excited; whilst they, on the other hand, must be dissuaded from opposing him, and advised to acquiesce in all his proposals. But this must be done only in *generals*, always avoiding *particulars*, lest on the ill success of the affair, the miscarriage be thrown upon the society. And should ever the action be called in question, care must be taken to have instructions always ready, plainly forbidding it; and these also must be backed by the authority of some senior members, who being wholly ignorant of the matter, must attest upon oath, that such groundless insinuations are a malicious and base imputation on the society.

4. It will also very much further us in gaining the favour of princes, if our members artfully worm themselves, by the interest of others, into honourable embassies to foreign courts in their behalf; but especially to the Pope and great monarchs; for by such opportunities they will be in a capacity both to recommend themselves and their society. To this end, therefore, let none but thorough zealots for our interest, and persons well versed in the schemes and institutions of the society, be ever pitched upon for such purposes.

5. Above all, due care must be taken to curry favour with the minions and domestics of princes and noblemen; whom by small presents, and many offices of piety, we may so far bias, as by means of them to get a faithful intelligence of the bent of their master's humours and inclinations; thus will the society be better qualified to chime in with all their tempers.

6. How much the society has benefited from their engagements in marriage treaties, the houses of Austria, Bourbon, Poland, and other kingdoms, are experimental evidences. Wherefore, let such matches be with prudence picked out, whose parents are our friends, and firmly attached to our interests.

7. Princesses and ladies of quality are easily to be gained by the influence of the women of their bed-chamber; for which reason, we must by all means pay a particular respect to these, for hereby there will be no secrets in the family but what we shall have fully disclosed to us.

8. In directing the consciences of great men, it must be observed, that our confessors are to follow the opinion of those who allow the greater latitude, in opposition to that of other religious orders; that, their penitents being allured with the prospect of such freedom, may readily relinquish them, and wholly depend upon our direction and counsel.

9. Princes, prelates, and all others who are capable of being signally serviceable to our order, must be favoured so far as to be made partakers of all the merits of the society, after a proper information of the high importance of so great a privilege.

10. Let these notions be cautiously, and with cunning instilled into the people, that this society is intrusted with a far greater power of absolving, even in the nicest cases; of dispensing with fasts, with paying and demanding of debts, with impediments of matrimony, and other common matters, than any other religious order; which insinuations will be of such consequence, that many of necessity must have recourse to us, and thereby lay themselves under the strictest obligations.

11. It will be very proper to give invitations to such to attend our sermons and fellowships, to hear our orations and declamations, as also to compliment them with verses and theses; to address them in a genteel and complaisant manner, and at proper opportunities to give them some handsome entertainments.

12. Let proper opportunities be used to get knowledge of the animosities that arise among great men, that we may have a finger in reconciling their differences; for by this means, we shall gradually become acquainted with their friends and secret affairs, and of necessity engage one of the parties in our interests.

13. But should discovery happen to be made, that any person serves either king or prince, who is not well affected towards our society, no stone must be left unturned by our members, or (which is more proper) some other to induce him by promises, favours, and preferments, (which must be procured for him under the king or prince,) to entertain a friendship for, and familiarity with us.

14. Let all be very cautious of recommending or preferring such as have been any way dismissed from our society, but especially those who of their own accord have departed from it; for let them disguise it ever so cunningly,

nevertheless they always retain an implacable hatred against our order.

15. Finally, Let all, with such artfulness, gain the ascendant over princes, noblemen, and the magistrates of every place, that they may be ready, at our beck, even to sacrifice their nearest relations, and most intimate friends, when we say it is for our interest and advantage.

Chap. III.—How the society must behave themselves towards those who are at the helm of affairs, and others who, although they be not rich, are notwithstanding in a capacity of being otherwise serviceable.

1. All that has been before mentioned, may in a great measure be applied to these; and we must also be industrious to procure their favour against every one that opposes us.

2. Their authority and wisdom must be courted, for obtaining several offices to be discharged by us; we must also make a handle of their advice with respect to the contempt of riches; though at the same time, if their secrecy and faith may be depended on, we may privately make use of their names in amassing temporal goods for the benefit of the society.

3. They must also be employed in calming the minds of the meaner sort of people, and in wheedling the aversions of the populace into an affection for our society.

4. As to bishops, prelates, and other superior ecclesiastics, they must be importuned for such things only as shall appear necessary; and even for these, with a proper regard to the diversity of our evasions, and the tendency of their inclinations to serve us.

5. In some places it will be sufficient if we can prevail with the prelates and curates, to cause those under them only to bear a reverence to our Order, and that they themselves will be no hinderance to us in the exercise of our ministry. In others, where the clergy are more predominant, as in Germany, Poland, &c. they must be addressed with the profoundest respect, that by their and the prince's authority, monasteries, parishes, priories, patronages, foundations of masses, and religious places may be drawn into our clutches; and this is no hard matter to be obtained, in those places where Catholics are intermixed with heretics and schismatics. And for the better effecting of this, it will be of great importance to remonstrate to these prelates the prodigious advantage and merit there will be in changes of this sort, which can hardly be expected from priests, seculars, and monks. But should they be prevailed upon, their zeal must then be rewarded with public commendations, and the memory of the action transmitted in writing to latest posterity.

6. In prosecution of the same end, we must engage such prelates to make use of us both for confessors and counsellors; and if they at any time aim at higher preferment from the see of Rome, their pretensions must be backed with such strong interest of our friends in every place, as we shall be almost sure not to meet with a disappointment.

7. Due care must be also taken by such of our members who have intercourse with bishops and princes, that the society, when these found either colleges, or parochial churches, may always have the power of presenting vicars for the cure of souls; and that the superintendent of the place for the time being be appointed curate, to the end we may grasp the whole government of the church; and its parishioners by that means become such vassals to us, that we can ask nothing of them that they will dare to deny us.

8. Wherever the governors of academies hamper our designs, or the Catholics or Heretics oppose us in our foundations, we must endeavour by the prelates to secure the principal pulpits; for by this means, the society at least may sometime or other have an opportunity of remonstrating their wants and laying open their necessities.

9. The prelates of the church, above all others, must be mightily caressed when the affair of canonization of any of our members is upon the foot; and at such a time, letters by all means must be procured from princes and noblemen, by whose interest the matter may be promoted at the court of Rome.

10. If ever it happen that prelates or noblemen are employed in embassies, all caution must be taken to prevent them from using any religious Order that opposes ours, lest their disaffection to us should be infused into their masters, and they propagate it in the provinces and cities where we reside. And if ever ambassadors of this kind pass through provinces or cities, where we have colleges, let them be received with all due marks of honour and esteem, and as handsomely entertained as religious decency can possibly admit of.

Chap. IV.—The chief things to be recommended to preachers, and confessors of noblemen.

1. Let the members of our society direct princes and great men in such a manner, that they may seem to have nothing else in view but the promotion of God's glory; and advise them to no other austerity of conscience but what they themselves are willing to comply with; for their aim must not, immediately, but by degrees and insensibly, be directed towards political and secular dominion.

2. We must, therefore, often inculcate into them, that honours and preferments in the state should always be conferred according to the rules of justice; that God is very much offended at princes when they any wise derogate from this principle, and are hurried away by the impulse of their passions. In the next place, our members must with gravity protest, and in a solemn manner affirm that the administra-

tion of public affairs is what they with reluctance interfere in; and that the duty of their office obliges them often to speak such truths as they would otherwise omit. When this point is once gained, care must be taken to lay before them the several virtues persons should be furnished with, who are to be admitted to public employs; not forgetting slyly to recommend to them such as are sincere friends to our Order; but this must be done in such a manner, as not immediately to come from us (unless the princes enjoin it), for it may be effected with a far better grace by such as are their favourites and familiars.

3. Wherefore, let the confessors and preachers belonging to our Order, be informed by our friends of persons proper for every office, and above all, of such as are our benefactors; whose names let them always carefully keep by them, that when proper opportunities occur, they may be palmed upon princes by the dexterity of our members, or their agents.

4. Let the confessors and preachers always remember, with complaisance and a winning address, to sooth princes, and never give them the least offence in their sermons or private conversations; to dispossess their minds of all imaginary doubts and fears, and exhort them principally to faith, hope, and political justice.

5. Let them seldom or never accept of small presents for their own private use, but rather recommend the common necessities of the province or college. At home let chambers plainly furnished content them; and let them not appear in showy dresses, but be ready at every turn to administer their ghostly advice to the meanest person about the place; lest they give others occasion to believe they are willing to be helpful to none but the great.

6. Immediately upon the death of any person in post, let them take timely care to get some friend of our society preferred in his room; but this must be cloaked with such cunning and management, as to avoid giving the least suspicion of our intending to usurp the prince's authority; for this reason (as has been already said) we ourselves must not appear in it, but make a handle of the artifice of some faithful friends for effecting our designs, whose power may screen them from the envy which otherwise might fall heavier upon the society.

Chap. V. Prescribes the conduct that must be observed towards such religious persons as are employed in the same ecclesiastical functions with the Jesuits. Chapters VI. and VII. relate to the management of rich widows; how to keep them from marrying again; and how to secure their wealth to the society. For the substance of these two chapters, see THE PROTESTANT, page 141. As it is not my intention to give the whole system but only a selection of passages, I pass on to

Chap. VIII.—How widows' children are to be treated, that they may embrace religion, or a devoted life.

1. As it will behove the widows to act with resolution, so must we proceed with gentleness on this occasion. Let the mothers be instructed to use their children harshly, even from their cradles, by plying them with reproofs and frequent chastisements, &c. And when their daughters are near grown up to discretion, let them then especially be denied the common dress and ornaments of their sex; at all times offering up prayers to God, that he would inspire them with a desire of entering into a religious order, and promising them very plentiful portions, on condition they would become nuns: let them lay before them the many inconveniences attending every one in a married state, and those in particular which they themselves have found by woful experience; often lamenting the great misfortune of their younger years, in not having preferred a single life. And lastly, let them persist to use them in this manner, that their daughters may think of a religious state, being tired of leading such a life with their mothers.

2. Let our members converse familiarly with their sons, and if they seem fit for our turn, introduce them occasionally into the college, and let every thing be shown with the best face, to invite them to enter themselves of the Order; as the gardens, vineyards, country seats, and villas, where those of our society pass an agreeable life: let them be informed of our travels into several parts of the world, of our familiarity with princes, and whatever else may be agreeable to youth; let them see the outward neatness of our refectories and chambers, the agreeable intercourse we have one with another, the easiness of our rules, which yet has the promise of the glory of God: and lastly, the pre-eminence of our Order above all others; not forgeting, amidst our discourses of piety, to entertain them also with pleasing diverting stories.

3. Let us now and then (as if by divine inspiration) exhort them to religion in general; and then carefully insinuate the perfection and conveniences of our institution above others; and take care to set in a due light, both in public exhortations and private discourses, how heinous a crime it is to resist the immediate call of God; and lastly, let them be soothed to the performance of spiritual exercises, to determine them in the choice of such a state of life.

4. We must also take care to provide for these youths, tutors that are firmly attached to our interest, who must keep a strict eye over them, and continually exhort them to such a course of life; but should they seem reluctant, abridge them of some of their former liberties, that by such restraint they may become conformable. Let their mothers set forth the difficulties which the family labour under; and, if, after all, they cannot be brought of

their own accord to desire admission into our society, send them to distant colleges belonging to the Order, under the notion of keeping them closer to their studies; and from their mothers let them receive little countenance, but let our members make use of the most alluring behaviour, that their affections may be brought over to us.

I have not room for another chapter. The tenor of the 9th is, get money, and enrich the society by all possible means; particularly, by inducing persons to bequeath property to them; and by inveigling the heirs and expectants of large estates to join the Order, and become Jesuits, that thereby the estates may fall into the society. I am tired of copying so much disgusting matter as the reader will find in this Number; and I am afraid he will be tired of reading it. It would require about two entire Numbers more to give the whole system; but it is all so like what I have given, that I do not think it necessary to extract much more. I shall introduce my next with a few general remarks on the subject.

No. CXLIII.

SATURDAY, April 7th, 1821.

In my last Number, I gave a specimen of *Secreta Monita Societatis Jesu*, "The secret Instructions of the Jesuits." These secret instructions were not communicated to all the members of the society, but only to persons who had been well tried, and in whom the utmost confidence might be placed. The society had other rules, not so exceptionable, which were put into the hands of her ordinary members; and it was provided, that if ever the "secret instructions," or any part of them, should be divulged to the enemies of the society, or to the world at large, they should be solemnly disclaimed, and denied to be the rules of the society; and those novices who had not been entrusted with the secret, were to be called upon to declare upon oath, that they had never seen such rules, and to produce those which had been put into their hands as the only rules to which they had been required to conform.

To persons unacquainted with the history and character of the Jesuits, the secret instructions will perhaps appear no more than a piece of irony, like Dean Swift's advice to servants, and Dr Wotherspoon's Ecclesiastical Characteristics; and, indeed, I have a suspicion that both these authors must have been acquainted with *Secreta Monita*, and that they formed their respective works according to the model which it furnished. They, however, were only in jest, while Lainez and Aquaviva were in earnest. The infidelity of many servants, in the view of the one, and the defection of certain ministers in the Church of Scotland from the faith and evangelical practice of their ancestors, in the view of the others, occasioned those exquisite pieces of irony which I have mentioned. But the *Secreta Monita* stands upon higher ground. There is no jesting in it. It is a system of legislation, devised with consummate skill, with a deep knowledge of human nature, calculated and intended to enlist the passions of men and women in the service of that superstitious and idolatrous power that has so long held the human mind in bondage, wherever his authority has been recognised. Besides, the history of Europe, from the time of the institution of the Order, till its suppression, shows that these rules were diligently acted upon. The Jesuits insinuated themselves into the palaces of princes, into the cabinets of ministers of state, and into the families of men of all ranks: and by their sacrament of confession they had access to the heart of every man and woman, from kings and queens down to their butlers and chambermaids; insomuch that nothing of a civil or domestic nature could be carried into effect without their knowing it beforehand, and being able either to frustrate or further it, as it might appear to them to affect the interests of their own Order, or of the Church of Rome at large. When the king of Syria found his movements anticipated, and his plans frustrated once and again by the intelligence which Elisha, by divine inspiration, conveyed to the king of Israel, it is said, "the heart of the king of Syria was sore troubled for this thing, and he called his servants, and said unto them, Will ye not show me which of us is for the king of Israel? And one of his servants said, None, my lord, O king; but Elisha the prophet that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber;" 2 Kings vi. 11, 12. Without inspiration, the Jesuits, by means of confession, have been able to do things almost as wonderful, and they have thereby "sore troubled" the heart of many a king and prime minister. According to the first rule of chapter second, princes and persons of distinction every where, were to be so managed, that the Jesuits should have their ear, and that would easily secure their hearts; by which means all persons would become their creatures, and no one would dare to give the society any opposition. This was, in effect, taking the government of the world into their own hands. They became spies, not only of men's actions and words, but also of their thoughts and designs, which they communicated to their general at Rome, and which he communicated to his agents wherever he thought the interest of Rome, or an ally of Rome, might be promoted. And thus what was merely passing in the mind of the king of France might have been made known to the king of Spain, before the former had proposed it to his own servants.

The Jesuits carried on their work with so much cunning and address, that they got the ascendency over great kings before the latter were aware of it; and kings finding that they were unable to extricate themselves, had no alternative but to submit. They thought it better to flatter the Jesuits than to fight them; and thus Henry IV. of France, notwithstanding their attempts against his life, took them into favour, expecting to find in their gratitude that security which the whole strength of his empire could not afford. He was disappointed, and he fell a sacrifice to his own simplicity: and no better can be expected of any one who shall place confidence in a fraternity so notoriously treacherous, and so unfeeling with regard to every thing that does not affect their own Order.

The following is a short specimen of their intrigues in our own country. After the Reformation had been carried a considerable length in the minority of King James VI., it was in danger of being overthrown by the artifice of the Duke of Lennox, a Papist, and a creature of the French court, who had acquired undue ascendency over the young king. Through his influence matters were beginning to assume a new appearance; and both the national liberties and the Protestant religion were in the utmost peril. "This change on the court could not fail to alarm the ministers of the church, who had received satisfactory information of the project that was on foot. Their apprehensions were confirmed by the arrival of several Jesuits and seminary priests from abroad, and by the open revolt of some who had hitherto professed the Protestant faith. They accordingly warned their hearers of the danger they apprehended, and pointed at the favourite as an emissary of the house of Guise and of Rome. Lennox, after holding a conference with some of the ministers, declared himself a convert to the Protestant doctrine, and publicly renounced the Popish religion. The jealousy of the nation was revived and inflamed by the interception of letters from Rome, granting a dispensation to the Roman Catholics *to profess the Protestant tenets for a time, provided they preserved an inward attachment to the ancient faith, and embraced every opportunity of advancing it in secret.* This discovery was the immediate occasion of that memorable transaction, the swearing of the national covenant."—*M'Crie's Life of Melville,* vol. i. p. 262.

Passing over their more public delinquencies, I shall advert shortly to the unspeakable misery which the Jesuits, according to their own rules, inflict upon private families. One of the first things which they endeavour to accomplish in a family, is to corrupt the servants, and gain them over to their interest. If they cannot be so gained, something against them must be insinuated into the minds of their mistresses, that they may be dismissed; then the Jesuit confessor has a parcel of his own creatures ready to be recommended to fill their places, who, of course, become his spies, and inform him of all that they see and hear in the family. Confession gives a Jesuit the complete command of every family, and binds every individual in it to do just what he is pleased to dictate.—See *Secreta Monita,* chap. vi.

But what is still worse than the corrupting of servants, and retaining them as their spies in every family, the Jesuits teach mothers, especially those who are widows, to make the lives of their daughters miserable, in order that they may become *religious;* that is, become nuns, and throw themselves into the arms of the *holy* fathers, in the hope of finding that happiness which they cannot find at home. The mothers themselves have scarcely a choice in this matter. They must do as their ghostly confessors bid them, else they shall be subjected to such penances as will make their own lives miserable. Thus a worse than Egyptian bondage is inflicted on all who submit to the insidious interference and influence of the society of Jesus.

The fiend-like cruelty of the Jesuits is no less manifest in the measures which they take for entrapping young men into the service of their Order. In the 8th rule of the 9th chapter, relating to the children of rich parents, we have the following directions:—"If they have sons who are fit for our turn, let them be allured to us, and the others, (that is, the daughters) be enticed by the promise of small rewards, to enter themselves of different Orders. But should there be an only son, let no means be omitted for the bringing him over to the society, *and freeing him from all fear of his parents;* let him be persuaded it is a call from above; and shown how acceptable a sacrifice it would be to God, *should he desert his parents without their knowledge or consent;* if this be effected, let him enter his novitiate in a remote college, having first given information to the general. But if they happen to have both sons and daughters, let the daughters be first disposed of in a nunnery; and afterwards let the sons be drawn into the society, when they are got into possession of their sisters' effects."

It was the practice of the society to allure young men of genteel appearance, and superior genius, into their Order. They accomplished this by showing them what a happy life the members of the society led. Notwithstanding their vow of poverty, they were wallowing in wealth, and enjoying all the luxuries which wealth could procure. Besides, they were not very strict in restraining the vices of youth. Theirs was what has been called "easy virtue." They would allow the most ample indulgence to youthful passions, provided a decent appearance was preserved, but especially provided the young men would implicitly submit to the rules of the Order,

and become the devoted slaves of the Pope. Thousands were allured by these means; and from the circumstance of selecting young men of superior genius and appearance, the Order of Jesuits came to rise above all that had been instituted before it.

But miserable was the case of every young man who had been induced to profess himself of the Order, even in its lowest degrees, who afterwards repented of the step he had taken, and wished to return to his friends; and miserable was also the case of him, who, upon trial, was found too simple and honest; or not acute enough to serve the purposes of the society. Such persons were dismissed; and all the Jesuits in the kingdom where they resided were instructed to discountenance them; and to whisper about, either that they had been detected in crimes, or had divulged such things of themselves in confession, that it was not consistent with the interest and reputation of the society to retain them. Thus a mark was set upon them, which would remain to the last day of their lives; and they became an excommunicated *cast*, not for any fault in them, but because they were not villains enough to be Jesuits.

"Since those that are dismissed (says Secreta Monita, chap. xi.) do frequently very much prejudice the society, by divulging such secrets as they have been privy to; their attempts must, therefore, be obviated in the following manner. Let them be prevailed upon, before they are dismissed, to give it under their hands, and swear, that they never will directly or indirectly, either write or speak any thing to the disadvantage of the Order; and let the superiors keep upon record, the evil inclinations, failings, and vices, which they, according to the custom of the society, for the discharge of their consciences formerly confessed: this, if ever they give us occasion, may be produced by the society, to the nobility and prelates, as a very good handle to prevent their promotion.

"Let it be immediately published through all our colleges, that such and such are dismissed; and let the general causes of their expulsion (such as an unmortified mind, disobedience, disaffection to spiritual exercises, an obstinate adherence to their own opinion, &c.) be highly aggravated. In the next place, let all be advised to keep no correspondence with them upon any account whatsoever. And if strangers should happen to make any mention of them, let all our members unanimously affirm, in every public place, that the society expels none without weighty causes, spewing out, as the sea, all its dead carcasses, &c.; and let such causes also be artfully insinuated, which have occasioned us any ill-will, that their ejectment may appear to the world with a more commendable grace. In private exhortations, at people's houses, let these be represented as persons very turbulent, and continually importuning a readmission into the society. And let their sad fate be industriously aggravated, who, after exclusion, have happened to come to an untimely or miserable end." Again, "Let the society, by all manner of obligations, endeavour to prevail upon the noblemen and prelates, with whom the dismissed may have any credit or authority, to deny them their countenance; and let it be shown that the common good of an Order, which is as famous as it is useful to the church, should always be preferred to the private advantage of any particular person whatsoever."

Thus, if a young man has once consented to put his neck under the Jesuits' yoke, there is no possibility of his ever obtaining deliverance in this world. He will be deprived of all the privileges and honours of the society when they are pleased to expel him, or when he is pleased to leave them; but he shall not be able to withdraw himself from the sphere of their malignant influence. He shall be the object of unceasing and unrelenting persecution; and every man who shall seem disposed to befriend him, will have his ear filled with stories to his prejudice, so that he shall be left to perish in misery and contempt; and then the Jesuits will triumph in his death as the judgment of God against him, and hold up his case as a warning to all others. It would be less cruel, and if possible less diabolical, if they would murder in cold blood those young men whom they find upon trial unfit for their purpose, than thus to torture them to death by their malignant calumnies.

Every attempt of a Jesuit to make himself familiar to Protestants ought to be repelled at the very first. The approaches of the Order are like the temptations of sin; at first promising and flattering; and not presenting any thing *very* evil or *very* dangerous; but when they have obtained the smallest compliance, they effect a lodgement in the soul, and obtain a command over the body, from which human power cannot grant deliverance. The first chapter of "Secreta Monita" begins thus:—"It will be of great importance, for the rendering our members agreeable to the inhabitants of a place where they design their settlement, to set forth the end of the society, in the manner prescribed by our statutes, which lay down, that the society ought as diligently to seek occasions of doing good to others as to themselves; wherefore, let them with humanity discharge the meanest offices in the hospitals, frequently visit the sick, the poor, and the prisoners, and readily and indifferently take the confession of all, that the novelty of such uncommon and diffusive charity, may excite in the *principal inhabitants an admiration of our conduct, and forcibly draw them into an affection for us.*"

The reader will perceive the "cloven foot" at the conclusion of this rule, but it is still more apparent in the 5th and 7th of the same

chapter. "At their first settlement, let our members be cautious of purchasing lands: but if they happen to buy such as are well situated, let this be done in the name of some faithful and trusty friend. And that our poverty may have the more colourable gloss of reality, let the purchases adjacent to the places wherein our colleges are founded, be assigned by the provincial to colleges at a distance; by which means, it will be impossible that princes and magistrates can ever attain a certain knowledge of what our revenues amount to."—"Let the greatest sums be always extorted from widows, by frequent remonstrances of our extreme necessities."

By the apparent humility and charity above recommended, the Jesuits deceive the simple, and work their way into the good opinion of many respectable Protestants. Nay, though gold be one of their chief idols, they will sometimes be at a little expense to commend themselves and their religion to persons in office, or those connected with them. One of the Order who had recently settled in a certain town, went one day to a gentleman, and presenting him with half-a-crown told him, it was his property. On being asked how that happened? he received for answer, "Ask no questions, I am the Catholic priest; this money is yours, and it is my duty to restore it to you." It was of course to be inferred that he had discovered by confession, that a servant had defrauded his master to that amount; and as might have been expected the circumstance left upon the gentleman's mind a favourable impression of both the priest and his religion. Happily the love of money prevented the trick from being practised to any great extent; else for a few pounds the priest might have purchased the good opinion of all the chief men of the place. That it was a mere trick I am convinced from the rarity of the thing, in a place where Papists are known to form a very large proportion of the thieves. If the priests were able and willing to enforce the duty of restitution, we should hear of instances every day; but the fact is, after all the attention I have paid to the character and the conduct of Popish priests, I have heard of only two instances besides the one above related:—One was an offer of twenty pence to a gentleman in such terms as the above, which, however, he declined accepting, and desired the priest to give it to the poor. Sometime after, the same priest brought him ten shillings, which no doubt alarmed him with regard to the character of his servants, and not knowing the extent to which they might be robbing him, he took the money, which, it is supposed, was a disappointment to the priest, for he came to him no more.

I shall conclude this subject with the "Oath of Secrecy devised by the Roman clergy, as it remaineth on record at Paris, among the Society of Jesus." It is inserted in "Foxes and Firebrands," from a collection of papers by Archbishop Usher.

THE OATH OF SECRECY.

I, A. B. now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael, the Archangel, the blessed St John Baptist, the Holy Apostles St Peter and St Paul, and the Saints and Sacred Host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his holiness Pope Urban is Christ's vicar-general, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments, all being illegal, without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed: therefore to the utmost of my power I shall and will defend this doctrine, and his holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical (or Protestant) authority whatsoever: especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother-church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state, named Protestants, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare, that the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and of other of the name Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist, and advise all, or any of his holiness' agents in any place, wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom, I shall come to; and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the mother-church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels from time to time, as they intrust me, and not to divulge directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance, whatsoever; but to execute all what shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred convent. All which I, A. B. do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed Sacrament, which I now am to receive, to perform, and on my part to keep inviolably: and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof,

I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the Eucharist; and witness the same further with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent this day of An. Dom. &c.

No. CXLIV.

SATURDAY, April 14th, 1821.

Having finished what I had to say about the Jesuits, I shall take the opportunity of a pause or break in the thread of my discussion, to say a few words to some correspondents, who wish to know if I intend at this time to take up the subject of what is called "Catholic emancipation." My friends will be satisfied when I inform them, that it is not lawful in such a work as mine to discuss matters pending in parliament, or indeed any topic of a purely political nature. The late Act relating to cheap periodical publications, lays me under the necessity of keeping within the circle which I prescribed to myself at first; that of exposing the errors of Popery as a religious system, and of showing how these errors tend to the ruin of the souls and bodies of individuals, and to the great injury of civil society, when men holding them have power in their hands.

To such of my readers as have access to the Morning Post London Newspaper, I strongly recommend a series of letters under the signature of Philopatris, as perfectly conclusive and unanswerable on the subject of my correspondents' inquiry. I think the author would render essential service to his country by publishing them in a cheap form, that they might be extensively circulated. In the Morning Post, there is also in course of publication a series of letters addressed to Mr Wilberforce, well worthy of attention. And in the number of that Paper for the 30th of last month, there is a powerful letter by the Reverend Sir Harcourt Lees, Bart. a gentleman who has written more against Popery within the last eighteen months, than almost all his brethren together. I have been informed that his exertions have had a powerful effect in convincing the Protestants in Ireland of the very great danger to their own safety, that will result from the admission of Papists to authority over them, and even some of the priests have felt the power of his pen; one young gentleman, in particular, who was preparing for orders, has abandoned his purpose, and avowed in a letter to Sir H. which is printed in The Religious Retrospect, attached to the Antijacobin Review, for Nov. last, that he has convinced him of the errors of Popery. One thing is certain, we hear nothing *now* of Irish Protestants petitioning to have their enemies set over them, which was common enough of late years; and the change is said to be owing in a great measure to this gentleman's labours.

I have of late received a good deal of information from Ireland, with respect to the practices of Papists in that kingdom. One gentleman writes me as follows:

"Sir,—I concluded my former Letter * with an affecting, but well-authenticated account of one of the numberless instances of those stratagems resorted to by priests and Papists in Ireland, for the purpose of supporting the tottering fabric of Popery; and it is astonishing what effect the pretended conversions of Protestants have upon the minds of that community. Many objects are hereby gained by its votaries: the estimation of that religion, which, as they pretend so many Protestants embrace, is enhanced, and considered the exclusive one; and it cuts off the inquiring or the wavering from any idea of examining into the principles of the reformed religion, which they are assured by their priests, will not bear the test of a death-bed; and thereby giving them an unlimited ascendency over the purses and consciences of their flocks. To gain these desirable objects, every engine is set to work, and every device practised. Of many take the following:

"The priests call at the houses of the better description of sick Protestants, in country places, apparently to inquire after their health. This has all the appearance of good nature; but their real object is to make their flocks believe that they have been sent for by the sick; and as the wisdom of our forefathers, knowing the proselyting system of Popery, enacted a law, enforced by penalty, to prevent Roman Catholic priests from visiting sick or dying Protestants, unless sent for by a Protestant messenger over the age of 16 years; the priest says that the circumstance must be kept secret, but that the sick person has died in the Catholic faith (as they call their profession.) A case of this nature lately occurred in my neighbourhood, when it was asserted by a priest, that a Protestant *clergyman* on his death-bed had sent for him, and had changed his religion. The priest being charged with this report, refused to give any satisfaction, until two Protestant attendants proved upon oath, that the priest only called to inquire after the man's health, and never opened his lips on the subject of religion. Indeed, this practice is so general in country towns and country places, that contrary to the acknowledged hospitality of the Irish, the writer has known of many instances where directions were given, not to admit a priest inside the doors if he should call. Nurse-tenders also are instructed to countenance these practices by admitting the priest at night into the house, and if possible to the sick. In a case of this kind

* See Prot. No. CXXXV.

which came under my own observation, a Roman Catholic gentleman of my acquaintance, and a relative of a Protestant lady who was sick, was so indignant, that he declared that he himself should be the first to prosecute the priest, if he persisted to persevere in such unworthy schemes of clandestine interference.

"A Protestant, a man in comfortable circumstances, had married a Roman Catholic (a custom too prevalent in Ireland, and encouraged by the priests); the sons went to church, the daughter to mass. The writer has been assured by the sons themselves, that they were obliged to watch their dying father, to prevent the introduction of a priest which the man detested; and when every attempt made by the daughter proved abortive to prevail on the dying man to have a priest sent for, she left him in a rage, *to die and be damned!* One of the fraternity having spitefully assured him, that unless he sent for the priest, he should not be buried near his wife, (who was dead,) the dying man mildly replied, 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.'

"The Roman Catholics, Sir, complain of persecution on account of their religion; but is it not a most grievous persecution which they thus carry on by every means *at present* in their power against the poor dying Protestants? Surely a tyrant would allow his dying enemy to die in peace; but this privilege is not allowed to many Protestants who detest Popery. What, Sir, may we expect from men of like principles with increased power? Or what may be expected from a people where Popery is predominant? No longer should we find them privately plotting the advancement of their religion by persuasives, or even by threats of *future* punishment—we should again see present and temporal, not future and spiritual punishment applied—we should again see Smithfield in a blaze.

"I have frequently charged some of the better description of Roman Catholics with believing that the priest has power to forgive sin; but this they have denied, although they allowed that the poor and ignorant of their profession thought so, but they acknowledged that they believed that the priest had power to forgive the sins of a dying person being confessed and anointed; this they call being *prepared;* which still brings us to the same conclusion, that they are made to believe that it rests with the priest whether any person shall go to heaven or to hell. Indeed, that this is the opinion of Roman Catholics is most evident; because they will not allow a Roman Catholic, at least, to be buried in consecrated ground in country places who has not been *prepared* by the priest. Many instances could be adduced of their coffins being thrown by night out of their graves, and even over the walls. Their enmity, instigated by their priests, is particularly excited against the bodies of those Roman Catholics who had renounced Popery, to deter the living from following their example. In cases of this nature, Protestant clergymen have been prevented from reading the burial service, and more than once knocked down.

"The last ceremony to be performed by the priest to the dying after confession and the sacrament, is the application of what they call the consecrated oil to particular parts of the body; after which the person is not on any account to speak one word, otherwise the entire ceremony must be gone through again; in this stage the person is said to be *prepared.*

"A man formerly in my employment, of dissipated morals, having been considered in a dying state, the priest was sent for, who a short time after informed me, that he had *prepared* him. He also told the persons about the sick man, that he was now *as free from sin* as the child new born; and that he would soon as certainly be in heaven. Unfortunately for the priest's prediction, the man recovered, but has not since evidenced the least change for the better in his religious or moral conduct.

"Whatever pretended sanctity may be thought to reside in the use of this holy oil, as well as in other Popish ceremonies of even higher supposed sanctity, I am convinced that many of the better informed Roman Catholics, as well as many of the priests, are not so well satisfied with their efficacy as to place unlimited confidence in them: in general you will find that Roman Catholics of liberal education, look with indifference upon those things so highly valued by the commonalty. I have heard several express perfect indifference, bordering upon contempt, in speaking of them, and I shall hereafter show that some of the priests themselves are of the same way of thinking, whatever they may pretend to the contrary.

"We are told that a drowning man will grasp at a straw, and it is thus that many Roman Catholics, convinced that all is not right in the sight of God, laying hold on the promises and performances of the priest, go down to the grave with a lie in their right hand; but if perchance, these straws of Popery are not thought sufficient to bear up the mind of the dying Papist, to believe that he can safely depend upon them, and he requires some legitimate proofs of their efficiency; the priest will either not condescend to give him any, or refer him to the legends of the saints and the infallibility of the church.

"A young gentleman, a Roman Catholic of my acquaintance, while studying physic, was attacked by a pulmonary complaint, which brought on consumption. His attendance at chapel while in health was very regular, and he passed for a moral and religious young man. As his complaint gained ground, it became necessary for him to examine the grounds of his dependence for future happiness or misery, and he then found that his attendance at chapel was merely from habit, not conviction;

he feared to trust to the mere ceremonial of a religion, which he saw had more of show than substance in it; I found him, on visiting, in a state of great unhappiness of mind, and on asking him whether his priests could not give him any ease? he said, 'Ah no! they are extremely ignorant, they indeed promise great things, but they cannot convince my judgment; they cannot support their promises by any legitimate proofs, that they are well founded;' he then begged I would give him my opinion on this subject. In fact, I found that this young gentleman had, in consequence of seeing through the tinsel ceremonies of Popery and the conduct of the priests, become an infidel. He first doubted the system of Popery to be the way of salvation held out to guilty man, and from thence he declined by a natural gradation into a disbelief of all revealed religion. Under these circumstances I saw it was necessary first to convince him from the Bible, that there was a religion revealed, and next to open or reveal the way of salvation as contained in that revelation. On requesting to see a Bible, (though the family were considered highly respectable,) they assured me they never had such a thing! and on inquiring whether one of their Bibles could not be procured, they told me they did not know, but *perhaps* the priest might have one. I did not however send. Sufficient for me here to observe, that by arguments drawn from the prophets, this young gentleman was convinced that they all wrote of Christ, and therefore, that they must have been divinely inspired; consequently that Jesus was the great sacrifice for sin, and the *only* intercessor for guilty man, when applied by the Holy Spirit and received as the gift of God, by faith.

"The wisdom of our forefathers having a more *experimental* knowledge of the intolerant spirit of Popery, had fenced the vine of the Reformation by guards and fences, to prevent the wild beast in the Apocalypse from breaking down the hedges and devouring its tender branches. A law had been enacted to prevent the public processions of the Host, and of the images of saints in these kingdoms: this was not only a just enactment to suppress an open display of idolatry, but also a wise measure to defend his Majesty's loyal subjects from insults and injuries to their persons. However, of late years, the Papists have revived these processions in Ireland, and we have now a yearly display of the ceremony of bearing the Host in public procession with all the glitter and paraphernalia of a sumptuous canopy, with gorgeous plumes and incense; priests, nuns, friars, monks, all in their costumes; and every thing else that is calculated to arrest the attention of admiring crowds and prostrate devotees: it is true that these ceremonies are, *at present*, carried round the chapel yards; but in country places, many of these yards are not enclosed, and border the public roads; so that the traveller or curious stranger is in danger of being insulted or knocked down, unless he take off his hat in obeisance to the idol. I have known several instances of insults offered, and injuries sustained on these occasions, by Protestants, who justly conceived that taking off the hat was an act of adoration, and I have also known many Protestants, to their shame I speak it, who, to gratify an idol curiosity, have conformed to the dictates of these devotees, by thus worshipping the idol which they had set up. The Papists take particular notice of Protestants who attend to see these ceremonies, and they are instructed to believe that such are favourably inclined to Popery in their hearts. We may soon therefore expect that, with an extension of Roman Catholic privileges, their circuits of procession will be extended also through our streets and cities, when every person who shall not prostrate himself to the Host, will be laid prostrate by the club of a fanatic. I am not now stating a theory or an idle fancy, I have my eye on some countries in Europe, where Popery is predominant, and where the statements I have made have really occurred.

"On these days of procession, the parish priest invites the assistant priests and his acquaintances to a sumptuous entertainment prepared at his house. The writer, some years ago, dined with them more than once on these days, and he can bear testimony, that every rarity to gratify the palate had been provided, even from a distance of several miles round; with the best wines that could be procured. One of these days falling upon a Friday, which is called a *fast* day, he has counted *eleven* different kinds of the best fish dressed in every possible way, with pies, puddings, peaches, grapes, &c. &c. A curious incident occurred on one of these occasions: the company having assembled in the priest's drawing room, were coming down a dark staircase to dinner; when one of the priests pinched the writer, (who being dressed in black he mistook for a priest,) and whispered, that *this was the best procession*, to which I answered, 'I thought so too.' My intelligent neighbonr finding his mistake, pushed through the crowd to conceal himself.

"I said that many of the priests do not believe the efficacy imputed by them to many things counted holy. Surely the above anecdote speaks a volume in confirmation of this assertion, and as I myself was the person, there can be no mistake in it. Now, Sir, if one of the highest, if not the highest mystery, as I believe they call these things, can be so disrespectfully spoken of by a priest, what must they think of those other mysteries counted less sacred. If it be said that this was the language or opinion of an individual priest, I admit it; but surely

we must draw a fair deduction from the thing itself, that he would be afraid to speak in this way, if he did not know that other priests held these things in the same contempt. Why, therefore, it may be asked, do the priests countenance and support such rites and ceremonies? The answer is obvious, they are a means for keeping the people satisfied with a religion which presents them with such finery and shows, and of bringing a good deal of money into the priests' coffers. The late Sir Richard Musgrave, Bart. who wrote a history of the last Irish Rebellion, assured me, that he has frequently seen priests take the wafers from their pixes, (boxes to hold what they call the consecrated wafer or Host) and seal their letters with them. If they believe in transubstantiation, they must believe that each wafer contains, nay, is the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and nothing but the greatest scepticism to their avowed or professed opinions, could induce them to apply this consecrated Host to such profane uses.

"To such a system of religion and to their priests, may we not by application address the following quotation from Acts xix. 24 to 28 inclusive:—'For a certain man, named Demetrius, a silver-smith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen; whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth: moreover, ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands; so that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought; but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth. And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.' "J. A."

The following is from the same writer:—

"Sir—The Scriptures say there is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; no, says the Papist, there are many more: there is the Virgin, and the Virgin's reputed mother in chief; and there are a host of inferior intercessors in the saints, whose stock of merit, beyond their own wants, forms an inexhaustible fund, to draw on to supply the want of it in the Church; and indeed, if we could suppose such a stock of merit belonging to the saints to exist, it must be inexhaustible, if it were not expended long since. Papists very wisely fearing the capability of this reservoir to hold out, are daily adding to it by other means. In many parishes in Ireland, there are one or more old men or women, (if old maids so much the better,) whose pretensions to sanctity stand very high in the estimation of their more ignorant neighbours, and as it is believed that they daily repeat more rosaries than are required for their own salvation, they are supposed to have a pretty large stock of this article to spare, which they are at liberty to barter to the most advantage with their less industrious neighbours for things of more immediate consumption. I have known an old maid of this celebrity, draw so largely on her grocer in this way, by way of barter, that he was obliged at last to close his account with her. The merit of these persons' prayers is considered to be so highly valued in heaven, by many of the ignorant Papists, that they think it would be a kind of injustice to refuse their petitions; consequently, they are frequently employed to pray for the recovery of the sick, or for success in any business, and if the event should prove propitious, these saints claim with the merit, a correspondent gratuity.

"I understand, that by some regulation of the Vatican, no persons can be now *sainted* by the Pope, until a century after their decease, and unless some well-attested miracle can be adduced to prove their claim to such high pre-eminence; this prevents the scandal which would otherwise attach itself to the appointment of persons to this high favour, before old time has sunk their frailties and their vices into oblivion; but as the friends of a reputed saint cannot get them an immediate appointment on the Pope's list, they perform their part in providing the necessary credentials, by the attestation of some miracles performed by the candidate saints to entitle their names to be placed on the Pope's *Cadet* list for future preferment. So much sanctity was said to reside in a parish priest who died a few years ago in my neighbourhood, (of whom it was industriously circulated, that several miraculous cures were wrought,) that at least 10,000 persons daily for a month frequented his grave; and as fast as the clay could be thrown upon his coffin, it was sold out in bits to the eager multitudes, until all their wants were supplied."

I find I have not room here for the sequel of this letter, but I may find room for it in a future Number. Every account which I receive from Ireland, confirms what I have endeavoured to prove, that Popery continues in that country to exhibit all the grossness of the dark ages, of which I hope to adduce more evidence before I have done.

No. CXLV.

SATURDAY, APRIL 21ST, 1821.

HAVING procured a copy of Berington and Kirk's work, as noticed at the conclusion of

my 139th Number, it will be expected, after what I said of it, that I should inform my readers what sort of a work it is; and, indeed, it is by no means so formidable as I was led to expect from the account which I had got of it. I judged from its title that it would be easy to refute it, but this I find was not correctly given by the writer whose account of it I inserted in Number 138. It should have been, "The faith of Catholics *confirmed* by Scripture and *attested* by the fathers of the five first centuries of the church." My opponents however gain nothing by the correction: for this title is every whit as objectionable as the incorrect one. The meaning of the word *confirm*, according to Johnson, is, 1. "To put past doubt by a new evidence—2. To settle; to establish—3. To fix; to radicate—4. To complete; to perfect—5. To strengthen by new solemnities or ties." The first is most applicable to the case in hand;—"to put past doubt by a new evidence." This supposes that "the faith of Catholics" is originally derived from some other source than the Bible; and that the Bible is no better than a corroborating witness relating to something which they know without it, and independently of it. This inference is perfectly legitimate; but the authors have very candidly given me the advantage of an explicit avowal, that they conceive the Scriptures "to be of no use, as an *independent* rule of faith, for this plain reason: That as all the truths which we believe to be divine, and which are the objects of our faith, came immediately from Christ, and were taught by the apostles, before those Scriptures (of the N. T.) were written—we are not at liberty to think that those truths would not have remained, to the end of the world, pure and unadulterated, had that primitive state of things continued: that is, had it never seemed good to any of those apostolic men, as it did to St Luke, to commit to writing what they had learned." *Intro.* p. xiv. Again: "Hence we lay it down as an introductory and certain principle; that all that, and that only, is of Catholic faith, which God has revealed, AND the church proposes to our belief.—'The Catholic Christian,' observes the learned bishop of Meaux, 'forms not his faith by reading the Scriptures; his faith is already formed before he begins to read; reading serves only to *confirm* what he before believed; that is, to confirm the doctrine which the church had delivered to him.'" *Ibid.* p. xxi.

Thus it is plainly avowed by modern Papists, that the Bible is with them of no authority by itself. I consider the simple statement of this fact enough for my present purpose; and I hope it will satisfy every one who really believes and understands his Bible, that Papists are not Christians, and that they cannot be reasoned with as such. The primary, or more properly speaking, the *only foundation* of their faith is the testimony of the church: and what is this church? it is the Pope of Rome with his army of priests—nothing else. It is a body of men, who, for hundreds of years, have been notorious for all the vices by which men can possibly degrade themselves. What is called *Church* History groans under the load of filth and abomination which attaches to the character of the head of this church; namely, the Pope of Rome; and like the head have been the members. To deny this would be to set aside the evidence of all history; and no man will deny it, who is not prepared, if occasion require, to call good evil, and evil good. It is needless to tell me that the present Pope is a sober man, and that many of the priests of the present age are men of decent and sober lives. The light of the Reformation has forced them into this state in spite of the demoralizing tendency of their system; but Berington and Kirk, and all genuine Papists, believe that the doctrine of Christ has descended to them uncorrupted through all the Popes and priests of the dark ages, though they were men whose mouth was an open sepulchre, under whose tongue was the poison of asps, and in whose ways were destruction and misery.

I beg leave to ask our Glasgow Papists, if they would consider the profligate inmates of the stews in the most depraved and polluted lanes of our city, as infallible judges and teachers of what is pure in morals, and amiable in domestic life? If they say they would not, then I say, they ought not to receive the testimony or teaching of their clergy with regard to Christianity, which is a system of perfect holiness. It is not possible that such men could teach it in sincerity; for though bad men may sometimes be found to speak sound doctrine where the contrary would be detected and condemned, men so profligate and abandoned as the Popish priests generally were before the Reformation, and under no restraint from men better informed than themselves, would feel compelled to teach corrupt doctrine as an apology for their impure lives.

I know that it will be replied, that the promise of Christ to be with the apostles and their successors to the end of the world, secures the clergy against teaching false doctrine, whatever their lives may be; that having received *holy orders*, they are, *ex officio*, infallible; and therefore are not to be put upon a footing with the heroes and heroines of our Saltmarket, who, though they be equally innocent, have not received the unction which the priests have received, and by which they are incapable of error. In reply, it is enough to tell Papists that this is a mere fancy of their own, without the shadow of countenance from any thing that Christ and his apostles taught. The apostles themselves had no security against falling into error; but that which was con-

nected with their personally abiding in Christ. It is admitted that they had extraordinary gifts as men divinely inspired; and therefore they were miraculously preserved from falling into error, either in preaching or writing. This cannot be said of the ordinary ministers of the church who lived after them; and they have therefore no right to call themselves successors of the apostles, seeing they do not possess those endowments which were imparted to inspired men, and to none else. But even apostles would not have been credible teachers of Christianity, or preachers of the gospel, if their own lives had not exhibited the influence of the gospel in some measure of purity, and obedience to the law of God. Christ told them plainly, John xv. 2—8, that in order to their fruitfulness, it was necessary that they should abide with him, and he in them. Ye are clean (says he) through the word which I have spoken unto you; that is, they were holy persons; they were born of the incorruptible seed of the word; and it was necessary that they should continue holy, and in personal union with Him who is the fountain of holiness, and the pattern of it, otherwise they would remain unfruitful, not only in their personal state and character, but also as labourers in the Lord's vineyard. I do not say that the word of God may not be spoken by men who are not savingly united to Christ, or that God in sovereignty may not bless his own word spoken by men of impure heart; but I do say, that there is not a promise in the whole Bible to such persons—not a word that can encourage them to hope that they shall be kept from error, or that their teaching shall be profitable, or tend to the salvation of any soul. "Unto the wicked the Lord saith, What hast *thou* to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth? seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest my words behind thee. When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers. Thou givest thy mouth to evil, and thy tongue frameth deceit," Psal. l. 16—19.

Here, by the pen of the Psalmist, the Holy Spirit has drawn the very character which the Popish priests have exhibited for hundreds of years,—from the very time that the Church of Rome began to give heed to seducing spirits; from that time they have been unceasingly employed in building up and upholding, by all deceiveableness of unrighteousness, a system of fraud, imposition, will-worship, superstition, and idolatry. These are the men who give themselves out as the depositaries of the pure doctrines of Jesus Christ, and who boast that they would have kept them pure and uncorrupted through all ages, though the New Testament had not been written! No wise man would make an unclean vessel the depository of that which he wished to keep clean; and it would be blasphemy to suppose any such thing to have been done by Jesus Christ. As well may we suppose him to have intrusted the keeping and transmission of his word to the devil himself, whose kingdom is to be destroyed by it, as to his active agents, whose own wicked lives compelled them to conceal what condemned them.

I might very honourably leave Berington and Kirk's work here, as condemned by its own title, and their admission that they do not derive their faith from the Bible, but use the Bible only as a secondary authority to *confirm* what they have received by tradition, through the medium of men as ignorant, and, I suppose, a great deal more wicked than themselves.

I think it worth while, however, to give a more particular account of this work, especially as it is understood to be a masterpiece of its kind, and to be quite unanswerable. And I confess, that if it were necessary to scrutinize the immense heap of matter brought together from the canons of councils and the writings of fathers, many of whom most Protestants never heard of before; if it were necessary to ascertain the degree of credit due to all these men, and whether the works ascribed to them were genuine, and truly translated, it would be a work which few men would choose to undertake. But my readers know that I admit no writing, later than those of the apostle John, to be of authority in matters of religion; and thus I reduce ninety-nine hundredth parts of the great volume, of 500 pages, to a dead letter.* The arguments which profess to be drawn from the Bible, are such as a child may answer; and it is not necessary that I give any more than a specimen.

Before going into detail, however, it is right to remark, that notwithstanding the boasted certainty with which the Church of Rome teaches the true faith, without any mixture of error or mistake, my authors declare themselves not sure whether they have given the true "faith of Catholics" correctly or not. To the work they prefix the following DECLARATION. "As the sole design of the following compilation is to aid the instruction, and to strengthen the faith, of the Catholics of this united kingdom; and as inaccuracies, in the wording of the propositions; in translating so many various passages; and in stating some opinions, notwithstanding our utmost care, may have escaped us, we submit, without reserve, the work in all its parts, to the judgment and correction of our ecclesiastical superiors, and the other pastors of the church, who are the appointed guardians of her faith and discipline.

October 2, 1812. "JOSEPH BERINGTON.
"JOHN KIRK."

* I have given my reasons for rejecting the authority of the fathers in some former Numbers, particularly in my replies to Juvenis, (See Number 132.) so that I need not go over the ground again.

The danger of mistaking the meaning of the Bible, when read by common people, forms the leading subject of a long Introduction; but what do the readers of this work gain, in point of security, from mistake, when the authors are not certain whether they understand their own meaning, or whether they have expressed it intelligibly? They submit to their ecclesiastical superiors whether or not they have written properly; and if these said superiors should condemn their propositions, they must confess their error whether they are convinced of it or not. In point of fact, Bishop Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London district, has pointed out a number of inaccuracies, which Mr Berington explains and palliates as well as he can, in a letter addressed to this, his superior—"in order," he says, "to remove or lessen difficulties, not to excuse inaccuracies, or to controvert objections." In the Church of Rome, to enter into controversy, or differ in opinion from a superior, is out of the question. An ordinary priest must never presume to know what is of faith, so well as a bishop; no bishop must presume to know it so well as his metropolitan; and no metropolitan dares to know it so well as the Pope. In this church, therefore, the body of the people can know nothing at all with certainty, for few of them have personal access to the head, who alone is not responsible to a superior, and who has power to dictate to inferiors whatever he pleases, as articles of faith. Yet Papists are continually boasting that theirs is the only Church in which the true faith is declared with *infallible certainty!* This is almost as great an absurdity as transubstantiation; and only he who believes the one is able to believe the other.

Professing to lay down and prove at length only those points which distinguish the church of Rome from other churches, my authors scarcely touch the doctrine of the Trinity, the atonement, and some more which they say are held in common with them, and others: but those men do not believe in the scripture doctrine of the Trinity, who worship a fourth person under the title of Our Lady, and a host of inferior deities; and he does not believe in the atonement of Christ, who thinks that his salvation requires another propitiatory sacrifice, such as the mass. In short, there is not one peculiar doctrine of Christianity which the Church of Rome does not directly or indirectly contradict and set aside by her own traditions; and yet there are Protestants, and clergymen too, who publicly maintain in print, that the fundamental principles of their own church, and of that of Rome, are substantially the same.

Berington and Kirk have the merit of going to work in a very regular methodical manner. Euclid himself did not lay down his propositions more distinctly; but Euclid's chief object was, and his great excellence consists in demonstration, in which my authors have failed in almost every instance. I shall give the first three propositions entire, as they are expressed in few words. PROP. I. "When man has sinned, the remission and pardon of sin is not attainable by him, otherwise than in and by the merits of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, who freely purchased our ransom. PROP. II. It is only through the same merits of Jesus Christ, that the just man can obtain either an increase of holiness in this life, or eternal happiness in the next." This seems very sound scriptural doctrine; and there are many pertinent texts adduced to prove that the pardon of sin is to be obtained through Christ alone; yet the first four words of the first proposition contain the germ of a very great error. "*When* man has sinned," implies that sometime or other, he has *not* sinned, or that he is free from sin. This Papists believe to be the case with them all when they have confessed and received absolution from the priest; and it is only *when*, after confession, they have sinned, they need to seek for pardon again. If this were not explicitly taught by the Church of Rome, I might have passed over the above as merely an awkward mode of expression.

PROP. III. "The good works of a just man proceeding from grace and charity, are so far acceptable to God, through his goodness and sacred promises, as to be *truly deserving of an eternal reward;* God crowning his own gifts, when he crowns the good works of his servants." Here the leaven of Antichrist appears more distinctly; and it is that which leavens the whole mass of Popery;—it is the doctrine of human *deserving*, or human *merit*, for the ideas are the same. This strikes at the very root of Christian doctrine; for if any man shall think of his *works as deserving* an eternal reward, in any sense whatever, he cannot be saved by grace, and therefore, if the Bible be true, he cannot be saved at all. He who in any sense deserves a reward, claims it as a debt; and it cannot be withheld from him without injustice. The Church of Rome places her "just man" in the impious and bold attitude of one who can say to his Maker, Pay me that thou owest. He demands his reward, not as a favour, but as an act of justice. It matters not that the expression is guarded on both sides, by such words as grace and charity, and, God crowning his own gifts when he crowns the good works of his servants. These are words without meaning, when connected with human deserving; for where this has possession of the mind, grace can have no place whatever: otherwise grace is no more grace. That is, things divinely established must change their nature, ere man, who is a sinner, can be saved in virtue of his doings or deservings. The church of Christ in heaven and on earth, with one voice acknowledge, that not by works of righteousness which we have done, that is, not

according to our deservings, but according to his mercy he hath saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. If there were a particle of *deserving* in the mind of any one of the glorified saints, it would make such a discordant note in the song of the redeemed, as would mar the harmony of the blessed company, while ascribing salvation to Him that loved them, and washed them from their sins in his own blood.

The proposition on which I am commenting is followed by more than a page of scripture passages given at length; but there is not a word of man's works deserving a reward in any one of them, of which the reader may satisfy himself by turning to his Bible, according to the following references: Mat. x. 42; xvi. 27, and xxv. 34, 35; 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25; 2 Cor. iv. 17, and v. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Heb. vi. 10; 2 Pet. i. 10; Jam. ii. 14, 17, 26. They give the passages from their own translation, which in these instances at least, is as silent about human merit and deserving as ours. They say a great deal indeed about the glorious reward with which the people of God shall be crowned in heaven; but it is all of grace, of sovereign, rich mercy, without the least hint of their having deserved it.

As I hope my readers will examine the passages of the New Testament above referred to, to see if there be any thing of human deserving acknowledged in them, I think it right to observe, that there is one of them which, at first view, may seem to give some countenance to it. It is Heb. vi. 10; "God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love," &c. From this Papists argue, that if it would be *unrighteous* in God not to reward his people's good works, surely they must *deserve* a reward. But the difficulty will vanish when it is recollected that the persons addressed are considered as heirs of salvation; and who, trusting in the promise of God, had suffered the loss of all things, and had taken joyfully the spoiling of their goods, knowing that they had in heaven a better and an enduring substance. They had endured such things, knowing that God had promised a heavenly inheritance; they had confided in this promise; and the words of the apostle strongly assert, that God is not unrighteous to disappoint those who had confided in him, and who had given evidence of their confidence by their work of faith and labour of love. There is nothing in the passage that can lead us to suppose that these works are so *meritorious*, as that it would be unrighteous not to reward them; but merely that it would be unrighteous in God, not to fulfil his own promise. If we speak of the pardon of sin, as a mere matter of speculation, it would be absurd to say, God would be unjust if he did not pardon it. Yet when the subject is viewed in the light of the gospel, his justice and righteousness are as conspicuous in the matter as his mercy and faithfulness. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and *just* to forgive us our sins." Not surely because we have deserved or merited forgiveness, but because he has promised this to all who believe in Christ, and his justice as well as his faithfulness is engaged for the fulfilment of the promise.

The authors then very impudently tell their readers, that "the doctrine of these three propositions is very generally admitted, and all controversy on the subject, in regard to the belief of Roman Catholics, has in a great measure ceased." This will serve the purpose of making Papists believe that the doctrine of salvation by grace, without our "works and deservings," is now very generally exploded, and that the grand fundamental article of the Reformation is discarded by Protestants; and if it were so, I would say, there is little remaining of the Reformation, as it respects doctrine, that is worth contending for. But the controversy has not ceased; and it shall not cease while the world stands. It involves no less than the question, whether Christ alone has merited the salvation of his people? or whether they must wholly or in part merit it for themselves? The former is the doctrine of the Bible; the latter is that of false religion under every form. They are as much opposed to one another as light and darkness, Christ and Belial; and the controversy cannot terminate while both of these powers have an interest and a subject in the world.

I am afraid some, even of my Protestant readers, will think I have made more of this expression of the Popish authors than it deserves. They will say, I am disputing about a word; and that there can be little danger in saying our good works *deserve* an eternal reward, when it is admitted that these good works are the gifts of God's own grace. But we ought not to forget, that it was by a single word that the serpent beguiled Eve, and ruined our whole race. "Ye shall NOT surely die," was his assertion, and it is only in one word different from the declaration of God, by which he warned our first parents of what would be the consequence of their disobedience. So this one word, DESERVE, in relation to men's works and eternal life, will as effectually overturn and frustrate the grace of the gospel, as the devil's lie did the happiness of the paradisiacal state. As I have said somewhere already, the smallest degree of obliquity extended, will lead to an infinite distance from the right line of truth, so this notion of human *deserving* in the Church of Rome, led by degrees to the monstrous error, that the saints performed more good works than were necessary for themselves, and thus furnished the Pope with a storehouse of merit, which he sells for money to those who have none of their own.

No. CXLVI.

SATURDAY, April 28th, 1821.

I SHALL occupy a few pages more with a review of Berington and Kirk's work, in order to show how artfully Popish writers introduce their peculiar doctrines, and on what a slight foundation they are made to rest. I say they are artfully introduced; for in the work before me, there is an attempt to bespeak the good opinions of Protestants, by laying down first, certain propositions, which, with a verbal exception or two, seem very orthodox, and such as most Protestants would subscribe. The doctrine of merit, indeed, is rather too plainly expressed in the third proposition to escape the notice of any person acquainted with the Bible. The authors in this instance make a trip in the threshold; but they soon recover their feet; and in the fourth proposition, they speak as soundly as Luther would have done. PROP. IV. "The merits of Jesus Christ, though infinite in themselves, are not applied to us otherwise than by a right faith in him; which faith is one, entire, and conformable to its object, which object is divine revelation, that is, the truths taught by Christ, and to that revelation, or to those truths faith gives an undoubting assent." Now, though I do not admire the mode of expression in some parts of the proposition, it is, upon the whole, agreeable to the doctrine of most Protestant churches: so much indeed, that Bishop Poynter finds fault with it, because he says, "it may be inferred that *man is justified by faith alone.* And Mr Berington replies, by referring to other parts of the work in which his readers are guarded against that *error.* This it seems is the secret by which Papists understand one another's writings; whereas a simple Protestant, having his attention directed to such a proposition as the above, with a number of Scripture texts appended to it, would be led to conclude that the Church of Rome was as sound in the faith as those of England and Scotland.

PROP. V. "The divine revelation contains many mysterious doctrines, surpassing the natural reach of the human understanding; for which reason, it became the wisdom and goodness of God to provide some way or means, whereby man might be enabled to learn what these mysterious doctrines are—means apparent to all, proportioned to the capacities of all, and sure and certain to all." This again seems all very good, if we are to understand that the means which God has provided for imparting to men the knowledge of the mysterious doctrines of the Bible, are, the enlightening influences of his Holy Spirit, to accompany the reading and preaching of his word; and this is the import of the passages of Scripture which are cited in support of the proposition; which are, Mat. xi. 25, 26, and xvi. 17. John xv. 22. 1 Cor. i. 27, and ii. 12, 13. Eph. iv. 11, 14. I request the reader to turn to his Bible, and read all these passages, and judge for himself, whether they do not plainly intimate, that God, by his word and Spirit, gives the saving knowledge of his will for their salvation, to children and others of the capacity of children, without reference to any other authority whatever.

But the legs of the lame are not equal. And thus it is that the greatest Popish authors, even when they state one truth with some degree of propriety, cannot state two together without stumbling into an error. Thus it is that my authors, in their sixth Proposition, overset all that had the appearance of truth in their fifth. The sixth is:—"The ways or means by which to arrive at the knowledge of the divine truths, is, by attention and submission to the voice of the pastors of the church; a church established by Christ for the instruction of all; spread for that end through all nations; visibly continued in the succession of pastors and people through all ages. Whence the marks of this church are, unity, visibility, indefectibility, succession from the apostles, universality, and sanctity."

Here my authors take their departure from every thing that has even a resemblance of real Christianity. They slide away from the authority and teaching of the Holy Spirit by means of the Scriptures, to the authority and teaching of their own church; that is, of the Pope and his clergy. These become invested with supreme authority over the Scriptures themselves, so as to dictate with infallible certainty what the Scriptures mean; and what is sacred Scripture and what is not. It is not necessary that I should follow them through all the corruption that unfolds itself in the sequel of their thick octavo volume; because I have already exposed almost every article of their creed; and if any candid person should ever be at the pains, after reading this exposition of the "Faith of Catholics," to peruse what I have written in former Numbers, I shall not be under any apprehension of hearing him say, that no Protestant has attempted an answer. The fact is, there is nothing in the work before me but what has been written hundreds of years ago, and answered hundreds of times; and if this work were replied to by name, and every proposition in it refuted to-morrow, some Papist would come forward next year, with the same things under a new title; and then he and his party would boast that no man was able to refute *him.*

Let us see, however, in a few instances, how they support their propositions by the authority of Scripture. For the authority of the church as laid down in the sixth proposition, the first quotation is Mat. xviii. 17, "And if he will not hear them, tell the church. And

if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." The thing to be proved is, that all men are bound to receive the truths of divine revelation from the lips of the priests, who are divinely commissioned to declare what is the true sense of revelation. This, I say, is what is to be proved; but what is meant for the proof has no relation to the subject. Let the reader turn to the passage, and he will find that our Lord is prescribing the manner in which an offending brother ought to be treated. If private admonition has no effect upon him, his fault must be told to the church of which he is a member. If he refuse to hear the church; that is, if her admonition shall not produce the desired effect of making him repent of his fault, then he must be put away, and ever after looked upon as a heathen, as one who never believed the gospel, unless he shall repent; which, if he do, he may be received into the church again, just like any other man who repents of his sins, and professes his faith in Christ. Here there is not a word of the priests being divinely appointed as the sole oracles of the Christian faith, and the standing, infallible interpreters of the Word of God. The other passages under this head have as little relation to the point which they are adduced to establish. They are as follow; Mat. xxviii. 18, 19; Mark. xvi. 15; Luke x. 16; Rom. x. 17, 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; 1 John iv. 6. Some of these passages relate to the divine commission of the apostles, and the extraordinary authority with which they were invested as Christ's inspired ambassadors; but there is not a word of their having successors, endowed with the same powers; yet this is the thing which the Church of Rome asserts, and which these passages are cited to prove.

For the "Unity" of the church, their leading text is, John x. 16, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." There can be no question that the church of Christ is one body; and this text proves it; but it does not prove it to be the Church of Rome, and therefore it proves nothing to the purpose. Throughout the whole work this is taken for granted, though it is the very point at issue. Hundreds of passages of Scripture are given at length, descriptive of the purity, and glory, and perpetuity of the church of Christ, as a body united to Him who is the Head; sanctified by his Spirit, so as to be without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; and protected by his mighty power, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. All this we know to be true of the spiritual church of Christ; but in the work before me, and in most other Popish books, it is all applied to the Church of Rome; and applied with such confidence, as if it were universally acknowledged, that she is the holy and spotless spouse of Christ. There is a barefaced impudence in this, as well as an impiety that will find no parallel, but in the other lies and impositions of the upholders of the mystery of iniquity. I have written largely on the difference between the Church of Christ and the Church of Rome, in different parts of my work, and need not resume the subject here. See particularly pages 425—436, and No. CXI.

The 8th proposition of Berington and Kirk, is as follows:—"From the testimony and *authority* of the Catholic church, we receive the Scriptures, and believe them to contain the revealed will of God." There is not one passage of Scripture adduced to prove this proposition; and not one father earlier than the third century. The 9th proposition is merely an extension of the 8th. Let us see therefore how it is supported by Scripture: "As the church can assuredly tell us, what particular book is the word of God; so can she, with like assurance, tell us the true sense and meaning of it, in controverted points of faith: the same Spirit which directed the writing of the Scriptures directing the church to understand them, and to teach all mysteries and duties as are necessary to salvation." By the church, the writers still understand the Church of Rome; and that she possesses the privilege here ascribed to her, is attempted to be proved by the 15th of the Acts, which records an application by the church in Antioch to that in Jerusalem, where it was known some of the apostles were, for information upon the question of imposing circumcision upon the Gentile converts; but the Church of Rome has no more to do with this, than the Church of Scotland. The other passages cited are equally irrelevant: see Mat. xvi. 18, and xxviii. 18, 19, 20; John xiv. 16, 26, and xvi. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15. Some of these passages do indeed contain a promise of the presence of the divine Spirit with the apostles, to preserve them from error, and lead them into all truth; and some of them imply a promise of the same Spirit to be with all true believers for their sanctification and comfort: but what is this to the Church of Rome? Suppose she had continued in the faith of Christ, she would have enjoyed the benefit of these promises only in common with other churches. Before she can justly claim a monopoly of them, she must produce her patent, which she has never yet done.

Besides, it is well known in point of fact, that there never was a church in the world that exhibited a greater variety, and even contrariety of opinions, than the Church of Rome. Nay, she actually had within her bosom great *saints*, who taught all the variety of doctrines that are to be found at this day, among all the sects in Christendom, from the highest Supralapsarian down to the lowest Pelagian. The learned are well acquainted with the furious

and long-continued controversies, on the most fundamental points of doctrine, between the Thomists and the Scotists, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, the Jansenists and the Jesuits. Opposing sects, in different communions, could not be more furiously *pitted* against one another, than those Popish orders were, while abiding in the same communion, which afforded an example of schism, in the proper sense of the word, much more disgraceful than the separation of one sect from another when they cannot live comfortably together. This is matter of fact, known to all the world; and yet the Church of Rome has the effrontery to maintain in the face of the world, that she alone possesses the privilege of assuredly telling us the true sense and meaning of the Scriptures on controverted points of faith! Here is another absurdity almost equal to transubstantiation!

On the subject of purgatory and prayers for the dead, these authors adduce as their leading proof from Scripture, 2 Maccabees xii. 43—46; and in order to *confirm* what is said in that apocryphal writing, they introduce some passages from the New Testament, which, as I showed, when discussing the doctrine of purgatory, have no relation to the subject. Indeed my authors themselves candidly confess that this doctrine has little support from Scripture. Thus they speak in their introduction: —"The Catholic reader will now be sensible, should any point of his belief seem to receive little support, or even no support, from any text of Scripture, that its truth is not thereby affected, as its divine origin from Christ, and its descent from the apostles, remain the same; and, therefore, that the doctrine of *purgatory* and the *invocation of saints* stand upon the same foundations as that of the authority of the church, though, in support of the former, the evidence of Scripture be comparatively weak. Why, or how, this has happened let him say, "Who hath known the mind of the Lord, and hath been his counsellor," Rom. xi. 34.

With all due submission to these reverend authors, I maintain, that *they* ought to tell us "how this has happened,"—that in support of the doctrine of purgatory, the evidence of Scripture is comparatively weak. Protestants who do not profess to believe any thing in religion but what they find in Scripture, do not pretend to know the mind of the Lord from any other source. But Papists do pretend to know the mind of the Lord, independently of Scripture; therefore they ought to tell us why a doctrine that forms an essential and most lucrative part of their system, has little support from Scripture. But it seems, that with all their infallibility or *inerrancy*, as they pedantically call their faculty of knowing all articles of faith with infallible certainty, they know no more than other men. They do not even know that they know any thing; for whether they do or not, depends upon their lawful superiors.

I take leave of this work with remarking, that it seems rather intended for confirming Papists, than for converting Protestants; and I believe it has not been seen by many of the latter. I do not recollect ever to have seen it advertised; and a learned dignitary of the English church, who has been long engaged in controversy with the Church of Rome, on reading my first notice of it, wrote me that he knew nothing of such a book. I suspect that it was not intended for the Protestant meridian, else some pains would have been taken to make Protestants better acquainted with it.

When speaking, in one of my late Numbers, of the folly of Protestant Dissenters in petitioning for what is called Catholic emancipation, I remarked, that the wolf might tell a flock of sheep that he had laid aside his claws and his teeth; but that they would be silly sheep indeed who would believe him. On this subject, a correspondent has favoured me with a communication, with which I conclude the present Number.

AN OLD STORY VERSIFIED,

By the Rev. JOHN GRAHAM, A. M.

A CAREFUL shepherd had a flock
Of thriving sheep—his only stock,
Their pasture he with walls surrounded,
As wolves throughout the land abounded.
Great were his pains, his labour long,
To make the barrier high and strong;
Yet often as he went to sleep,
The wolf broke in and slew the sheep.
At last he finds his work complete,
No entrance left but at the gate;
His flock protected and at peace,
Began to flourish and increase.
Till full of years, and honest pride
At his success—the shepherd died.
A son succeeded, mild and kind,
Of liberal and gentle mind,
Who wish'd indeed to save the sheep,
And yet the wolves in humour keep.
Him the submissive brutes petition,
To pity their forlorn condition;
Of their primeval rights denuded,
And from the pasturage excluded.
They vow'd—they swore—their alter'd mind
To sheep had long become so kind,
They would not put a tooth or foot on
The choicest, fattest leg of mutton.
Their ancestors, they all confess'd,
Of harsher notions were possess'd;
Had often broke the shepherd's wall,
And made the sheep in thousands fall;
Spread death and desolation round,
And stain'd with blood the blushing ground
But they—kind souls—had other kidneys
As noble as Sir Philip Sidney's.
Mild as Melancthon—they would keep,
And help to feed this flock of sheep.
The shepherd fearing such a trial,
Was resolute in his denial;

Till by false friends extremely puzzled,
He let the wolves in strongly muzzled.
Pared from each foot was every claw,
And twenty straps bound up each jaw;
Each wolf was forc'd an oath to pass,
He would eat nothing there but grass.
The wall was levell'd and the meeting
Twixt wolves and sheep was grac'd with greeting;
One would suppose through all the plain,
The golden age was come again;
Sheep join'd with wolf, hard names to call
The builders of the levell'd wall.
A few bold watchmen dared to cry
Against this frightful novelty,
And said it soon would come to pass,
That wolves would think all flesh is grass;
And in their plenitude of power,
The silly, feeble sheep devour—
These warnings are all giv'n in vain,
Within the fold the wolves remain.
The watchmen meet contempt and hate,
As "born two hundred years too late,"
Vile bigots, who for private ends,
Would disunite the new made friends.
Meantime the claws which had been cut,
Grew strong and sharp on every foot;
Some of the straps are old and worn,
And others from the muzzle torn;
Slender and few those that remain,
Give tenfold discontent and pain,
Till as an useless galling "*brand*,"
They're all drawn off with gentle hand,
Then starts the shepherd as from sleep,
Resolv'd to save the trembling sheep;
Suspicion shows, and late takes care,
New straps and muzzles to prepare:
But vain is all precaution now,
The grim wolf knits his horrid brow;
The muzzle he rejects with scorn—
And on that melancholy morn,
Destruction rages through the fold,
The sheep are slaughter'd young and old;
In vain for help the shepherd cries,
Amidst his butcher'd flock he dies,
And curses in his hapless fall
The day he moved his father's wall.

SAT SAPIENTI VERBUM.

LIFFORD, April 5th, 1821.

Happily this *jeu d'esprit* is nothing but a fable, though when it was written, and even when I sent it to the compositor, there was some probability of its soon becoming a reality. The wall must now remain uninjured, and the wolf be kept out of the fold for another year at least; and perhaps by that time, the wolves will be regarded with such favour by a majority of the shepherds, that they will be admitted without any muzzle at all. I think my worthy correspondent has made a slight mistake in representing the wolves as acknowledging the faults of their ancestors, and professing that they themselves were more kind and gentle; for certainly the wolf of the present day possesses the same qualities as wolves possessed a thousand years ago; and those whom the animal is meant to represent do not profess to be different from their ancestors. The tendency of all their writings, at this day, is to make it appear that their religion was always tolerant and merciful; that their fathers were always persecuted, but never persecutors; which, in point of fact, is about as true, as that sheep have always been in the habit of devouring wolves, but that wolves never devoured sheep.

No. CXLVII.

SATURDAY, MAY 5TH, 1821.

I HAVE lately received from a correspondent, on the continent, a document which is curious in itself, and of considerable importance in my controversy with the Church of Rome. Those who are acquainted with the correspondence which was carried on in the Glasgow Chronicle, in which this work commenced, will recollect that I mentioned a famous bull of indulgence, which had been granted by the Pope to the ancient house of Kilravak. The existence of this bull was positively denied by one or both of my opponents; and on my referring to several literary gentlemen by name, who could bear witness that they had seen it, the objectors were silenced, though they had not the grace to make confession, or acknowledge their error. The document before me is not merely a bull of indulgence granted to a family, but it actually confers upon an individual the power of granting a dispensation, relating to matters of the greatest importance in morals, to as many as he pleases. My correspondent says, "I have very unexpectedly got my hands upon the original of the subjoined document, signed by the proper authorities at Rome, and stamped by the *Sigillum Officii Sacri*." "It may be necessary," says he, "to mention, that these powers of absolution are given by his holiness only to the dignitaries of the church, such as archbishops and bishops of the different dioceses, as also to a few who are high in favour with the court of cardinals. You may, therefore, know how difficult it is to get a sight of such a document. I am not at liberty to say how I obtained it, or to give the name of the *favoured one* to whom it is addressed, but I give you it, word for word, even to its errors." From prudential considerations, I forbear giving the name of my correspondent, for English gentlemen travelling in Popish countries are in danger of getting into trouble, by writing to their friends what they see and hear, especially if it happen to meet the eye of any Jesuit, who could soon communicate the fact to his brother Jesuit in any part of Europe, and the hapless traveller would be in danger of being overtaken by the officers of the Inquisition.

The reader, however, may perfectly rely on the authenticity of the following. The learned will, indeed, perceive from the monkish style of the Latin, that it cannot be a piece of British Protestant manufacture. The errors in point of style which my correspondent mentions, have made it difficult to render some parts of it into English; and though I have

availed myself of the aid of a classical scholar, I am not sure that the translation is perfectly correct. I therefore give the original *verbatim et literatim*, as I received it. I would not willingly do injustice even to the Pope; and if any of his children, who may be supposed to understand their father's language better than Protestants, shall point out any mistake in the translation, I shall cheerfully publish it.

It is addressed on the back, "Tibi Dilecto in Christo,———Salutem in Domino. Ex S. Pœnitentiaria Gratis."* Its title within is, "MICHAEL MISERATIONE DIVINA EPISCOPUS ALBANENSIS, S. R. E. CARDINALIS DE PETRO SS. DD. PAPÆ ET SEDIS APOSTOLICÆ MAJOR PŒNITENTIARIUS," and then commences.

"Tibi dilecto in Christo Confessario ab Ordinario Loci ad excipiendas utriusque sexus Sacramentales Confessiones legitime approbato infrascriptas concedimus facultates, quibus, pro Foro Conscientiæ, et in Sacramentali Confessione, Auctoritate Apostolica, uti valeas, et non aliter; Ita tamen ne debeas illas cuilibet manifestare; nisi necessitas aut utilitas id exegerit.

Primo. Absolvendi ab Excommunicatione ob manus violentas injectas in Clericos, aut Presbyteros, sive Sæculares, sive Regulares, in casibus tamen non deductis, nec de facili ad Forum Ordinarii deducendis; dummodo non sit sequuta mors, vel mutilatio seu Lethale vulnus, aut ossium fractio; et injuncta congrua Pœnitentia salutari, cum obligatione caute et competenter satisfaciendi parti læsæ.

II. Absolvendi a Censuris contra Duellantes inflictis, dummodo casus ad Forum Ordinarii non fuerint deducti: Injuncta gravi Pœnitentia salutari, et aliis injunctis, quæ fuerint de jure injungenda.

III. Absolvendi quoscumque Pœnitentes, sive Viros, sive Mulieres, (exceptis Hæreticis publicis, sive publice Dogmatizantibus,) a quibusvis Sententiis, Censuris, et Pœnis Ecclesiasticis ob Hæreses tam nemine audiente, vel advertente; quam coram aliis externatas, ob Infidelitatem, et Catholicæ fidei abjurationem private admissas, Sortilegia, ac Maleficia etiam cum sociis patrata, necnon ob Dæmonis invocationem cum pacto donandi animam, eique præstitam Idololatriam, ac Superstitiones exercitas, ac demum ob quæcumque insinuata falsa Dogmata incursis, postquam tamen Pœnitens complices, si quos in præmissis habeat, ordinario Loci, vel Sacræ Inquisitionis ministro in locis, in quibus viget Sacræ Inquisitionis Auctoritas, prout de Jure, denunciaverit: In aliis vero locis, facta a Pœnitente seria promissione denunciationem peragendi cum primum, et meliori modo quo judicio tuo fieri poterit, coram Ordinario Loci; Et postquam, in singulis casibus hæreses coram Te secreta abjuraverit, et pactum cum maledicto Dæmone initum expresse revocaverit, tradita tibi syngrapha forsan exarata, aliisque mediis superstitiosis, ad omnia comburenda, Injuncta pro modo excessum gravi Pœnitentia salutari cum frequentia Sacramentorum, et obligatione se prudenti judicio tuo retractandi apud personas coram quibus hæreses manifestavit, et reparandi illata scandala.

IV. Absolvendi a Censuris incursis ob violationem Clausuræ Regularium utriusque sexus, dummodo non fuerit cum intentione ad malum finem, etiam effectu non sequuto, et dummodo casus non fuerint ad Forum Ordinarii deducti; cum congrua Pœnitentia salutari. Et insuper absolvendi mulieres tantum a Censuris, et pœnis Ecclesiasticis, ob violationem ad malum finem Clausuræ Virorum Religiosorum incursis, dummodo tamen casus occulti remaneant; Injuncta gravi Pœnitentia salutari, cum prohibitione accedendi ad Ecclesiam, et Conventum, seu Cœnobium dictorum Religiosorum, durante occasione peccandi.

V. Absolvedi a Censuris ob retentionem, et Lectionem Librorum prohibitorum incursis, postquam tamen Pœnitens Libros prohibitos, quos in sua potestate retineat, ordinario Loci, seu alii, cui de jure consignaverit, vel consignandos, Tibi dederit; Injuncta congrua Pœnitentia salutari.

VI. Absolvendi a casu Sedi Apostolicæ reservato ob accepta munera a Regularibus utriusque sexus; injuncta Pœnitentia, et quando agitur de muneribus infra valorem decem scutorum, aliqua eleemosyna judicio tuo taxanda, et caute eroganda, cum primum poterit, in beneficium Religionis, cui facienda esset restitutio; dummodo tamen non constet, quod illa fuerint de bonis propriis Religionis: quatenus vero accepta munera vel fuerint ultra valorem scutorum decem, vel constet fuisse de Bonis propriis Religionis, facta prius restitutione, quam si de præsenti adimplere nequeat, præstita in tuis manibus obligatione restituendi intra terminum tuo arbitrio præfiniendum, alias sub reincidentia.

VII. Absolvendi Religiosos cujuscumque ordinis (exceptis monialibus, nisi fueris pro ipsis ab Ordinario Loci approbatus vel deputatus) non solum a præmissis, sed etiam a Casibus, et Censuris in sua Religione reservatis.

VIII. Commutandi, consideratis causis, omnia Vota simplicia, in alia Pœnitentiæ, seu pietatis opera: exceptis quinque Votis Sedi Apostolicæ reservatis, scillicet Castitatis, et Religionis, ac trium Peregrinationum, nempe ad Sacra SS. Apostolorum Limina, ad S. Jacobum in Compostellis, et ad Jerusalem; nec non Votis pœnalibus ad sese arcendum a peccatis; et insuper Voto non ludendi; ac Votis, in quibus agitur de præjudicio, vel de Jure Tertii.

IX. Dispensandi ad petendum debitum Conjugale cum Transgressore Voti Castitatis, qui Matrimonium cum dicto Voto contraxerit: Monendo hujusmodi pœnitentem, ad idem votum juvandum teneri, tam extra licitum usum Matrimonii, quam si marito seu uxori respective supervixerit.

X. Dispensandi cum Incestuoso, sive Incestuosa, ad petendum debitum conjugale, cujus jus amisit ex superveniente occulta affinitate per

* Probably for Gratia.

copulam carnalem habitam cum Consanguinea, vel Consanguineo, sive in primo, sive in primo et secundo, sive in secundo gradu suæ Uxoris, seu respective Mariti: remota occasione peccandi: Et injuncta gravi pœnitentia salutari, et Confessione Sacramentali semel quolibet mense, per tempus arbitrio tuo statuendum.

XI. Dispensandi super occulto Impedimento primi, necnon primi et secundi, ac secundi tantum gradus affinitatis provenientis ex illicita copula, quando agatur de Matrimonio cum dicto impedimento jam contracto: Ita tamen, ut, si hujusmodi affinitas proveniat ex copula cum Matre Desponsatæ nativitas Desponsatæ copulam ipsam antecedat: Monito Pœnitente de necessaria secreta renovatione consensus cum sua putata Uxore, vel suo putato Marito, certiorato, seu certiorata de nullitate prioris consensus, sed ita caute, ut ipsius delictum nusquam detegatur: Remota oocasione peccandi: atque injuncta gravi Pœnitentia salutari, et Confessione Sacramentali semel in mense per tempus arbitrio tuo statuendum.

XII. Dispensandi super impedimento occulto Criminis, dummodo sit absque ulla machinatione, et agatur de Matrimonio jam contracto: Monitis putatis Conjugibus de necessaria secreta renovatione consensus: ac injuncta gravi Pœnitentia salutari, et Confessione Sacramentali semel quolibet mense, per tempus arbitrio statuendum.

XIII. Item dispensandi super occulta Irregularitate contracta ex violatione Censurarum dumtaxat cum Sacerdotibus, vel in Sacris Ordinibus constitutis, tam Sæcularibus, quam Regularibus.

Volumus tamen, ut supradictis facultatibus De licentia proprii Ordinarii uti valeas tantummodo per Triennium, a data præsentium computandum: Et abstineas absolvere a Casibus Reservatis Locorum Ordinariis, nisi facultatem ab iisdem obtinueris.

Datum Romæ ex Ædibus Nostris,
die 9 Decembri, 1819

(Signed) R. Mazio, S. E. Corrector.

And upon the back of the Seal,

(Signed) J. Pio, S. Pœn^{riæ} Sec^{rius}."

POPISH INSTRUMENT.

Translation.

Endorsed on the back,

"To the ——— beloved in Christ; safety in the Lord. From the Holy Penitentiary, Grace."

Entitled within,

"Michael, by Divine mercy, Bishop of Albania, of the Holy Roman Church. Cardinal *de Petro*, and Superior Penitentiary of our Holy Lords, the Pope and the Apostolic See."

And commencing,

"To thee ——— beloved in Christ, Confessor, legally approved by the Ordinary of the place for receiving the Sacramental confessions of both sexes, we grant the undermentioned powers, which thou art empowered to use for a Court of Conscience, and in Sacramental confession by Apostolic authority, and not otherwise. So, however, that thou oughtest not to exhibit them to any one, unless necessity or utility should require it.

First. Power of absolving from excommunication on account of having laid violent hands on the Clergy or Presbyters, whether secular or regular: in cases, however, that have not been brought, or that cannot easily be brought before the Court of the Ordinary, provided that death has not ensued, or mutilation, or a mortal wound, or a fracture of the bones. A heavy and salutary Penance being enjoined, with the obligation of carefully and sufficiently satisfying the party injured.

Second. Of absolving from the censures pronounced upon Duelists; provided that the cases have not been brought before the court of the Ordinary. A heavy and salutary Penance being enjoined and all other things which ought of right to accompany it.

Third. Of absolving all the Penitent, whether men or women, (except avowed Heretics, or those who openly teach their doctrines) from all kinds of sentences, censures, and ecclesiastical penalties, on account of Heresy, whether when no person heard or observed it; or when thrown out in the hearing of others:—for Infidelity, and abjuration of the Catholic faith, privately avowed;—Sorcery and witchcraft committed with accomplices; also for invocation of the Devil and an agreement of consigning to him their soul; for idolatrous worship paid him, and unhallowed rites; and in short for every kind of false doctrine inculcated; after however the Penitent, as of right he ought, has disclosed his accomplices in the afore-mentioned crimes, if he has any, to the Ordinary of the place, or to the officer of the Holy Inquisition, in those places where the authority of the Holy Inquisition prevails. In other places, however, let the Penitent come under a solemn engagement of communicating this disclosure, as soon as possible, and in the way which shall seem to you the best, before the Ordinary of the place. And after he shall, in every instance, have secretly abjured the heresies before you, and recalled the compact entered into with the evil one;—and have delivered to you the written agreement executed, if any; with the other symbols of superstition, that they may all be burned. Having enjoined according to the degree of his wickedness a severe and salutary penance, with a frequent use of sacraments, and exacted an obligation of retracting his sentiments according to your prudent advice, in presence of those before whom the heresies were uttered; and of removing the scandal so produced.

Fourth. Of absolving from censures incurred

by the violation of the residences of Religious Orders of either sex, provided that it was not done intentionally for a wicked purpose, and without any event having followed from it, and whilst the cases have not been brought before the court of the Ordinary;—with a suitable and salutary penance. And moreover of absolving women only, from the censures and ecclesiastical penalties incurred by having violated for a wicked purpose the residence of religious men, whilst only the cases remain concealed: having prescribed a severe and salutary Penance, with a prohibition from entering any Church, Convent, or Monastery of the said Religious orders, during the continuance of the Penance.

Fifth. Of absolving from the censures incurred for retaining and perusing prohibited Books;—after, however, the Penitent shall have delivered up the prohibited books which he may have in his possession, or intrusted them to thee that they may be delivered up; to the Ordinary of the place or to some other person lawfully authorized to receive them. A suitable and salutary penance being enjoined.

Sixth. Of absolving from a case reserved for the determination of the Apostolic See, for gifts received from Regulars of either sex, penance being enjoined. And when the case is concerning gifts under the value of ten Scuta,* some charitable donation is to be required at thy discretion, and carefully exacted as soon as possible for the benefit of Religion, to which restitution was to have been made; provided always that it does not appear that these gifts were of the proper effects of Religion. In so far, however, as the accepted gifts were either above the value of ten Scuta, or appear to have been given out of the proper effects of Religion, restitution is to be previously made, which if the individual cannot immediately perform, an obligation is to be lodged in thy hands that this shall be done within a certain limited time to be fixed by thy judgment; otherwise according to circumstances.

Seventh. Of absolving the Religious of every order, (except Nuns, unless thou hast been approved of, or authorized, by the Ordinary of the place, to act for them) not only from the aforesaid, but also from Cases, and censures, reserved for the determination of their own community.

Eighth. Of commuting, on having considered the causes, all simple Vows, into others of Penance, or works of piety; with the exception of the Five Vows reserved for the Apostolic See, viz. of Chastity, of Religion, of the Three Pilgrimages, namely, to the sacred threshold of the Holy Apostles; to St James *in Compostellis*, and to Jerusalem; and from the penal vows to restrain themselves from sin; and from the vow against indulging in amusement; and from vows made with respect to Prejudice and the *Jus Tertii*.

Ninth. Of granting a dispensation to a Transgressor of the Vow of Chastity, who has contracted a matrimonial connection with this vow upon him, to obtain the *Debitum Conjugale*. Such a Penitent being admonished that in every other respect except the lawful matrimonial privilege, this vow is to be considered binding, as also in the event of surviving the husband or wife respectively.

Tenth. Of granting a dispensation to an incestuous man or woman, to obtain the *Debitum Conjugale*, which right he or she had lost from a supervening secret affinity, by a carnal connection having taken place with a male or female relation, whether in the first, or in the first and second, or in the second degree of his wife or her husband respectively. The occasion of the sin being removed; and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once every month, for a period to be appointed according to thy judgment.

Eleventh. Of granting a dispensation with regard to a secret impediment of the first, also of the first and second, and of the second degree of affinity by itself, arising from unlawful connection: when the question is concerning Matrimony already contracted with that impediment existing. So, however, that if an affinity of this kind arises from connection with the mother of the espoused woman, the birth of the espoused shall have preceded that connection. The Penitent being admonished of the necessity of a secret renewal of the compact with his supposed wife, or the woman with her supposed husband; or assured of the nullity of the former compact; but so cautiously that the delinquency shall by no means be made public. The cause of crime being removed, and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once a month, for a period to be fixed by thy judgment.

Twelfth. Of granting dispensation with regard to the secret impediment of a crime, provided that it has occurred without any evil design, and the question is respecting matrimony already contracted. The supposed spouses being admonished of the necessity of a secret renewal of the bond, and a severe and salutary penance being enjoined, and sacramental confession once every month, for a period to be fixed by thy judgment.

Thirteenth. Likewise of granting dispensation concerning a secret irregularity contracted by a violation of censures, namely, with Priests, or those in Holy Orders whether Secular or Regular.

It is our will, however, that thou shouldst be empowered to use the above mentioned powers by License from the proper Ordinary for three years only, from the date of these

* A Scuta or Scudi is about four shillings sterling.

presents ; and that thou shouldst abstain from granting absolution from cases reserved for the Ordinaries of the various places, unless power to do so is obtained from them.

Given at Rome, from our Palace, on the ninth day of December, 1819.

(Signed) R. Mazio,
Corrector of the Holy Church

(And upon the back of the Seal) J. Pio,
Secretary of the Holy Penitentiary."

I shall not make many remarks on this modern piece of Popish jugglery : but it lets out certain secrets with regard to the practice of *religious* persons, which it is worth while to mention ; such for instance, as the monks and nuns being in the practice of stealing into one another's apartments. The 4th clause empowers the confessor to grant absolution for this fault, which would have been needless if the practice did not exist. Nay, so profligate and shameless are these *religious* women, that they will violate for a wicked purpose the apartments of the *religious* men; and the confessor is empowered to grant absolution for this, provided it be kept secret. This is the fruit of their vows of chastity ! this is the boasted sanctity of those who have obtained *holy* orders, and who profess to have fled from the pollutions of the world !

We learn from the third clause that, as lately as the year 1819, sorcery and witchcraft, and the crime of making unlawful bargains with the devil, were understood to be practised in the Church of Rome. Whether such things are really practised, I shall not take upon me to say ; but it is certain that the Pope and his "holy lords" believe they are ; from which we may infer that the gross darkness of the tenth century has not yet passed away from the capital of the *Christian* world.

The 8th clause empowers the confessor to dispense with all simple vows, five only excepted, on condition of some penance or pious work being performed ; and as those of civil allegiance are not excepted, the confessor can, whenever he pleases, relieve a man from the obligation of any oath he may have taken to the king or government that affords him protection. The simple fact that this is an existing law in the Church of Rome, ought to open the eyes of some of our statesmen and others, who seem to have fallen into a most romantic fit of love and affection for the children of Babylon, if not for the old lady herself. Every reader of history knows that the Pope exercised the power of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance ; and here is a proof that he does so still, which proves what I have all along maintained, that Popery is unchanged, let simple Protestants say what they will to the contrary.

The 9th, 10th, and 11th clauses need no comment. They lay open so plainly the gross wickedness which Rome tolerates, that I think no person can doubt the truth of what I asserted at the commencement of my work, that the Church of Rome grants indulgence, or rather dispensation to her members to commit sin.

I had prepared to be inserted here the present state of Rome with regard to indulgences, from a work entitled, "Rome in the 19th century," but I find I have not room for it. It will appear in a future Number.

No. CXLVIII.

SATURDAY, May 12th, 1821.

The following was intended for the conclusion of last Number, but was omitted for want of room :—

"Plenary indulgence and remission of sins are liberally offered here on very easy terms. I was at first rather startled with the prodigal manner in which that full pardon of all transgressions, which the gospel promises only as the reward of sincere repentance and amendment,* was bestowed at Rome, in consideration of repeating certain prayers before the shrine of certain saints, or paying a certain sum of money to certain priests.

"I was surprised to find scarcely a church in Rome, that did not hold up at the door the tempting inscription of '*Indulgenzia Plenaria.*' Two hundred days' indulgence I thought a great reward for every kiss bestowed upon the great black cross in the Coliseum ; but that is nothing to the indulgences for ten, twenty, and even thirty thousands of years, that may be bought, at no exorbitant rate, in many of the churches ; † so that it is amazing what a vast quantity of treasure may be amassed in the other world with very little industry in this, by those who are avaricious of this spiritual wealth, into which indeed the dross or riches of this world

* The reader will be aware that these are not The Protestant's words.

† You may buy as many masses as will free your soul from purgatory for 29,000 years at the church of St John Lateran, on the festival of that saint ; at Santa Bibiana, on All Souls' Day, for 7,000 years ; at a church near the Basilica of St Paul, and at another on the Quirinal Hill, the names of both of which I have unluckily forgotten, for 10,000, and for 3,000 years, and at a very reasonable rate. But it is vain to particularize, for the greater part of the principal churches in Rome and the neighbourhood are spiritual shops for the sale of the same commodity.

Bishop Burnet, in his *History of the Reformation*, (Records, book 1, page 26, King Edward's reign,) has extracted from Horæ B. Mariæ Virg. ad usum Sarum, printed at Paris 1526, sixteen instances of pardons beyond one hundred years, granted by Popes, in consideration of repeating such and such prayers with Ave-marias and credos. A monument in St Michael's chapel, Macclesfield, grants pardon 26,000 years for saying 5 pater-nosters, 5 aves, and a credo. See *Prot. Guardian*, vol. 1, p. 337.

may be converted with the happiest facility imaginable.

"We are told that 'it is easier for a camel to enter into the eye of a needle, than a rich man into the kingdom of heaven,' but at Rome at least, it would seem to be difficult, nay, impossible, to keep a rich man out."

Rome, in the nineteenth century, Literary Gazette, No. 213, p. 101.

February 17, 1821.

The 144th Number of the Protestant broke off in the middle of a letter from a gentleman in a remote part of Ireland, who has the advantage, if such it may be called, of seeing Popery in its naked deformity. Having stated the fact that a miraculous virtue was supposed to reside in the clay that had touched the coffin of a priest in his neighbourhood, lately deceased, my correspondent proceeds:—

"The writer saw a woman, a cripple, who, hearing of this celebrated relic, had been taken there for a cure; on her return, being asked if she had received any benefit, she replied she did, but her husband saying she did not, the wife asked him how he could dare to deny that a miracle was wrought in her, *though he could not see it!* Indeed, this idea is not at all unfamiliar to them, since they are accustomed to believe that bread and wine is transubstantiated into the very body, bones, and blood of our Lord, although to their visual comprehension, they still remain the same substances without any alteration whatsoever. I had in my possession a *printed* paper, giving an account of some of the miracles performed at the shrine of this saint, and headed, '*Miracles have not ceased;*' these were *publicly* cried through the towns by hawkers, of one of whom I purchased the copy.

"Those who receive any benefit by such impostures, are the priests and the publicans; (the latter erect booths around these precious relics, as long as curiosity, faith, or superstition invite customers,) and it is natural enough that this should be the case, and that they should act in concert, for while the former are vending their clays, the latter are vending their spirits. It is remarkable, that wherever there is a saint's day held, (called a Patron,) you will uniformly find the greatest superstitions succeeded by the grossest sensuality, drunkenness, and vices of all kinds. The writer had been a long time at a loss to conjecture the cause of this intimate connection between superstition and vice, until he was informed by a Roman Catholic, *a great devotee,* in his employment, and whom he accused with getting drunk, that, as it was committed on a saint's day, *it was no sin,* for they believed that each of the saints ask and receive the *pardon of all sins* committed on the days kept for their commemoration, provided they attended the prayers offered up to them in the chapel. We therefore need not wonder why so many saints' days are kept in Ireland, since such great benefits are said to arise from them. Indeed, the wonder is, that they do not make saints' days of every day in the year; but on recollection, this would not be agreeable to the priests, for if the people believed that the intercession of the saints in their favour went on daily, and as a matter in course, there would be nothing left for the priest to do—or, what would be worse—to *receive.*

"Is it therefore a matter of surprise that Papists are held back from education by every means, and even threats held out by their priests, since it is so much for their advantage to prevent the moral and religious improvement of their parishioners; and they have brought them so completely into obedience (I mean the lower orders) that they can make them believe the grossest impositions of their church in opposition to their reason.

"The mind of man is naturally desirous of knowledge, but if you can draw off the mind from seeking more rational attainments to rest in superstitions you thereby enervate the faculties, and make the understanding a mere machine to be impressed or impelled at the will of the mover. The common Irish, Sir, do not want naturally good capacities; they are intelligent, generous, and unsuspicious, and if these qualities were improved by a real, not pretended moral and religious education, they would not come behind the most celebrated of other countries—but these mental endowments are beclouded by the dense and gross atmosphere which every where overhangs Popery, preventing any rays of intellectual light to shine out.

"Of late years there have been many efforts made by the Protestants in Ireland to improve the condition of the lower orders, by the establishment of schools calculated to promote their moral and religious improvement,—and, as a means best calculated to produce these desirable ends, the *Bible* simply, without note, comment, or catechetical lectures of any kind, has been introduced into their schools, one would reasonably suppose that no objection could be taken against the morality of the Bible as a reading book; but this is not the case, the most violent determined opposition is every where given to the admission of Roman Catholic children into these schools by their priests, who, dreading the effects of a moral and religious education, denounce publicly and repeatedly the parents of those few children who attend. In the town where I live, at this present time, week after week, the thunders of the church are hurled from the altar against some, whose only crime is the anxiety they have to get instruction for their children. Their names are individually called out, to make them obnoxious to the rest, and every curse poured forth upon their devoted heads. It is of no avail to inform the priests

that during the fifteen years which this school has been established no one instance of any attempt to proselyte, by drawing away the Roman Catholics from the communion of their church, can be adduced; it is of no value to assure them that the object of the school is *solely* to convey moral and religious instruction by means of the Bible and the Bible alone, without any notes, comments, or catechetical lectures whatsoever, and that they recognize no sect or party amongst the children in their schools. The priest's answer invariably is, 'we cannot allow the Bible to be read by the people,' 'they must only hear such explanations from it as we choose to give.' On expostulating with a younger priest here, on this subject, he replied, he was only obeying the orders of his bishop, whom he was bound to obey, by the most solemn and sacred oaths taken at his ordination, and of which his bishop frequently reminded him, nor did he execute his directions with that *severity he ought;* for he was positively directed by his bishop to bring all the children who were sent by their parents to this school before him, and while he denounced all the curses of the church against their parents by *name,* the children were ordered to *curse their own parents,* by pronouncing audibly at the end of each curse, Amen!!!

"It is a precept of the divine law to 'honour thy father and mother; and he that curseth father or mother let him die the death,' Matt. xv. 4. But the Popish bishops and priests order, that children shall *curse* their fathers and mothers; and they that shall refuse to curse their fathers and mothers, shall be cursed, and that bitterly, by the Holy Mother Church.

"To counteract the growing avidity for education amongst the lower orders of the people of Ireland, the priests have established in most parishes what are called monks' and nuns' schools, that is, schools kept by monks and nuns, for what they are pleased to term the moral and religious education of the poor Roman Catholic children,—the entire of which nearly consists in teaching the children to repeat their Catechisms and Rosaries—it is evident that the sole object of establishing these schools is to prevent the children's being sent to the free schools of the Hibernian School Society, and thereby hold them in ignorance; complaints are frequently made by the parents that their children, after a close attendance at these schools for two or three years, do not learn as much as children sent to the free schools do in as many months; and the writer has known instances, where even poor labourers have preferred paying something for their children's education rather than lose their time at the schools of these monks and nuns, who are generally as ignorant as their predecessors of the 9th and 10th centuries. To support these establishments every means are used to prevail on Roman Catholics, living and dying, to give or bequeath a proportion of their properties to such pious uses; and the great merit of keeping poor Catholics from Protestant heresy is pointed out to them in the most glowing colours.

"However, in the division of the booty thus obtained, things do not always go on so smoothly as they could wish. Take a recent instance of some notoriety, which occurred in a pretty large town in Ireland. The pastors of the Holy Mother Church having prevailed on a wealthy Papist to bequeath, for the good of his soul, the interest of a large sum of money for the education of poor children in the Roman Catholic faith; the monks and nuns each contrived to possess themselves of a moiety of this property for the purpose or pretence above-mentioned, and left the parish priest in the lurch; but as his reverence thought he had as good a right to his share of the booty as the monks and nuns, *who had made vows of poverty!* he endeavoured to wrest it out of their hands, and made representations to the trustees that the parties in possession were totally unqualified to teach the children, being ignorant themselves of the very rudiments of learning. Now as the priest's opponents could not perhaps well rebut this charge without first going to school, for which they were rather elderly, they attacked the priest where he was most vulnerable, they charged him *upon oath,* with being guilty of certain practices, not reckoned amongst Protestants at least, very moral; such as kissing the young females at confession, &c. but although these nuns did not throw the veil over the grossest crimes with which they charged their priest, I must, for they are too indelicate to be mentioned. The priest, you may be sure, did not remain an idle or an indifferent spectator during these proceedings; he also accused the brotherhood and sisterhood upon oath with perjury, the subornation of witnesses, and with more immoral practices of a more personal and private nature. How this dispute will end is uncertain, it being referred to a higher tribunal.

"The parishioners have also divided, part siding with the priest, and part with the holy fraternity; and to such a height has this enmity been excited, that they have more than once from invectives come to blows.

"'By their fruits ye shall know them,' is a short but very comprehensive direction, given us by our Lord himself for the examination of individual or collective character:—'For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit;' now applying this rule to the religion of Papists, we shall find, that their practice produces fruit the very reverse of every moral law contained in the Bible. Every religious rite and ceremony from the cradle to the grave

is, amongst them, succeeded by the grossest sensualities; and whether we observe their christenings, weddings, wakes, or funerals, they are all attended with the grossest idolatry and superstitions, and succeeded (among the lower orders) by revellings, drunkenness, and such like; 'of the which,' says the apostle, 'I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' The priests in Ireland look upon the unmarried daughters of their parishioners as forming a considerable proportion of their wealth; for a large share of their fees or perquisites arises from their weddings,—no female being allowed to marry out of her own parish; the priests therefore are extremely anxious to encourage matrimony, and they are frequently engaged in match makings. It being the rule or custom for the guests invited to the weddings of the better sort to pay the priest according to their abilities, he is anxious that a large number should be invited, and that a plentiful dinner be provided at the bride's father's expense; the whisky is so abundant on these occasions as to be sometimes brought out in cans, the priest himself partaking largely of the banquet; piping, dancing, and drinking, continues through the night. On these occasions the priest himself generally opens the dance with the bride, particularly if the collections are large. A melancholy accident not long since occurred at one of these weddings—the chimney happening to catch fire, one of the party took up a can of whisky, which he supposed to contain water, and dashed it on the flames, the spirits instantly exploded, and blew up most of the company.

"One very bad effect must always result from the interest the priests have to promote marriages; which is, that instead of dissuading, they induce the poorest sort who can beg, borrow, or steal a guinea, to marry, without having any provision made for a family; and they thus entail poverty and mendicity on the country. I have known matches of this kind so hastily made up, that the parties contracting had not seen each other before that day, and so poor as to be obliged to borrow a ginuea for the priest, for he won't take less, and if the parties should be under any church censures, he requires more. Ireland is thus overpeopled with a poor, ignorant, superstitious peasantry; and what is worse, there is no prospect of any change in their circumstances, while Popery holds them in her iron grasp, whose interest it is to keep them superstitious, by keeping them in ignorance. Nothing except a national system of general education for the poor, agreeably to the plans of the Hibernian School Society, where the *scriptures alone* are made the reading book, can effectually and finally promote the moral, intellectual, and religious improvement of Ireland, and this subject is well worthy the attention of the legislature.—J. A."

This plain unvarnished narrative exhibits such a view of Popery, as ought to excite universal detestation, not against the poor deluded people, but at the conduct of their priests, whose sole business it seems to be, to maintain the reign of ignorance and error, to rob the people of their little hard-earned property, and to fatten upon the soil: yet it has lately become fashionable to eulogize these priests as if they were the most virtuous men in the world. Panegyrists of their own communion boast of the "spotless purity" of their character; Protestant senators, in both houses, vie with one another in expressions of commendation, or in tacitly admitting the extraordinary merit of these ghostly deceivers; and it is esteemed of so much importance to Ireland to preserve the breed, that a college was twenty-five years ago erected at Maynooth for the purpose, at an expense to the public, originally, of about £40,000, and an annual charge of about £8000 ever since. This was no doubt meant for the best; but I am persuaded nothing of this kind would have occurred had the real character of the priests been better known to men in power. No dissenting sect in Britain ever received such countenance and support as is thus granted to Irish Papists, and yet these Papists are incessantly complaining of being an insulted, oppressed, and persecuted people.

"In 1795," says a late writer, "Maynooth College was established by an act of Parliament; by which, certain trustees were empowered to receive donations for establishing and endowing an academy for the education of persons professing the Romish religion, and to acquire lands, free from forfeiture by mortmain. Little short of £40,000 was granted for its establisment at first; and in every subsequent session, a regular charge of £8000 has been made to parliament, for its annual support. I may add, too, that this does not appear to content them. I have heard it represented as trifling, by gentlemen of that better informed, or rather deeper initiated class of Romanists, as to faith and doctrine, which is recognised as composed of 'competent expounders,' while the encouragement of the Protestant charter schools has been spoken of with contempt, dislike, and jealousy." *The True State of the Question, by Joseph Spearing, junr*, p. 229, Cork, 1816. The tithe of the money thus thrown away by Protestants, in bolstering up a system of idolatry and superstition, would go a great length in teaching the people to read the word of God, upon the economical plan of the Hibernian Society; but it has not yet appeared *politically* necessary to teach the poor Irish to read the Bible; at least not so necessary as the maintaining a regular succession of Popish priests. Candour,

however, requires me to say, that in this matter there was only a choice of evils. The Maynooth College was not endowed because our government wished to encourage Popery; but because it was reckoned better to have the priests educated at home, than to lay them under the necessity of going abroad for education. My opinion is, that the worst of the evils was chosen; but I do not profess to be a politician.

A correspondent has favoured me with the following recipe for making Italian soup, with which I conclude the present Number. The reader will not consider it below the dignity of my work, seeing it has so close a relation to the person of the present head of the Romish Church. It is extracted from Galiffico's Letters, relating to Italy and its inhabitants, 1816, 1817, translated by John Murray, London, 1820. After describing Cardinal Gonsalvi as the most popular minister that any Pope ever had, the author proceeds, page 23:—

—"Whatever may be the liberality of the prime minister, it is not sufficient to put a stop to the most absurd superstition. Little prints of the miracles attributed to the present Pope, were publicly sold in the streets of Rome; and some time before our arrival, an immense number of his shirts were sold in retail to the common people, and perhaps to better informed persons also, who fully believed that a small piece of one of them boiled in their soup, was the surest of all remedies against any disorder. I could not have credited this story, if I had not had it from a very honest merchant, who told it to me in the simplicity of his heart, as a thing of which no real Christian could entertain a doubt." It is not said whether the shirts were first washed; but it is to be presumed they were not; for washing would take the virtue out of them.

Another curious piece has come in my way this week, for which, I see by the proof sheet, there is room; and I insert it here, for the sake of preserving it to future times. It is what will be called a very devout prayer, by "His Most Christian Majesty," the king of France, on the occasion of the baptism of his young grand-nephew, the duke of Bordeaux:

—"Let us invoke for him the protection of the Mother of God, the queen of the angels; let us implore her to watch over his days, and remove far from his cradle the misfortunes with which it has pleased providence to afflict his relatives, and to conduct him by a less rugged path than I have had, to eternal felicity." This act of devotion was *performed* not a fortnight ago, by the sovereign of the most enlightened Popish kingdom in the world. Here there is no God acknowledged but a mere creature; and if such idolatry shall be persevered in, it is probable that the young prince, if spared as long in the world, will have to go over a still more "rugged path" than that of his predecessor.

No. CXLIX.

SATURDAY, MAY 19TH, 1821.

I HAVE still some accounts to settle with my long forgotten opponent, AMICUS VERITATIS, though after the exposure which I have made of the character of Popery, any farther notice of his errors may be considered almost a work of supererogation. It is necessary, however, that I keep my word, and therefore I must devote a Number or two to his service.

I observe, then, in the first place, that I have found him out to be a great literary thief. I have already shown that part of his declamation about good works was stolen, without acknowledgment, from a recent English publication. (See PROT. No. 121.) And I have made such farther discoveries as lead me to doubt whether he did not pilfer the greater part of what he gave as his own. In a letter which he published in the Glasgow Chronicle, dated 25th June 1818, (see PROT. page 27.) we read as follows:—"If frequency of repetition could give to misrepresentation the substance of truth, an indulgence would be of all scandalous things the most scandalous. Your correspondent seems to have adopted this principle; he conceives he may justly assume the privilege of saying what has been said by hundreds before him, and, therefore, without hesitation, condemns the practice of indulgences, in terms the most pointed and severe." Now this passage is stolen verbatim, without marks of quotation, from a pamphlet, entitled, "A Vindication of the Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham," 1807, p. 42, with only this alteration, to wit, Amicus strikes out "the Bishop of Durham," and puts "your correspondent," that is, THE PROTESTANT, in his place, which, if it were not mere words, would be a very comfortable *translation* for the said PROTESTANT; though both church and state would be losers, if a prelate so truly venerable and estimable were to be superseded by a mere layman of the North.

AMICUS then proceeds to proclaim his own courage, in the following terms:—"But I am not to be intimidated by a sourness of aspect: the shafts of ridicule will not in the least discompose me, and I can despise the meanness of sophistical reasoning, whilst I pity the prostitution of talent." What pity that so bold a man was so soon put to silence! and that too, by a writer so contemptible as to prostitute his little talent for the purpose of mere sophistical reasoning. Surely it would have been easy to refute such a writer; and though Amicus was denied access to the Chronicle, after I had withdrawn, he might have found means to publish his reply to the Protestant in some other way.

But we must come to matters of more importance. He said he had "endeavoured to

prove that it never was a doctrine of the Catholic Church that a Pope or Bishop could grant an Indulgence to commit sin." When I first used the word "indulgence," I did it in the common English acceptation of the term, —"to grant, or be favourable to:" and there is scarcely a page of my work from the commencement, in which it is not shown that Popery is favourable to the commission of sin, either by connivance or encouragement, or positive enactment. But I am aware that in the language of Popish catechisms the word indulgence has a technical meaning somewhat different; though the consequence remains the same as that with which I charged it. When a man knows beforehand that he can purchase from his priest, a remission of the temporal and purgatorial punishment of his sins, the natural consequence must be, that he entertains no great dread of sin; and the indulgence operates as an encouragement to the commission of it; especially when it is considered, that exemption or relief from purgatory, necessarily implies exemption from hell, insomuch that he who obtains a plenary indulgence, entertains no dread of any future punishment.

But call it indulgence, dispensation, or what you will, the evil of which I complain, is, granting permission to do what is sinful. Of this the Church of Rome is notoriously guilty, for proof of which I need not go farther back than the recent bull of the Pope, which was given in my last Number but one, in which power is granted to dispense with certain laws, with regard to the marriage of persons nearly related to one another. Such marriages are either sinful, or they are not; if not, why are they prohibited? and if they are sinful, the Pope's authoritatively allowing them, is permission to commit sin. AMICUS triumphantly asserts, that if the Popish bishops could have granted indulgence to commit sin, Henry VIII. had never professed himself a Protestant; but I cannot suppose my opponent to be so very ignorant as not to know this was the very thing that led to that event. Henry, when scarcely come to years of discretion, married his brother's widow. This was an unlawful, and a sinful thing in the ecclesiastical reckoning; but he had a dispensation from the Pope for doing it. Afterwards he had some real or affected qualms of conscience, on account of what he considered an incestuous connection. He applied to the Pope to dissolve the marriage, which he durst not do for fear of offending the emperor, who was the queen's brother: but he offered Henry another dispensation, namely, that he might have two wives. (See PROT. page 25.) Gross as Henry's notions of morality were, he was not bad enough for this; and finding that the Pope would not comply with his request, he threw off his yoke altogether, which was perhaps the wisest thing he ever did.

Amicus Veritatis attempts to evade the evidence which I had adduced of the great wickedness of his church in the article of indulgences, by doubting some of my facts, and denying others. "The doctrines or theses of Tetzel," says he, "were publicly condemned by the Pope's nuncio, Miltitz, and consequently cannot be Catholic doctrine;" for the truth of which he refers me to Mosheim and others. From the following extract the reader will judge how far this is correct; speaking of Miltitz's conference with Luther, we are informed that Miltitz "loaded Tetzel with the bitterest reproaches, on account of the irregular and superstitious means he had employed for promoting the sale of indulgences, and attributed to this miserable wretch all the abuses that Luther had complained of. Tetzel, on the other hand, burdened with the iniquities of Rome, tormented with a consciousness of his own injustice and extortions, stung with the opprobrious censures of the new legate, and seeing himself equally despised and abhorred by both parties, died of grief and despair. This incendiary being sacrificed as a victim to cover the Roman Pontiff from reproach, Miltitz entered into a particular conversation with Luther, at Altenburgh, and, without pretending to justify the scandalous traffic in question, required only, that he would acknowledge the four following things: 1st, That the people had been seduced by false notions of indulgences: 2dly, That he (Luther) had been the cause of that seduction, by representing indulgences as much more heinous than they really were: 3dly, That the odious conduct of Tetzel alone had given occasion to these representations: and 4thly, That though the avarice of Albert, archbishop of Mentz, had set on Tetzel, yet that this rapacious taxgatherer had exceeded by far the bounds of his commission." *Mosheim by Maclaine*, Cent. xvi. § 1.

Now, here is not a word that implies a condemnation of Tetzel's indulgences, but only of Tetzel himself. Like other doers of dirty work, he had overdone his part, and brought disgrace upon his superiors and employers. The bull was given under the authority of the Pope himself, the words of which are given in the THE PROTESTANT, page 18. This Miltitz had no right or power to condemn, and he does not profess to condemn it. If he had, he must have published another bull for undeceiving the many thousands whom Tetzel had deceived. But nothing of the kind was done. The people were allowed to believe in the efficacy of the indulgence which they had received and paid for; and there is not so much as a hint that the benefit of it was effected by the irregular and superstitious means which had been used for promoting the sale.

My second proof was a letter or bull of indulgence granted by the present Pope to the

people of Cork. Amicus considers this so trifling and inapplicable as hardly to require notice; but the fact is, he could not notice it in the way I called the reader to do, without divulging the truth, that that very indulgence was a permission to commit sin, for it calls itself a "plenary indulgence," and "in form of a jubilee." Let Amicus inform the reader in what manner the Papists in Ireland celebrate their jubilees, and the question will be set at rest: unless, indeed, the principle avowed by a Papist to the writer of the letter in my last Number, be admitted; namely, that drunkennes and licentiousness of every description are not sins when committed on a saint's day, or day of jubilee.

Amicus writes in the true spirit of Jesuitism. When a document is produced that bears hard upon his church, he holds up a face of brass, and boldly calls it a forgery, though he had never seen or heard of it before. This is the case with the bull of the Pope, inciting the Irish Papists to murder their Protestant neighbours, which I quoted from *State Trials.* (See page 18.) This document, as I have already said, was produced on the trial of Lord M'Guire, one of the rebels, and its authenticity was not questioned by either the court or the prisoner. Both the fact and the document were new to Amicus Veritatis: and he found no reply to such confounding evidence, but by applying the rule which Papists have always at hand; that is, a broad denial, or charge of forgery. "Respecting the bull of Pope Urban VIII." says he, "the style and language in which it is couched assure me that it must be a forgery. Its very date increases my suspicion." Here Amicus leaves the subject, and raises a great hurricane of words about persecution; which makes it very evident that he knew nothing of the matter; but he had the presumption to imagine that his bare word, written in ignorance, would be sufficient to set aside the recorded evidence of the court of King's Bench! This is a piece of impudence which the Pope himself could scarcely match, even with infallibility at his back,—I say, Amicus was writing in ignorance. This is very evident from his mode of expression. The style and language *assured* him that it was a forgery; but after being assured, we find him only *suspecting;* and the date of the bull *increased* his suspicion. Now as for style, it was given in English, and it would of course partake of the manner of the translator; and its date was May 25th, 1643. It remains with Amicus to show cause why a document of this date should not be received as authentic.

As if doubtful that this charge of forgery in this individual case would not be believed, Amicus makes the following general, and sweeping accusation, believing no doubt, that if he got this to go down, all the documents I should ever produce would go for nothing: —"Who would take a review, from the year 1577 to the year 1684, that would not shudder at the horrific scenes that were the consequences of accumulated forgeries? It was this detestable habit of fabrication and lies, in your chief reformers, which drew from the pen of the Rev. Mr Whitaker, a Protestant divine, the following remarkable confession:—'Forgery,' says he, 'appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism; originally coming forth as a kind of leprosy upon the brow of Presbyterianism in Scotland, it was conveyed by the intercourse of vice to the profligate head of the church of England.' *Whitaker,* Vol. III. p. 49." This, the reader will perceive, is nothing but mere rant and general assertion. Amicus does not so much as pretend to confirm his charge against our chief reformers by adducing a single fact; and they must be credulous indeed, who will take his bare word as sufficient to set aside the testimony of numerous contemporaries who have borne witness to the integrity as well as the intrepidity of the chief reformers, both in England and Scotland. Amicus may assert that John Knox was a coward; but most persons, instead of making a serious reply, would despise his folly, and laugh at his impudence. Yet the assertion would be every whit as true as that our chief reformers were addicted to lying and forgery. I defy the whole host of Jesuits to prove the fact with regard to any one, whom British Protestants have been accustomed to regard with veneration as instrumental in effecting the glorious work of overthrowing Popery, and establishing true religion. I do not deny that numerous Jesuits, in both Scotland and England, assumed the name of Protestants, and made a trade of lying and forgery, with a view to obstruct the progress of the reformation; and it was one of their main tricks to lay their own crimes to the charge of Protestants, so that some late writers, affecting to believe antiquated calumnies, have taken upon them to accuse the reformers of the vices of their enemies.

Amicus lays great stress upon the confession of Whitaker, who it seems was a Protestant; but the reader does not require to be informed, that there are, and have been, many Protestants, who maintain the hostility of Papists against the spiritual Christianity, and strict discipline of the first reformers, especially of the Scotch Presbyterians. Such men will condemn Popery as a system, on account of the political mischiefs which it occasions; and on this account they are far enough from being Papists; but they will gladly join with Papists or infidels, for the purpose of throwing discredit or ridicule on the character of men who were holier than themselves, and who would not have acknowledged such as they for brethren. Such seems to have been this

Whitaker. He was not a Papist, for he did not worship the Virgin Mary; but he chose another Mary as an object of almost equal idolatry; namely, the unfortunate Queen of Scots; and he was as ready to break a lance with any man who should doubt of her purity, as Loyola was with any one who denied the immaculate conception. Dr M'Crie has, in few words, justly characterized this writer as "the fantastical Whitaker, a late author who has equalled any of his predecessors in prejudice, and exceeded them all in the illiberal and violent abuse with which he has treated the most respectable of his opponents." In the style of this writer, "Knox was a fanatical incendiary—a holy savage—the son of violence and barbarism—the religious Sachem of religious Mohawks." He styles Buchanan, "a serpent—a daring calumniator—leviathan of slander—the second of all human forgers—and the first of all human slanderers." Dr Robertson he calls "a disciple of the old school of slander—a liar—and one for whom bedlam was no bedlam." *See Life of Knox*, Vol. II. pp. 153, 257. *notes.* I suppose the reader will set down Whitaker himself for a raving bedlamite, and attach to his assertion no authority whatever: but it is of more consequence to know the fact, that Mr Malcolm Laing, in his dissertation on Queen Mary's accession to Darnly's murder, appended to his History of Scotland, has shown that every one of the documents represented by Whitaker as forged, is genuine.

I had given the Popish doctrine of indulgences, from the French Catechism, translated by Dr Bogue, of Gosport; on this Amicus remarks: "I am not astonished that Bogue's Catechism was the one which your correspondent has selected for his purposes. This is a work which was translated from the original French, by a Protestant, merely for the purpose of exercising his talent of ridicule, and it was natural to suppose that your correspondent would apply to such a valuable source of misrepresentation." Here again we see that Papists hold it for certain, that no Protestant is to be trusted, even in the simplest matters. It does not appear that Amicus had ever seen the Catechism in question, or that he had compared the translation with the original; but merely because the translator is a Protestant, it *must* of course be a "source of misrepresentation." This, I suppose, furnishes an index to the state of morals among Papists. They know their own tricks, and those of one another, so well, that they take every man for a knave.

> "There's none so ready to detect a cheat,
> As he who is a knave complete."

I have the happiness of being personally acquainted with Dr Bogue, as many of my readers are; and I believe a man of more sturdy integrity is not to be found in the three kingdoms. I consider his personal character a sufficient guarantee for the fidelity of his translation; but though it were otherwise, no reasonable man will suppose him to be such a fool, as, by a false translation, to expose himself to the detection and derision of any schoolboy who might choose to bring his work to the test. In point of fact, I have never read or heard of any man calling in question its fidelity, except Amicus Veritatis; and he does it merely upon the ground that Dr Bogue is a Protestant. He does not attempt to point out a single error in his translation; but he gives him the praise of being more candid than *The Protestant*, and even seems to admit that he gives a just definition of what is meant by an indulgence.

Having in former Numbers (120, 121.) answered that part of Amicus's letter which relates to good works and the character of Luther, I proceed now to the next in order, (see page 30.) and I shall despatch what relates to indulgences before I take up any other subject. Amicus affects to find me tripping in the following sentence, with which I began one of my letters in the Chronicle:—"I know that Papists maintain that indulgences are meant only to relieve sinners from the temporal punishment which their sins deserve, or, at most, from the pains of purgatory." "Now, surely," says Amicus, "what Catholics maintain, constitute their tenets;" and certainly so it would, if they were honest men; and if they made a candid profession of their faith to all persons, and at all times: but it is notorious that this is not the case. Papists in Glasgow will disavow many things which were firmly maintained by Papists of old, which are still maintained in other parts of the world, and which they themselves would maintain in other circumstances, and among a less enlightened people. We are not therefore to take what they maintain in words to their Protestant neighbours, as the real tenets of their church, in opposition to the bulls of Popes, and the canons of councils; and with this explanation of what I wrote three years ago, the reader will be able to judge whether I contradicted myself, as my opponent triumphantly boasts

I had given the real doctrine of Rome on the subject of indulgences, as laid down by St Thomas Aquinas; and for the sake of readers who may not possess the first part of the Protestant, I shall repeat it here. The words are few, but they are very comprehensive: "There actually exists an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints have performed, *beyond what is necessary for their own salvation*, and which are therefore applicable to the benefit of others; the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure is the Roman Pontiff, and, of consequence, he is empowered to assign to such as he thinks proper, a portion of this inexhaus-

tible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes." Amicus denies that this quotation is correct, for which, of course, there is nothing but his bare assertion. He does not so much as say what is erroneous in it; and I suspect that he knows no more about it, than he does of Pope Urban's bull, which he was first assured, and then suspected to be a forgery. I made the extract from the Edinburgh Encylopedia; and I have since found that it is *verbatim*, the same as that given by Mosheim, Cent. XII. Part II. To the rest of this paragraph I gave a very particular answer in my 18th Number, in which I showed that the doctrine of indulgences, in its most modified form, operated as an encouragement to commit sin.

With an equally bold front, Amicus pronounces, "The Tax of the Apostolic Chancery" to be a forgery; * and he says, that "to such gross and palpable forgeries a denial is all that can be expected." It is evidently all that he had to give, though he had promised more, which was never forthcoming. If this was a forgery, it was the work of Papists; it was extensively circulated and sold among Papists; and it was actually the standard by which, for many years, the priests were in the practice of selling absolution for the crimes specified. Protestant princes complained of it to the council of Trent, and mentioned it as one of the abominations of Popery, on account of which they rejected the council. If it had been a forgery, this was the time for the Church of Rome to have cleared herself; but there was not among all the fathers of the council so much impudence as Amicus has in his single person. In short, they had not the face to deny what was known to the whole world. They pretended, indeed, that Protestants had corrupted it, which was impossible, seeing it was corruption itself all over; and to show their regard for it, the holy council put it, along with the Bible, into the *Index Expurgatorius*.

No. CL.

SATURDAY, MAY 26TH, 1821.

IN my last Number, I paid my respects to AMICUS VERITATIS, and replied to several passages in his letters, which I had not particularly noticed before. It was, however, only a gleaning of passages that required the performance of this duty, as I had replied to some points very fully in the earlier part of my first volume, particularly in the Second Number, in which I exposed the imposition practised by Amicus, in garbling a passage of Luther's works, so as to make him appear to teach the lawfulness of concubinage and polygamy. In a subsequent Number, I showed that it had been the practice of Popish writers, for two hundred years, to garble the same passage, in the same way, and for the same purpose; so that on the part of Amicus it was only another literary theft.

The exposure which an inspection of Luther's works enabled me to make on this occasion, made a deeper impression on the public mind, than any thing I had previously written. From long inattention to the subject, people had forgotten that Popery was a system of lies and imposition; but the example of a Papist, living in the midst of us, practising such an impudent literary fraud, had the effect of opening the eyes of many. Amicus had not the courage, after all his boasting, to attempt a reply; but it was one of the first things which the CATHOLIC VINDICATOR took up. He professed to make it the subject of his Second Number,—one of the two or three that had a pretty extensive sale; but he occupied almost the whole Number with a discussion of the law of divorce, which seemed intended to divert the reader's mind away from the imposition practised by his friend. This he despatches in very few words, as follows: —"He (The Protestant) actually charges him (Amicus Veritatis) with *forgery*; and for what? Because in quoting Luther's words, he refrained from giving the *whole* sentence, and suppressed the explanation, which made the reformer's case worse." This is all that we have in the form of a direct reply to the main charge—that of garbling a man's words, to make him speak what he did not intend to speak, which I called a crime equal to forgery; and these words of the Vindicator, if not a vindication of the deed, make it evident that he thinks very lightly of it; nay, in another part of the Number, he calls it "perfectly correct and honourable," from which we may estimate the degree of credit that is due to the fidelity of his quotations. Andrews does not fall behind Amicus, in boldly asserting the thing which is not. It might have been expected, that from habit and long experience in defending Popery, he would have been able to write a credible lie; but it seems he cannot always do it, for the one which I have quoted carries its own refutation in its face. He represents Luther's explanation of his meaning, as *making his case worse;* and yet Amicus, whose object was to make Luther's case as bad as possible, "*suppressed the explanation!*" That the thing is a lie any person may satisfy himself, by reading the passage either in the original, or in the translation in the Second Number of the Protestant; and that the Vindicator

* For a full, perhaps the most complete account of the editors of this book, the existence of which Papal controversialists are so fond of denying, see *Taxatio* Papalis, being an account of the Tax Books of the Church and Courts of modern Rome, 1825.

knew it to be such, I cannot but believe, without supposing him possessed of a degree of stupidity, such as he would not thank me for ascribing to him. I will illustrate what I mean by supposing a similar case:—I maintain "that it is lawful for a man to marry two women, provided one be dead before he thinks of another." Now if any man, professing to give my words, should stop at the comma, substitute a period, and leave out the rest of the sentence, he would represent me as teaching polygamy. Then, suppose I had detected this imposition, and had charged the guilty person with it, and he in justification had pleaded, that he had only "refrained from giving the *whole* sentence, and suppressed the explanation, which made" my "case worse," what would the world think of such a controversialist? Just what all who know the Vindicator must think of him, seeing he declares such conduct "perfectly correct and honourable."

For the sake of illustration I have put the case in the strongest light; it is, however, a case perfectly analogous to that of Luther, which is the subject of dispute. He was speaking of the lawfulness of a man taking a second wife, *his first being alive.* In a case of obstinate desertion on the part of the wife, he says it is lawful; but explaining himself, he says, the man must not do it by his own authority; but must take all the regular steps which the law prescribes. The question at present is not whether Luther's doctrine be sound or unsound; but whether it be not gross imposition to pretend to give his doctrine in his own words, and yet leave out those which are essential to the understanding of it. This is the trick of a succession of Popish authors for more than two centuries—from Walsingham down to Amicus Veritatis, and which Mr Andrews attempts to vindicate. Such jugglery, if it were general, would unhinge the whole frame of civil society; and as it is unblushingly practised by Papists, Protestants ought to take care how they attach credit to any thing that they say or write.

Since I have the Second Number of the "Catholic Vindicator" under my hand, I may as well despatch it at once, which I shall do in few words, and then return to Amicus Veritatis.

Mr Andrews says a great many true and undisputed things about the unlawfulness of a man putting away his wife; and he cites our Saviour's words, Mat. xix. 3—9, as if they were against both Luther and The Protestant. Now I do most certainly admit the divine authority of these words, and so, I suppose, did Luther. I believe it is not lawful for a man to *put away* his wife, and take another, except in the single case which the divine Lawgiver allows. This, I suppose, no Protestant disputes; and therefore, the Vindicator's flourishes and harangues about it, are mere beating the air. Luther was not speaking of a man *putting away* his wife; but of a wife's *obstinate desertion of her husband,* or refusing to dwell in conjugal duty with him. This is a case for which, so far as I recollect, there is no provision made in the New Testament; and it would not be fair to apply to it any of the peculiarities of the ceremonial law. In as far as marriage is a civil contract, it falls to be decided by civil authority, like other matters of right and wrong, between man and man, or man and woman, according to the general rule of equity laid down in Scripture. Marriage imposes on the parties a religious obligation, under the form of an oath, or sacrament if you will, to be true to one another; but the infidelity of the one party relieves the other: yet the relief itself is a civil right, and can be obtained in a well-regulated community only according to law; that is, by a regular process of divorce. In this case if a man does *put away* his wife, he does it according to the law of the land, and consistently with the word of God.

But the case of a wife deserting her husband, and obstinately refusing to be reclaimed, is not a case of *putting away.* The words of Christ do not apply to this at all, and as there is no rule in the New Testament for this specific case, it seems, like other things of a civil and temporal nature, left to the decision of temporal authority. In the event of a divorce in this case, there is no injury done to the wife. It is only a confirmation of her own act. According to the doctrine of Luther, she was to have the most liberal indulgence. The husband was not allowed to take advantage of a hasty thought, or fit of passion, on the part of his wife, though followed by actual running away. He was not allowed to divorce her, until she had been publicly admonished a first, second, and third time, and that in presence of the church, that there might be no doubt on the mind of any person that she was wilfully obstinate. I think the only error of Luther in this matter was, that he made divorce a sentence of the church, when it should have been of the magistrate.

At all events Luther was only laying down what he considered an equitable rule of procedure, in an extreme, and perhaps difficult case. Suppose the doctrine erroneous, and suppose there is no legal relief for man or woman in the case of the one obstinately deserting the other, Luther's believing and teaching the contrary may be considered an error in judgment, but it is no proof that he practised or taught immorality; yet this is the very thing which Papists are incessantly labouring to fix upon him, and for which they refer to that part of his works. This should satisfy every impartial person that there is no real evidence of immorality on the part of Luther, either in life or doctrine, seeing his

enemies can find nothing against him, but by garbling his words, and misrepresenting his meaning.

The Vindicator objects to my translation of Luther's words, that I have used the expression *ought* not, for *could* not; and though I am ready to maintain that my rendering is in the true spirit of the original, I do not think the distinction of any importance. I will even concede to him that the sexes could not be without each other, without very deplorable consequences; and though he should rail ever so much against Luther for teaching this doctrine, I must be excused from entering more particularly upon the defence of it. My work was not undertaken for the purpose of defending the doctrines of Luther, or of any other man; but to point out the false, insidious, and malignant character of Popery. And seeing that Papists have selected Luther, above all others, as an object on which to spew out the venom of their malice, I have thought it proper to spend a few hours, both now and formerly, in exposing their wickedness to the world. The character of the great Reformer needs not the weak advocacy of my pen; but any pen may, and every pen ought to be employed in holding up to universal detestation, the arts of fraud, falsehood, and forgery, by means of which the Church of Rome has so long imposed upon, and held in bondage the nations of Europe.

There is a great deal of ribaldry in this Number of the Vindicator, which I do not choose to answer. The main object of it is, to vindicate Amicus Veritatis' misrepresentation of Luther; and having replied to this, I leave all the extraneous matter to answer for itself. Amicus Veritatis proceeds as follows:—"Your correspondent says, that those indulgences of Luther which I adduced were solitary cases, I now ask him in short words:—Did not Luther issue more bulls than one, to absolve the Germans from their obedience to Charles V.? Did not Calvin and Beza require the Huguenots to rebel against their sovereigns? Did not Knox, and the Presbyterian clergy of Scotland in general, with thundering anathemas, impel their followers to shake off the dominion of the Queen Regent, and afterwards that of the unfortunate Mary? What else were the sermons and writings of Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Poynet, and other fathers of the new religion at home, in the reign of Queen Mary, but so many decrees in favour of rebellion, and so many absolutions from the duty of allegiance? Did not a new set of Protestant doctors, proceeding, however, upon the fundamental principle of the former, that of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and in all matters of religion, preach up, on the alleged authority of God's word, the justice and necessity of deposing and murdering their king, the gallant Charles I., and subverting the constitution? Did not the same doctors, on the same pretended sacred authority, absolve the prisoners of war who were released to them at Brentford, from the oaths they had severally taken of not serving again in the republican army? Did not the most famous prelates and divines of the establishment, a few years before, pretend to absolve the King himself from his sworn duty to his subjects, and the very law of nature, by deciding that he was at liberty to send his favourite minister, Strafford, to the scaffold, notwithstanding he himself was conscientiously persuaded of the Earl's innocence? He will not now have to complain that I depend upon one or two solitary cases: let him answer these, and I can furnish him with more." PROT. page 31.

The above, it will be allowed, has a very imposing appearance; but the intelligent reader will perceive, that it does not *furnish* a *single case* of improper conduct on the part of any of the Reformers, even from Luther's time down to Charles the First's time. Amicus had furnished one case which presented Luther and his colleagues in an unfavourable light. I admitted this, page 23.) and remarked that it was a singular and solitary instance; and so it seems now admitted to be, for no other case of a like nature has yet been adduced by my Glasgow opponents, or their London proxy. I request the reader to observe, that putting a question is not adducing, much less proving a case; and that, according to the laws of literary warfare, no man is obliged to prove a negative. It does not, therefore, rest with me to prove that Luther, and Calvin, and Beza, and the other reformers did *not* do the bad things here laid to their charge; it rests with Amicus to prove that they did: at least let him bring his accusation in a tangible form; let him produce his evidence, and he may depend upon its being carefully sifted.

I shall endeavour to bring down this subject to Amicus' capacity in the following manner: Did not a certain professional gentleman, in a state of intoxication, oftener than once stumble into a certain house in the Saltmarket? Did he not require the inmates to rebel against their *lawful* superiors, and take the household affairs into their own hands? Did he not, with thundering anathemas, call for the officers of police to carry off a poor unfortunate quean who threatened to give him trouble? What were his letters to a London radical Popish editor, the associate of Wooler and Co., but so many absolutions from the duty of allegiance, unless "Catholic Emancipation" were granted in its fullest extent? I am merely supposing things; and I now ask Amicus Veritatis what he would think, if he were called upon to *disprove* all the bad things which these questions may be under-

stood to insinuate against a third person in whom perhaps he feels no particular interest? He would give the whole a broad and indignant negative, with a much better grace than he gives to his denial of plain facts and public documents. He would say, Bring a specific accusation against the professional gentleman to whom you allude; produce your evidence and let him have a fair trial; but in the meantime let him have the privilege of a British subject—that of being counted innocent until he is proved guilty.

Now this is all that I demand on behalf of the reformers, in whom I have no particular interest, for I do not derive my faith from them; and though all the bad things insinuated against them were true, it would not affect the truth of the Protestant religion as opposed to Popery. I am entitled, however, to deny the whole indictment as laid. I deny that Luther issued more bulls than one, to absolve the Germans from their obedience to Charles V. I deny that Calvin and Beza required the Huguenots to rebel against their sovereigns; and so on, with regard to all the other counts in the libel. There are some of them, indeed, which I would deny with some explanation, some with a greater, and others with a less degree of positiveness. This denial ought not to be understood as maintaining that such crimes were not committed, for that would be the absurdity of asserting a negative, which no man can do who has not a perfect knowledge of all the words, and writings, and actions of hundreds of men who died from 150 to 300 years ago. It rests with the enemies of the reformers to prove them guilty of the crimes laid to their charge, which they have not yet done. No man can reasonably be called upon to prove their innocence. That ought, as in all other cases, to be taken for granted till there be evidence of the contrary.

It is easy to put into half a page a series of questions which it would require a volume to answer. It is easy even for persons of a convenient conscience to assert a number of falsehoods which it may be impossible to disprove; and hence it is that the burden of proof ought always to rest with the accuser, or maker of an injurious assertion. One may even by mistake make an erroneous assertion, which it is not easy to correct; an instance of which occurred very lately, which I give as an example. A noble peer, pleading the cause of Papists, declared that two noblemen of distinguished merit, and high in naval and military command, in the reign of Elizabeth, namely, Lords Howard and Cobham, were both Papists. This was to show that Papists might be safely admitted to places of power and trust; and though the assertion was made in the best informed assembly in the world, there was not one prepared to set the speaker right. A writer in the Morning Post has since shown that both these noblemen were zealous and distinguished Protestants; but he confesses that it cost him the labour of a whole week to find sufficient evidence of the fact. If it was so difficult to rebut an assertion made in ignorance, with regard to two of the greatest subjects in the kingdom, how much more difficult must it be to repel all that malice may invent against men so politically insignificant in their day as were Calvin and Beza, and a host of others who are not named at all, but introduced under the general designation of the "fathers of the new religion at home," "a new set of Protestant doctors?" &c.

If I were to go into a detailed refutation of the slanderous matter contained in this paragraph of Amicus' letter, I would show, that were certain facts which he alludes to fairly stated, they would redound much to the honour of the persons whom he meant to condemn. For instance, in the case of Knox, and the Queen Regent, a fair historian would not say, that he and his colleagues, with thundering anathemas, impelled the people to shake off her dominion; but that they did by sober reason, and reference to the first law of our nature, persuade the people to defend themselves and their wives and children against treachery and lawless violence, by the traitorous attempts of the said Queen Regent, to overpower them by means of a French army, and thereby subject the kingdom to a foreign yoke. This princess not only broke her engagements with the people once and again; but she actually maintained the doctrine, that the promises of princes were not to be considered as binding, and that the performance of them ought not to be rigorously exacted. She and her advocates therefore have no right to complain that the people considered themselves relieved from their engagement to her, especially as their liberties and their lives were at stake; and great credit is due to the leaders, whoever they were, who persuaded the people to such unanimity and moderation, that they were able to maintain their privileges, with comparatively small expense of human life, which would hardly have been the case had they been under the control of factious and violent demagogues.

At the same time, I freely confess, that I think ministers of the gospel are out of their element, when they take a lead in matters of political strife. But so far as this applies to the reformers, Popery was to blame for it, as well as for all its other mischiefs. In the Church of Rome there was little learning or science of any kind but among the clergy; it was their policy to keep all this among themselves; insomuch that they were usually the best qualified to manage state affairs, as well as those of the church. The Reformation found society in this condition; and the ill-taught laity, even among nobility, naturally looked up to their ministers for instruction and counsel as they

had been accustomed to do; and the ministers, conscious of their own powers, and of the extent of their influence, believed it to be their duty to exercise such influence in the way they thought best for the good of their country. In the hand of Providence they were made the instruments of incalculable good, on account of which their names ought to be held in everlasting remembrance; but no man can tell how much more good might have been done, had there been a sufficient number of well qualified statesmen to manage state affairs; and had Knox and his colleagues attended to nothing else but preaching the gospel of the grace of God to a people, most of whom were as ignorant of it as the most benighted heathen. If, instead of troubling themselves with the affairs of a worldly kingdom, they had directed the whole force of their mighty minds against the kingdom of Satan, by preaching the gospel, and otherwise instructing the people, the result might have been a thousand times more beneficial to the state than that of their mixed labours was; because they might thus have been the instruments of effecting the more extensive prevalence of genuine Christianity among all ranks of the people, and so have established the political prosperity of the kingdom upon the surest basis.

But lest Amicus should suppose that I evade his questions, and that I shrink from a defence of the Reformers, I hereby call upon him to produce his charges in a tangible form. Let me have the very words of Luther, Calvin, Beza, Knox, Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Poynet, and all the rest whom the Churches of England and Scotland acknowledged as their chief Reformers, in which they are alleged to have taught sedition and rebellion, and I have no doubt I shall be able to show that they teach no such thing, without garbling and misrepresentation, as in the case of Luther, referred to in this Number.

No. CLI.

SATURDAY, JUNE 2ND, 1821.

I CONCLUDED my last Number by calling upon AMICUS VERITATIS to produce the very words of Luther, Calvin, Knox, and other Reformers, which, he says, were so many decrees in favour of rebellion. To allow him time for so arduous a work, I shall now commence my reply to THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, which will occupy a few Numbers; and if Amicus cannot persuade the editor of the Chronicle, or any other editor to insert his letter; and if he is unable to undertake the publication of it at his own expense and risk, he may send me the manuscript, and I shall readily give it room, if it be of moderate length, and written in a style fit to appear in THE PROTESTANT. But I give him warning beforehand, that I will not receive and publish such ridiculous bombast as that which he gave from Counsellor Philips, at the conclusion of his last letter in the Chronicle, to which I reckon this short notice a sufficient reply, and with which, for the present, I conclude my reply to Amicus himself.

WILLIAM EUSEBIUS ANDREWS, *The Catholic Vindicator*, was, in his own opinion, a great man; but he allowed THE PROTESTANT to be greater, in the proportion that Goliah of Gath was greater than David, the shepherd of Bethlehem. He set out by declaring it to be his object to "bring this champion of the Philistines to the ground." But whether it was because his own head was nearer the ground, or was heavier, or had a greater affinity with the clod, it so happened, that it reached the ground first. His Vindicator expired in December 1819, as described in my 80th Number; and exactly a year thereafter, his "Orthodox Journal" also became defunct. This I mention with no small regret. It was a very useful work for me, and will be found so by any other who shall attempt to lay open the true character of Popery, because it exposed many Popish secrets which are not revealed by any other journalist. I had heard of his fame before he made his appearance on this field of battle; and it was boastfully given out by our Glasgow Papists, that a little David would soon annihilate the great Goliah.

In his first Number, (col. 3.) Mr Andrews promised to follow THE PROTESTANT through the several counts which he had drawn up against Papists: which I suppose must mean that he intended to make a distinct reply to every thing that I had advanced against them; but in the very same Number, (col. 6.) he says, "To follow THE PROTESTANT through all his windings and flippant remarks would be impossible, without bewildering the reader." This was the Vindicator's "second thought;" and I suppose he considered it the best; for in point of fact, he did not follow me through any one subject of discussion, or fairly engage with any one series of argument. He often set down whole paragraphs of my work, with a view, as he pretended, to refute them; but his attempts at refutation, are very like what I suppose to be a charge of a troop of cavalry upon a firm square of rank and file, with fixed bayonets. Whenever they come within sword length of the bayonet's point, the horses, by a natural instinct, which is very commendable in the dumb creatures, turn about and fly as fast as their legs can carry them. This is precisely the way in which Mr Andrews behaves with regard to almost every paragraph of THE PROTESTANT which he quotes for refutation. When we think we have him just at the point of aiming a deadly blow at the head of his enemy, in less than the twinkling of a eye we find him

scampering away after something else, and the object of his attack remains untouched.

This will appear from the following quotation from my 19th Number, and his remarks upon it in his first, col. 4—6, which I give at length, even repeating my own words, as the passage is short; and it may not be convenient for all my readers to refer to it:—"Previous, however," says Mr Andrews, "to entering upon the first charge laid against us, I shall notice a second declaration which THE PROTESTANT makes in his 19th Number, p. 103, as follows:—

"'My work was not undertaken with the view of defending the Church of Scotland, or any other church. I took my stand upon the true Protestant doctrine of the Bible, and the *Bible alone*, as the foundation of my religion; and what I find not authorised by the Bible, if it should be in the church of which I am a member, or any other, I am ready to disavow it as antichristian. Popery had taken so fast a hold of the human mind throughout all Europe; it had insinuated itself so much into all the feelings, and principles, and practices of the people; its influence has so descended from one generation to another; and it has become so interwoven with our modes of thinking, and speaking, and acting, that I question if there be any visible organized church in the world that does not possess less or more of the antichristian leaven. When the cry shall be made, Babylon the great is fallen! is fallen! there will be found, perhaps, some in every church crying, Alas! alas! for something that they have lost.'"

"Here," says the Vindicator, "I am ready to give THE PROTESTANT due credit for the sincerity of his professions, but I cannot speak much in praise of the accuracy of his judgment. He did not commence his undertaking with a view to defend any church; he takes his stand upon the Bible. As to the former, I believe him. His object undoubtedly is not to defend but to *slander*. Throughout the whole of his effusions, he has slandered and calumniated the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and in this very quotation he libels the Saviour of mankind, and declares him indirectly a LIAR.—He says he takes his 'stand upon the true Protestant doctrine of the Bible, and the *Bible alone*, as the foundation of his religion.' The Bible testifies that our Saviour solemnly promised that he would establish a church which should be a light to the world, a guide to the ignorant, a city placed on a mountain; that it should be guided by the Holy Spirit till the end of time, and that the powers of hell should not prevail against it. These solemn promises of Truth itself must convince every rational man that a church has been, *is*, and *must be*, in existence, which cannot err, and *this* church our Saviour commanded every one to *obey*, under pain of being declared a heathen or a publican; and yet the Protestant questions 'if there be *any* visible organized church in the world that does *not* possess less or more of the antichristian leaven;' which is the same as to say, that there is *not* a church but *has* committed *error*, or fallen under the power of darkness; whereas the Redeemer assures us there shall be *one* without spot or wrinkle, to the consummation of the world. Now, reader, who are we to believe? The Protestant, or the Bible, on which he pretends to take his stand, but contradicts the plain text of it, to support a groundless insinuation. He professes to be a member of the church of Scotland, and considers it to be, 'in constitution and doctrine *nearer* the divine pattern exhibited in the Bible than *any other* established church in *the world*.' This is a second acknowledgment, that he does not believe the veracity of the Son of God, but makes him an asserter of falsehoods, inasmuch as he contends there is not an *infallible* church on earth, when the Scriptures say *there is*, and *shall be* one. With this specimen of impious arrogance, need we wonder that he has perverted the tendency of the catechisms used by Catholics to instruct the ignorant, for the purpose of fixing his base charges on the Church of Rome?"

The reader is requested to trace, if he can, the connection between my paragraph, and the Vindicator's remarks upon it. I was avowedly speaking of *visible organized* churches; and he answers me partly by referring to Christ's words to his apostles as the light of the world; partly by Christ's promise to his *spiritual invisible* church; and partly by asserting that there is *one* infallible visible church in the world, a thing that never had existence, but in the distempered brains of deceiving monks, and of those who were deceived by them.

In language sufficiently revolting for its grossness, he accuses me of contradicting the Saviour, for questioning if there be an existing visible organized church free from the antichristian leaven, which implies errors in practice as well as in doctrine. By church, in this sense, I mean such a body of professing Christians as that which existed in Jerusalem, and in Corinth, and in Antioch; or if you please, such bodies as now exist, established, or not established, in most countries in Europe. Now, I think, he who should assert of any one of these, that it is free from error in both doctrine and practice, would easily be convicted of contradicting some part of the word of God. The apostles warned the early Christians that perilous times were coming, when some should depart from the faith. Antichrist was working in their own time; and of seven churches in the Lesser Asia, who were addressed by Christ himself, through the medium of the apostle John, only two were found without blame; that is, free of Antichristian leaven; but where to find two, or even one such, in

the present day, I suppose that nobody can tell.

The Vindicator has the impiety to ascribe to our Saviour, words which none of the evangelists have ascribed to him. "The Redeemer," says he, assures us there shall be *one* (church) without spot or wrinkle to the consummation of the world." There is nothing like this in the New Testament; and Mr Andrews does not say where he found it. The words, "Not having spot or wrinkle," do indeed occur in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, chap. v. verse 27, but they are not spoken of any church on earth *till* the consummation of the world, but of the church in heaven after that period, or of that part of it which is in heaven already: that is, the heavenly spouse, which Christ shall present unto himself, a *glorious* church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish. Mr Andrews means the words to apply to the Church of Rome, as she is, and always has been, which is as great an insult to the common sense of mankind as transubstantiation itself. It is worse than to say, that all that is pleasant and odoriferous, is to be found in raking up a dunghill. This is not a subject of argument, but a mere matter of fact, with regard to which any man may satisfy himself, by inquiring into the character of the Church of Rome, and of her members wherever they exist.

This writer proceeds with his assertions in a sort of hap-hazard way, without the least regard to truth. Thus he asserts that I profess to be a member of the Church of Scotland, though the paragraph in my 19th Number, in which he affects to find this, is perhaps the only one in my whole work in which the reader may find the contrary. I gave that church the commendation which I thought was her due, and plainly stated that I was not guilty of *self-commendation* in doing so; from which an ordinary degree of shrewdness would have inferred that I did not belong to the northern establishment. It has been my study to advocate the Protestant cause without identifying myself with any particular sect of Protestants; and though I cannot say that there are no traces of any sectarian peculiarity in my work, I do venture to say, that they are very faint, and such as would not lead any Protestant church to regard me as an enemy.

The Vindicator quotes, col. 8, a long paragraph from the first Number of THE PROTESTANT, on the subject of indulgences, in which I charged the Church of Rome with monstrous cruelty, for not granting relief to suffering souls in purgatory, without being amply paid for it; and in which I showed that by this means she drained immense sums from the people who confided in her. Now, what does the Vindicator say in reply to this? Why, he says nothing at all, but that if this were true, the Pope and his clergy must be very rich, whereas it is well known that they are all very poor; nay, so very poor is the Pope himself, "that the regent of this kingdom," says Mr Andrews, "is said to have offered him a loan of some thousand pounds sterling, to enable him to carry on his government." This would probably go sweetly down with Papists, who would be glad to hear that their holy father was in such favour with the Prince Regent, now the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland; but Protestants know that the Prince Regent never had thousands of pounds of his own to throw away for such a purpose; that of course he never could make such an offer to the Pontiff; and they will believe that the thing is a mere figment of the Vindicator's own invention.

It would be easy to show that the Church of Rome did amass immense wealth by means of her indulgences and pardons, and that without calling in question the fact of the present poverty of the Pope and his clergy. Bands of robbers may levy immense sums from travellers, and yet not be able to enrich themselves. Money gotten over the devil's back is said to be spent under his belly; and it is very possible that where thousands of idle luxurious priests are saddled upon a poor people, the former may not be able to get rich by their exactions upon the latter. Without enlarging upon this subject, I think it is fair to infer, that the Vindicator admits the truth of my statement, seeing he has nothing else to say in reply to it.

It is an avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome, that men must, in some way or other, satisfy divine justice for themselves. This I showed to be contrary to the tenor of the gospel, in which it is declared that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto *them*, 2 Cor. v. 19, and the reason why trespasses are not imputed to men themselves, is, because they were imputed to Christ, who in the words of the apostle Peter, "bare our sins in his own body on the tree;" or in those of Paul, "God made him who knew no sin, to be sin (or a sin-offering)for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Now if our sins were imputed to Christ, and if he bare them, and gave himself to God in sacrifice for them, he either made *complete* satisfaction to divine justice, or he did not. To suppose he did not, would be to disparage the work of the divine Saviour, and effectually to reject the gospel; and if we admit that Christ did make complete satisfaction, to say that God still required men to make satisfaction for themselves would be to ascribe injustice to Him, than which nothing can be more impious. I represented the command to believe in Christ as virtually a command to forbear attempting to satisfy divine justice for ourselves; that is, to forbear

what is hopeless, and absolutely impossible; and to accept the merciful provision which God has made for our salvation by the death of his own Son. This is a salvation not only from the punishment of sin, but also from sin itself; for the end of Christ's death is, that we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; for which also provision is made by the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, who furnishes the only means, and suggests the strongest motives for abounding in all good works. No man can think of satisfying divine justice in his own person, without looking upon God as such a one as himself; one whose justice is not very strict, and which is easily satisfied. Hence I represented Papists as having as low ideas of the divine Being as heathens who worship the work of their own hands: and Mr Andrews confesses this to be the case with himself, if the above doctrine be true. But let us have the avowal in his own words:—

"Such are the opinions of THE PROTESTANT as to the duty of satisfying divine justice; but if *his* doctrine is not more calculated to grant leave to commit sin than the Popish doctrine of indulgence, I confess I am one of those who have as low ideas of the divine Being, as the man who worships a stock or a stone for the Deity. It is asked by the question (in the French catechism) above quoted, if it is the intention of the Church of Rome to *free* us by indulgences from the obligation of God? (what a strange expression!) Now what is the obligation a Papist is taught he owes to God? He is to love God with his whole heart, with his whole soul, with all his strength, and with all his mind; and his neighbour as himself. From this obligation it is averred the intention of the church is *not to free* us; consequently she cannot intend either to indulge us in the commital of sin, or *command* us to commit it. On the contrary, the last answer quoted expressly declares, that she intends, by the dispensation of indulgences, to *excite more and more in the heart* PIETY *and* LOVE *of God*. The assertions, therefore, of THE PROTESTANT are paradoxical, inasmuch as the declared intentions of the Church of Rome are meant to produce the contrary tendency imputed to them by the writer."

It was that branch of the doctrine that requires men to satisfy divine justice for themselves, that I accused of gross impiety; and certainly nothing can be more hostile to piety and the love of God. The essence of true piety is obedience to the command of God. Now his command to all men is, that they repent and believe the gospel, and unless they obey in this respect, there is nothing else that God will acknowledge to be obedience; and therefore nothing of the nature of piety towards God. The belief of the gospel invariably produces a grateful acknowledgment of the grace of God in providing a Saviour for the guilty,—of the infinite love of Christ in giving himself a ransom for us; that is, laying down his own life to satisfy divine justice *for us*. The experimental knowledge of this love powerfully operates in the way of producing *all* obedience; and nothing else can do it. But the Church of Rome commands her members to satisfy divine justice for themselves; which is a command to commit sin in the highest possible sense; for it is to declare that the atonement of Christ is insufficient; it is to slight and reject the provision which infinite mercy has made for the restoration of a ruined world. It is not enough for the Church of Rome that her children are naturally enemies of God; she commands them to continue so. This is the necessary effect of disbelieving the perfection of Christ's satisfaction, by which alone sinners are reconciled to God, and made his friends: and that man must necessarily be an enemy who is unreconciled; that is, one who has yet to satisfy divine justice. In the mind of such a man there can be no right thoughts of God at all. No love, no gratitude, no obedience. Hence it is that the minds of all true Papists are so estranged from the worship of God, and so degraded as to worship mere creatures, even the work of their own hands.

Towards the conclusion of his first Number, the Vindicator gives us an abundant quantity of hackneyed nonsense about the doctrine of salvation by grace being unfriendly to good works, and an encouragement to sin, all which was anticipated and answered by the apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans.

I have thus made a beginning in my reply to the Catholic Vindicator; and I suspect it will be very uninteresting to my Protestant readers, partly from the repetitions which it is necessary to make; and partly from the quality of the subject, which requires me sometimes to descend below the level of polite writing, and to adopt the less dignified alternative recommended by Solomon, Proverbs xxvi. 5. I shall not quote the words, as I hope, by omitting them, to send my Popish readers to the Bible for once. I find this the most irksome duty I have been called to perform since the commencement of my work. The style and matter of the Vindicator are so low and disgusting, that I anticipate no pleasure to myself, or profit to the reader in exposing his errors and misrepresentations; but as he was the public organ of our Glasgow Papists, and, I suppose, of all the strict, genuine Papists in the kingdom, including Dr Milner, whose patronage he enjoyed, and whose sentiments he was understood to express, it becomes necessary to pay more attention to his work than if it contained only the errors of an obscure individual. I shall, however, relieve the tedium of my subject by inserting from time to time such light matter as may come in my way. I am indebted to a correspondent for

the following counterpart of the story of the Pope's shirt, which was given in Number 148, from Galiffe's work,—not *Galiffico's*, as the word was erroneously given. The following is from the Literary Gazette of May 12th, in the account of the death and funeral of the Sultan of Souracarta, in the island of Java; and it shows that the affair of the shirt, like most other Popish customs, was derived from heathenism.

"The washing of the Sultan occupied above two hours. The water used for the purpose, and in which, for the first washing, tamarind and burnt rice straw were mixed, was taken up by the bystanders as a mark of respect. Some wash their head and body with it; others swallow a part of it. In this operation it is the duty of the eldest son to clean with a large piece of linen those parts which most require it. The linen, being afterwards cut into small pieces, is distributed among the family and bystanders, who ascribe to it a certain occult power to preserve them in all the dangers of life."

No. CLII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 9TH, 1821.

THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR begins his third Number with the following statement:—"Some of my readers, for whose opinions I entertain a high regard, disapprove of my using the terms *papist* and *popery;* but in this adoption I am not singular, as I only follow the example of the venerable and learned Gother in his *Pulpit Sayings*, and afterwards in his *Two-fold Character of Popery*, a work of general estimation among Catholics, it having passed through many editions, and is still in circulation. In Mr Gother's time, Catholics were always designated as Papists, and at this day there are many of our adversaries, from the prelatic chair to the cobbler's stall, who will not allow us any other title. Of this description of bigots is THE PROTESTANT; and as I am not very nice about names, so as I know the principles I defend are correct, I felt a willingness to humour my adversary, purposing, when occasion offered, to convince him, if he is open to conviction, as well as every candid Protestant who reads my VINDICATOR, that a Papist, and a Papist *only*, is entitled to the honourable distinction of *Catholic;* and that the system of Popery, and *this* system *only*, is the true church on earth, established by our Saviour and his apostles. This opportunity THE PROTESTANT has given me in the following remarks made by him on a similar objection to the epithet, by one of the newspaper disputants."

He then quotes a paragraph from my second Number, in which I showed that the Church of Rome never was *universal*, and of course never entitled to the word *Catholic*. This is another matter of fact, which every reader of history knows as well as he or I; and which scarcely admits of any argument, but a mere reference to history. Notwithstanding, Mr Andrews makes a very long and wordy reply, the substance of which is that the Church of Rome is entitled to the designation of Catholic, because her members are spread all over the world; and because she was the instrument of converting every country in *Christendom* to the Christian faith. I am by no means induced to concede to him that this last assertion is true; but though it were, it would not bear him out, for Christendom itself is far from being Catholic or universal; and as for the other fact, that the Church of Rome has her members spread all over the world, if that be enough to constitute her *the* Catholic church, then I maintain that Scotland is the universal empire, and Presbytery is the Catholic religion, for in what part of the world are not Scotchmen and Presbyterians to be found? But I am afraid the Jews will contest the point with us, for they were once the true church, and they are to be found at this day in all parts of the world, even in places where Popery and Presbytery would find it difficult to obtain a settlement.

The Vindicator admits that Popery and Papists are proper designations of the Church of Rome and her members; then it is surely unreasonable to charge with bigotry those who persist in using these proper words, and who refuse to use such as they think improper. In every controversy it is of advantage to use terms in which both parties are agreed; and when there are such terms, he would be a bigoted controversialist who would require his opponent to use any other. It seems, however, that the Vindicator's concession on this point was not agreeable to some of his brethren; and he justified himself by stating the fact that in Gother's time, that is, about a century and a half ago, Catholics were always designated as Papists. Luther, in his commentary on the Galatians, tells us, that Papist was the name by which they themselves chose to be called, and I have never read that this was contradicted by any of his contemporaries; but for about half a century our Scotch and English Papists have laboured hard to get themselves called Catholics; and through the indifference of Protestants they have very generally succeeded. Now what can be the reason why the professors of an unchangeable religion should be so anxious to change its name? for as they now call themselves Catholics, they call the system Catholicity. The fact is, the more respectable of them, mingling with Protestants, in an enlightened state of society, could not but come to know, that there were many horrible ideas associated with the words *papist* and *popery;* and such of them as were readers of history could not but know the fact, that these ideas had their foundation in truth;

hence they were led first to disavow the name, and to assume one less offensive; and one, which being recognized in a creed approved by Protestants, they thought would commend them to favour in a Protestant country.

The bulk of this more respectable class of Romanists differ from genuine Papists in many respects, though they are willing to be called by the same general name, Catholic. Though they all profess to hold fellowship with the Pope as the head of their church, there is as real a schism between them as between any two sects of Protestants. Their nobility and gentry in England, associating with Protestants of the same rank, have insensibly acquired a refinement, and in some instances a liberality, quite unknown to men of their communion in former times, and in countries where their religion is still predominant. They are conscious that they are not the savage, superstitious beings that all history represents Papists to have been, and which they know them still to be, in Spain, Portugal, and Italy. Hence, along with the name, Popery, they have renounced a great deal of the thing; and some of them go so far as to proclaim their dissent from the Church of Rome as papistical, and profess to adhere to it under a less objectionable character, which is virtually to give up its infallibility. But Mr Andrews takes his stand upon the system of Popery, as it was, is, and shall be, while it exists. He has on his side at least one Vicar apostolical bishop, most of the inferior priests, all the Jesuits, and almost all the common people; and he writes against the liberal and respectable part of his own communion with as much abuse and virulence as he did against THE PROTESTANT.

I shall confirm what I have said above by the authority of a doctor of their own, and, I suppose, the most learned man that has risen among them for a hundred years. Addressing one of his own bishops, Dr Geddes says:—"'The enlightened and well-principled Catholic,' your lordship observes, 'remains unshaken and unseduced.' Certainly, my lord. But who is the *enlightened* and *well-principled Catholic?* This is yet to be demonstrated. The CATHOLIC religion not only permits its children to be dutiful subjects, but expressly commands them to be such: but not so, my lord, the POPISH religion. These two ought never to be confounded. The former is a most amiable matron, who inculcates nothing upon the minds of her children but the peaceful maxims of the gospel; the latter is an ambitious termagant, who has often encouraged her children to commit almost every sort of crime. It was the *Popish*, not the *Catholic* religion, my lord, which (not to go out of our own country nor back to a remote period) could in 1537 excite 20,000 men, under the conduct of a monk, to rise in rebellion against Henry VIII. in consequence of his subjects having been freed from their oaths of allegiance by a bull of Paul III. It was the same *Popish* religion that, in 1539, attempted to depose the same King, and place on the throne the Dean of Exeter.* It was this religion that sent Radulpho into England in 1568 for the vile purpose of corrupting the loyalty of the English Catholics, and to pave the way for the famous bull of Pius V. which deprived Queen Elizabeth of her title, dominion, dignity, and privileges; and forbade all her subjects, under pain of *anathema*, to obey her! It was this religion that, the very next year, again erected the standard of sedition under the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland; and their want of success the Popish Surrius thinks, might have been owing to this, *that the Papal denunciation had not been sufficiently made known to all the Catholics.* It was this religion that in 1580 sent Parsons and Campion into England, with the qualified bull of Gregory XIII. which, in the hands of those two artful men, was deemed a surer means of raising a rebellion, than the more violent one of his predecessor. It was this religion that in 1588 sent the Spanish Armada to invade England, fraught with a 'powerful army, plenty of money, and treasures of indulgences, for the purpose of dethroning a queen, against whom Sixtus V. had confirmed all the censures of Pius and Gregory; and granted a full pardon to all who should embark in the holy enterprize! In short, my lord, I make no hesitation to affirm, that the *Popish* (not the *Catholic*) religion has been, mediately or immediately, the cause of almost all the political disturbances in Europe since the days of Gregory VII. It is against this religion, my lord, that we CATHOLIC † DISSENTERS protest; and whose interests ye Vicars apostolic appear to be contending for." See *Life of Dr Geddes, by John Mason Good*, London, 1803, pages 229—231.

Such is the true testimony of the most learned Romanist of the present age. He plainly declares that the religion of which the Pope was the head, was the cause of almost all the mischiefs which afflicted Europe for ages; and that the head of the church himself was the chief instigator of sedition and rebellion. Yet with a wonderful degree of inconsistency, he continued a priest of that church, acknowledging the Pope as his spiritual father, but intreating that he might not be called by his odious name: and the name which he chose for himself was so general, that it could not properly distinguish him from any other person professing Christianity, or his church from any other

* Afterwards Cardinal Pole.

† He means dissenters from the Church of England, and by the word *Catholic*, he distinguishes himself and brethren from Protestant dissenters; but the bishop whom he addressed strongly objected to the expression, declaring that Catholics were not dissenters from the Established Church, but truly and properly the church itself.

church called Christian. It is pretended to remedy this defect by adding another word; and so Papists are generally styled by Protestants, *Roman Catholics*, which implies a contradiction something like, *particular general* or *limited universal*.

It is enough for my present purpose to have it acknowledged by Mr Andrews, that it is *Popery* that he is defending, and to have it certified by a priest of his own communion, that this system of Popery has been the cause of unspeakable mischief to all the nations of Europe. The extracts which I have made from both these authors, will be found, I hope, to bear me out in what I have long been maintaining, —that Popery is the proper designation of the Romish system; and that this Popery is the convicted enemy, not only of real Christianity, but also of all that is amiable and virtuous in the world.

In treating this subject, the Vindicator writes as follows:—"In the first place our Redeemer singled out Peter as the rock on which he founded his *church*, and he assured his disciples that *this* church should *exist to the end of the world*, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. Here then we have a *visible* church, fixed upon an immovable basis, and in a distinguishable situation, defying the attacks of *error* and the malice of *devils*, to the end of time. In the second place, our blessed Lord chose twelve poor men, whom he commissioned to go to the farthest bounds of the earth, to teach all nations the truths and precepts he had imparted to them, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and commanding all men, under pain of eternal damnation, to hear and obey the church which they should establish. Accordingly, on the commencement of their mission, they formed a creed, called the apostles' creed, which was to be a symbol of the faith of themselves and of their followers for ever; and we find them in their acts, recorded in the New Testament, exercising that authority over the new converts which Christ had given them, when he said, 'he that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.' Here then we have an organized church, and that it was both *visible* and *organized*, is placed beyond a doubt, by the following words of St Matthew, chap. xviii. ver. 15—18."

Here we have the old figment of Peter being the rock on which Christ built his church, asserted with as much confidence as if the absurdity of it had never been demonstrated. This said rock, that is, Peter, is declared to be an immovable basis, against which the gates of hell, that is, the attacks of hell, and the malice of devils, should never prevail; and yet we find, in the very same chapter (Mat. xvi.) in which Papists affect to find that Peter is the rock, that he is exhibited by the inspired penman, as a mere reed, shaken by the wind; nay, it is declared that Satan had so far prevailed against him, and had got him to enter so far into his views, that the divine Saviour found it proper to call him by the name of the adversary to whose suggestions he had given a too willing ear:—"Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." A feeling of tenderness for the apostle, who was upon the whole a good and honest man, has led many readers of the Bible to suppose that such hard words were not spoken to Peter, but to the devil, who had somehow got the possession of his mind, and the command of his tongue; but there is no foundation for this tenderness. It was Peter himself, and none else, who at that time was called Satan, that is, adversary; for he was not a demoniac, or one possessed by a demon, who spoke through his organs, without the consent of his own mind. It was of his own deliberate judgment that he presumed to rebuke his divine Master, and to advise him not to submit to the shame and the pain of being crucified. In plain words, his advice went to dissuade Christ from finishing the work of our salvation on which he had entered. In this he acted the part of a very Satan, or adversary of both God and man; and this too, after that had taken place, which Papists understand to have constituted him the immovable rock against which the gates of hell should never prevail. It is painful to be obliged to advert to the fact, that even after this, the devil prevailed against this apostle once and again; but Papists by exalting him above measure, and putting him in the place of God, lay us under the necessity of showing that he was but a man.

The next thing of importance which the Vindicator asserts, is, that the apostles, on the commencement of their mission, formed a creed, called the apostles' creed, which was to be a symbol of the faith of themselves and of their followers for ever. Where he obtained this piece of information he does not say. I find, indeed, in the Douay catechism, after the question, Who composed the creed? Answer, The twelve apostles. But the Douay doctors were such moderns that they could know no more of the matter than we do. I have before me a large volume, entitled, The History of the Apostles' Creed, fourth edition, London, 1719, in which I find no evidence that the apostles were the authors of this comprehensive, and I must say, truly orthodox symbol. It contains just twelve articles, from which, I suppose, it is to be inferred that each apostle contributed one. The work to which I have referred does not assert this, but it gives it as an ancient opinion, "That the apostles were the real authors of the creed, and that they assembled together by their mutual consent to

compose and frame it," page 8. The author shows that there is no foundation for this; and indeed to suppose that the apostles of Christ, who had so much important work upon their hands, should be gathered together from the different parts of the world, to compose a short summary of what any man of common understanding might find in their published epistles and narratives, appears to me no less absurd than to suppose that twelve of the most learned men in Europe should be assembled in solemn council, to decide upon the best means of making a pen, which every scribe is, or ought to be, able to do for himself. Systematizing was no part of the work of either apostles or prophets. There is a divine simplicity in their mode of communicating heavenly instruction, which corresponds with the other works of God; and as no one field or cavern of the earth exhibits a classified arrangement of minerals or plants, so no work of inspired men was intended to give us a systematical or classically-arranged view of Christian doctrine. I find no fault with any man for endeavouring to classify and arrange the truths of the word of God, for the edification of himself or others, but let it be always regarded as a work of man, and not ascribed to the divine Spirit, or those who wrote under his infallible influence.

I admit that this short summary of doctrine is unexceptionable in itself, if taken with the explanatory note of the Westminster divines about Christ having descended into hell, which explanation, by the by, shows how difficult it is to draw up a summary of religious belief on which all Christians shall agree. The articles of this creed are so few and simple, that it must have been composed before controversies were greatly multiplied; and those who framed it were no doubt agreed about the meaning of the clause, "he descended into hell;" but in process of time this itself became a subject of controversy; one party maintaining that Christ, after his death, went down to the place of punishment,—another, that the words signify only that he went down to the grave, that is, was buried, and continued for a time in the state of the dead. It is not doubted that this creed is a composition of great antiquity. The whole of it as it stands in the English Liturgy, was generally received as an authoritative confession in the fourth century; but the word "Catholic" was not originally in it, as is admitted by Rufinus, who wrote a commentary on it about the end of that century. This word must have been foisted in to serve a purpose, after the Church of Rome had begun to put forth her claim to be obeyed as the mother and mistress of all churches: and though the word is retained in all the Protestant versions of this creed, I do not see how they can make sense of it, consistently with their other avowed principles, otherwise than by applying it to the spiritual church or spouse of Christ, which is not of this world but saved out of it; that is, washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God. This church is catholic, not considered as pervading the whole world, but as comprising the whole company of those who are saved, out of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations.

That the Catholic Church must be *visible* and *organized*, the Vindicator attempts to prove from Christ's words, Mat. xviii. 15—18. "Tell it unto the church," &c. "From this explicit command of Christ to his disciples," says Mr Andrews, "to have recourse to the church, in the event of any dispute or division arising among them, it is demonstrably evident that there must be a *visible organized* church on earth having power to *decide* all questions referred to her, and her decision, in every instance, was to be *final* and *binding* on *all* believers, under pain of being considered an outlaw or an *unbeliever*, and consequently no longer a *member* of the *true church*," col. 37. Now it is very clear that our Lord's words, even with the Vindicator's comment upon them, prove the very reverse of what he means to establish. When Christ says, "Tell it to the church," he certainly means such a church as a man could speak to, which is impossible of the Romish, or any other church that pretends to be Catholic or universal. The command is perfectly intelligible, and obedience to it was practicable and easy in any church which apostles founded, and in which the earlier bishops presided. But none of these churches pretended to be universal. The assumption of this title distinctly points out the Church of Rome as not being such a church as Christ was speaking of; for it is impossible to tell any thing to such a body, not even in the sense of a representative church, if we were to admit this meaning of the word, for she has had neither council nor convocation for 300 years; and therefore, according to her own doctrine, she can have given no decision, during that period, that is "binding upon believers." Perhaps Mr Andrews will allege that telling a thing to the priest is enough; but he has a great deal to do before he can prove that a priest is the church; or that all the priests together are entitled to this honourable appellation.

The Vindicator blunders away through many a long page, applying to one thing what Christ and the apostles spoke of another;—such for instance as the promises that the church should be preserved in the world till the end of time, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. This is what no Christian disputes; and yet Mr Andrews constantly writes as if I denied it. Thus because the Culdees and Waldenses were overcome by the Church of Rome, he argues that they were not *the true* church. The same thing will apply to the

churches in Jerusalem, in Samaria, in Judea, Galatia, and the latter Asia. We are sure these were true churches, yet most or all of them have been overcome and destroyed: yet the promise of Christ has been, and shall most certainly be fulfilled in all its extent. Plain facts therefore assure us, that this promise was not given to any particular church; that it does not insure perpetual existence to any one of them; but only to his church in that sense in which it is general, comprehending all real Christians in every age and country in the world. If I have succeeded in establishing this to the reader's satisfaction, I have answered the half of the Vindicator's great volume.

No. CLIII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 16TH, 1821.

BY wresting my words, and making what I wrote of *a* church in one sense of the word apply to *the* church in another sense of it, the Catholic Vindicator affects to find me guilty of innumerable contradictions; and he triumphs mightily in the victory which he supposes he has obtained. I can scarcely allow myself to set this down to the account of mere stupidity; for though my opponent had never read the New Testament, he must have seen from some of my earliest papers, that I made the distinction to which I have here alluded. He might indeed question the propriety of the distinction, but seeing I laid it so plainly down, he must have been perfectly aware, that whatever my errors, in his opinion, were, the things which he calls contradictions were made such by himself, by perverting my words.

This general reply may serve for all that he has written about my "endless contradictions," a charge which is reiterated through almost every Number of his work. He was aware that he was writing for people who would readily swallow any thing that might have the appearance of being a defence of their superstition, or that would place its great enemy in an odious light. Besides, as his main object was to draw me away from the vital parts of the controversy, and to engage me in a quibbling personal contest, he made the bait as tempting as possible, by the grossness of his accusations, and the unfair use of my words, expecting that I would instantly and eagerly defend myself against his attacks. Had I done so, I should never have got a step farther in exposing the errors and abominations of Popery. I would soon have disgusted my readers, as he did his, by personalities and other unprofitable discussions, and for want of support, my work, like his, would have lingered with difficulty to the end of a single volume.

In the 4th Number of the Vindicator, we have some paragraphs of THE PROTESTANT, in which the design and tendency of Popery are contrasted with the design and tendency of Christianity; and which conclude with the following sentence:—"With regard to the destruction of men's bodies, we know from history that Popery has slain its thousands and tens of thousands; but with regard to the ruin of souls from this fatal error, (that of depending upon something else than Christ's death) no man can tell the millions who have been by Popery deceived, to their everlasting destruction." See the whole passage, page 115.

Let us now hear the reply which the Vindicator makes to this passage:—"Poor Popery! if this description of thy case be true, what must thy votaries expect at the last accounting-day? The picture is really horrible to behold, and even THE PROTESTANT, in contemplating it, is fearful that some of his readers will condemn him for colouring it too much; for he adds, 'I am aware that I am here treading on delicate ground, and that many who take themselves for Protestants, will accuse me of uncharitableness, but I care not, while I know that I am upon sure ground, which I consider myself to be, while I proceed upon the plain declaration of the word of God.' Presumptuous man! before advancing so frightful a charge against the most numerous body of Christians throughout the universe, in all ages, oughtest thou not to have searched into the principles of their religion, from the writings and instructions given by their own pastors and doctors, rather than from the disfigurations of their enemies?" col. 55. Then follows a morsel of verbal criticism on the word "*consider*," in one part of a sentence, which it seems is not strong enough to correspond with the word "*know*" in another, in which, perhaps, the Vindicator is right for once. After this he finds that if my representation be true, Papists are "bloody and unfeeling murderers and cut-throats;" which inference I shall not dispute with him. Again, if such were Popery, "how are we to account for its triumphing over the works of darkness, by supplanting the heathen rites of Paganism, and planting the cross of Christ in their stead; and this, not by sacrificing other men's lives, but by its agents and dupes laying down their own, when persecuted to death by their adversaries?" Thus by putting a question, he takes for granted the very point at issue; for if Popery had triumphed over the works of darkness, I should have no argument against it; and it is well known that instead of *supplanting*, Popery *adopted* the rites of heathenism; and planting the cross in the Popish sense, is setting up as great an idol as ever heathen worshipped. I merely state this here; but I refer to the numerous proofs of Popish idolatry which I gave in Numbers 39 to 62.

The Vindicator, of course, denies that Satan is the author of Popery; and then he proceeds, questioning as follows, in which he still takes for granted the very thing that is disputed:—"If the *design* of Popery originated with Satan, is it probable, is it reasonable, to suppose that God would permit its influence to extend over the *whole* of Christendom; nay, that Christianity itself should owe its rise to this very influence?" We have been accustomed to think that Christianity owed its rise to the mercy of God; but no, says Mr Andrews, *Christianity owes its rise to the influence of Popery!* Then Popery, as I have all along maintained, is not Christianity, but something different from it, for a thing cannot take its rise from itself; and, farther, Popery must have been before Christianity, for a thing cannot rise out of that which comes after it. Here I will admit that the Vindicator is right once more. Popery, as I had been showing, owes its origin to the devil. He infused the very essence of it into the minds of our first parents when he persuaded them to disbelieve God, and to believe a creature. This, I say, is the concentrated essence of Popery as it exists in the world at this day. This was before Christianity; and it is so far true that Christianity took its rise from it, that it furnished occasion for the display of divine mercy, by the promise of a Saviour, in which Christianity originated.

But to proceed with the Vindicator's catechism,—for Popish writers have all a trick of putting what they mean to affirm into the form of a question, insomuch that some of them cannot understand a series of questions otherwise than as so many assertions; thus when I put a few questions to Amicus Veritatis by way of supposition, (Number 150, page 620.), I have been understood by Papists, as I am informed, as affirming something about Amicus himself. Had this been the case I would not have said, "I am *merely* supposing things;" for I hold it to be as sinful to write as to speak a lie. I know nothing whatever of him personally; and if he has suffered any injury among his brethren or others, by the misapprehension of my words, I hope this declaration will do it away. But to proceed:—"Were not our Saxon ancestors converted to Christianity by the missionaries of Rome? Do we not owe the principal privileges enjoyed by Protestants under the British constitution to Catholic or Popish kings, prelates, and people? Were not all the infidel nations that received the faith of Christ converted by the agents of Popery?"—and so on to the end of the paragraph. Now it is evident that the Vindicator intends these questions to stand for affirmations; but there is not one of them founded in truth: Rome did not convert our Saxon ancestors to Christianity, but to Popery; and Gregory, the Pope of the day, instructed his missionaries not to abolish the Pagan rites of the Saxons, but to adopt them, which Christianity would never have done. It is not true that we owe our principal privileges to Popish kings, prelates, and people; for the greatest of all these privileges is liberty of conscience, which was never enjoyed under a Popish king, and scarcely enjoyed at all with any degree of security in this kingdom till the Revolution of 1688, when the government became decidedly Protestant, and a Papist was declared incapable of sitting on the throne. As for the infidel nations which Rome boasts of having converted, it is well known that their conversion consisted in little else than a change of one set of idols for another.

In all that the Vindicator has said on this subject, there is nothing that has so much as the appearance of a reply to my paragraph about the bloody cruelty of the system which I am opposing. The amount of what he has written in opposition to my statement, is, If this be true, Popery is cruel indeed; but he has not a word to prove that it is not true; and he cannot, he knows that he cannot, disprove my statement, for they are recorded in letters of blood, visible to every man who reads the history of Europe for the last six hundred years. Instead therefore of meeting the charge of bloody cruelty which I brought against his church, by disproving or confessing it, he calls away his reader's attention to many fine things which he pretends Popery has done; as if a man charged with murder should plead not guilty, because he had given a penny to every beggar whom he had met on the street for the last two years. I suppose no jury would acquit a convicted murderer on this account; neither can I acquit the Church of Rome of bloody cruelty, because her defenders plead that she has done some good in the world, while they cannot prove even this on her behalf.

The Vindicator is so extremely diffuse and *wordy* in all his discussions, that I am in some instances under the necessity of abridging. I know he will find fault with this; and I know also that I would not satisfy him by quoting any of his paragraphs entire, unless I were to quote them all, that is, transfer his whole volume into mine, which would be rather a hazardous undertaking, for I am persuaded the buoyance of The Protestant would not be able to preserve the united mass from sinking into contempt and oblivion. The reader may however rest assured that what I give as quotations from the Vindicator, marked as such, are his identical words; that I have not, and shall not garble or distort any sentence, so as to misrepresent his meaning. Indeed, if I were so wickedly inclined, there is no temptation to it; for there is more *answerable* matter than I shall be able to get through for a long time, without distorting or affecting to misunderstand his words.

He tells me that I ought to have searched into the principles of their religion from the

writings and instructions given by their own pastors and doctors, rather than from the disfigurations of their enemies. I have done the very thing that he requires of me; and he knows that I have done it; but it is the practice of all Popish writers to represent their adversaries as acting a contrary part, and thus they attempt to do away the impression which writings hostile to their system are likely to make. My practice has been, when entering upon the discussion of any Popish dogma, first to lay down the doctrine in the very words of their own great and approved authors; and in the most important points, I have not rested satisfied with the words of individuals, however great, but have had recourse to public documents, approved catechisms, and even to the authentic canons of the Council of Trent; and I have not yet been convicted of misquoting or misrepresenting a single word. The Vindicator's call upon me, therefore, to have recourse to doctors of his own church, is a piece of disingenuous finesse, to make his readers believe that I know nothing of the system, but have taken a misrepresentation of it from its enemies.

The Vindicator affects to find, from the admissions of Luther and Calvin, that Popery is more favourable to good morals than the new religion. "Thus," says he, "writes Luther:—'Men *are now* more revengeful, covetous, and licentious, than they were ever in the Papacy.'—*Postil. Super. Evang. Dom. I. adv.* Again, 'Heretofore, when we were seduced by the Pope, every man willingly performed *good* works, but *now* no man says or knows any thing else, but how to get all to himself by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, usury, &c.' *Postil. Super. Evang. Dom.* 26. *Post. Trin.* Calvin complained in the same strain of the effects of the *new* system. 'Of the many thousands,' said he, 'who renouncing Popery, seemed eagerly to embrace the gospel, how few have mended their lives! Nay, what else did the greater part pretend to, but by shaking off the yoke of superstition, to give themselves liberty to follow all kinds of licentiousness.' *Lib. de Scandalis.* Such was the state of morals among the new evangelized people under the influence of Protestantism, as testified by its originators; and is it improved at the present period?"—Then follows a long account of the profligacy of manners in England in the present day, as proved by the reports in the house of Commons, and the records of the Old Bailey, all which is, of course, laid to the account of Protestantism. And we are invited to cast our eyes upon "Catholic" Ireland, and challenged to find, if we can, the same rapid progress of depravity and crime in that island.

To the last part of the above I shall reply first; and I admit that we have not of late had to remark, in Ireland, such "*rapid progress* in depravity," as in England, and even in our own city; because Ireland, I mean the Popish part of it, was so proficient in depravity long ago, that she had not the same room for "rapid progress;" and it is well known that her depravity was the offspring of her Popery. Besides, rapid as our progress towards depravity has been of late years, the most depraved spot of Great Britain is unspeakably less depraved than the average of the more Popish parts of Ireland. This is a mere matter of fact, for the truth of which I appeal to all who are acquainted with the state of both countries; and I await their verdict without any apprehension of being cast.

Besides, the progress of depravity in Britain, particularly in Glasgow, has been greatly accelerated by the influx of Irish Papists. This is another matter of fact, for which I appeal to our justiciary records, and to the personal knowledge of every public functionary in this city and neighbourhood. No writer but one who is in the habit of distrusting his own senses, or who writes for those who do, would have ventured a comparison between Britain and Ireland, with regard to their moral condition, with a view to prove the superiority on the side of the latter; but this Mr Andrews has done; from which the reader may draw his own conclusion with regard to his moral or intellectual condition.

Whether the words given as quotations from Luther and Calvin be genuine or not, I cannot tell. I have much reason to suspect a writer who publicly maintains that it is "perfectly correct and honourable" to give a half sentence as a whole one, and to suppress such words as explain an author's meaning. (See Number 150, page 619.) It would not be difficult to ascertain the fact; but it does not appear to be worth while. Luther and Calvin may have used the words here ascribed to them, without the least disparagement of the doctrines of the Reformation; and they may have used such language, not because the state of morals was really worse, but because they had acquired a more acute discernment of moral turpitude; as old, and especially religious old men have always been disposed to think the present age worse than the last.

It may be admitted, that when men shake off the yoke and the restraints of superstition, without coming under the influence of the gospel, they may exhibit more flagrant wickedness in their conduct than before. Calvin speaks of some who *seemed* eagerly to embrace the gospel, but who did not amend their lives, or that but few of them did so. There were some, it would appear, who had reformed; from which the inference is, that these had really embraced the gospel, and the others only *seemed* to do so: nay it appears they avowed their infidelity; they pretended nothing else by shaking off the yoke of superstis-

tion, than to give themselves more liberty to follow all kinds of licentiousness. The Reformation is not to blame for the conduct of infidels and hypocrites, who never received its doctrines, or submitted to its discipline.

There is, however, one expression in the words ascribed to Luther, which leads me strongly to suspect that they are not his :—" when we were seduced by the Pope, *every man willingly performed good works.*" Luther's best friends admit that he was often unguarded in his language; but if ever he said any thing like this, it must have been in his sleep; for he knew, and all the world knows, that it was the wicked works which were the effect of Popish seduction in the form of indulgences, which first opened his eyes to see the abominable character of Popery, and led him to throw off the yoke of Rome.

The Vindicator (col. 61.) makes a general reference to some documents and facts which I had adduced to prove the bloody cruelty of Popery; and the following is his reply:—"This system has existed for eighteen centuries; it exists now in full vigour in several populous and independent states on the continent; not all the cruel vengeance of Protestantism and Puritanism could subdue its influence in Ireland, where it has reigned fourteen hundred years; and does he (The Protestant) think that his imaginary cases are sufficient to establish his charge? No, no; he must explain to the reader the *extraordinary* methods used by Popery to make men *love* what is *hateful* to them. Few of us are fond of being tortured, and starved, and murdered, as The Protestant says the deluded victims of Popery *are* by its agents; and yet hundreds of Papists have suffered death under Protestant hands for adhering to it, while hundreds of others have fled to Popish countries from this Protestant kingdom, to avoid the same fate; and thousands and tens of thousands have borne every degree of insult and privation rather than renounce its influence. Now is not this something contrary to human nature and the usual course of things? Mankind in general love justice better than oppression; but according to the Protestant's logic, Catholics or Papists love cruelty and injustice better than mildness and equity. Protestants have had the *exclusive* care of the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of this kingdom for nearly two centuries, and the complaints from all parts of the island at this moment of the oppression of the taxes are so loud, and the burden so universally felt, that numbers are daily leaving their country to seek for relief in a foreign land, the same as Catholics were *compelled* to do under the penal laws; and publications are hourly issuing from the press, calling on those who are left behind to seek a remedy for their grievances. This is the natural consequence of discontent. But, notwithstanding Popery is described to be of so abominable a nature in its design and tendency, that it not only *destroys our bodies by thousands and tens of thousands,* but sends our poor souls to *everlasting perdition by millions,* it still preserves its influence over the minds of men of all nations, nor could the gibbets and knives of our Protestant ancestors root it out of this and the sister island; nor will the absurd nonsense of THE PROTESTANT and his associates in folly and falsehood, impede the progress it is making in the number of its members. The sequel then must come to this: either the greatest bulk of Christians are the most stupid and senseless of mankind, or THE PROTESTANT is an arrogant and barefaced calumniator."

Such is the Vindicator's *full* and *particular* reply to the plain facts by which I proved Popery to be a system of cruelty. The reader will perceive that there is not so much as an attempt to disprove any one of these facts. The sum and substance of the reply is,—if Popery be as I described it, Papists are great fools, as well as "murderers and cut-throats," and I shall not controvert this inference any more than the other, for there are simple ones who love simplicity, and scorners who delight in their scorning, and fools who hate knowledge. It is perhaps difficult to account for the taste of such persons; but it is a fact, that both heathens and Papists do torture themselves and one another, sometimes to death, with a view, as they think, to satisfy divine justice; and they prefer this to the merciful plan of salvation revealed by the gospel. While this remains an undisputed fact, all the Vindicator's flourishes about men not loving what is hateful go for nothing.

If we were to believe the Vindicator, we would suppose that by some unaccountable charm, the whole matter of history had been reversed;—that it was Protestants who kindled the flames of Smithfield to burn Papists; that it was Protestants in Ireland, who at different times rose in arms, and murdered their Popish neighbours by thousands. Yes, he would not hesitate to assert this in plain words, to serve a purpose. No doubt his Popish readers believe it is so; and therefore it is that they regard Protestants with such murderous hatred —"nursing their wrath to keep it warm."

No. CLIV.

SATURDAY, JUNE 23D, 1821.

IN his fifth Number, the Vindicator adverts to Mr Bourke's pamphlet, of which I gave an account in my twenty-third number. He does not know what to make of this production, which exposes in so strong a light the

wicked practices of Irish Popish priests. He says "whether he was the publisher, or even the author of some of the sentiments imputed to him, is matter of doubt, as the work is printed for W. Whittemore, 56, Paternoster Row, London." I do not know any thing that he can allege against Mr Whittemore, but that he is a Protestant, from which we are to infer, that no work published by a Protestant, though written by a Papist, can contain the truth. The editor, it seems, took upon him to abridge Mr Bourke's *observations*, from which Mr Andrews infers that we can have no dependence upon his *facts;* which is a species of logic much of a piece with what follows:—

"But what will the reader think when I inform him, that the accuser-general (*i. e.* The Protestant) and the reverend Romish priest, whom he has brought forward to sustain his charge, are at variance with each other in their assertions? The Protestant avers, that the system of Popery is a system of error and delusion, of cruelty and oppression. Mr Bourke declares, in the preface to his work, from whence the former has so copiously quoted, and in his first letter therein to his prelate, that the Catholic or Popish religion, meaning of course the system, is HOLY, which word being defined by Dr Johnson to signify *good, pure, sacred,* must be opposed to *falsehood* and *deceit,*" col. 71. Thus, because Mr Bourke has a better opinion of the Church of Rome than I have, he is not to be believed in a statement of facts, which not only came within his own knowledge, but which really regarded himself. This must be the Vindicator's meaning, else it will be difficult to find any meaning in his words; for I cannot suppose he seriously means to affirm that two persons, differing in opinion about the merits of a system, must necessarily contradict one another in a matter of fact. It is one of the inconsistencies of Mr Bourke, that he continued to adhere to a church in which such horrible oppression was practised; and that he still considered it a holy, and the true church; but this, so far from making his testimony doubtful, ought rather to confirm it, because it is not probable that so steady a son would belie his holy mother.

The Vindicator (col. 72) makes the following strange concession: "That corrupt practices are committed by some of the clergy of the Catholic church, no one will deny; it is the natural consequence of human frailty." I call this a strange concession, because it comes from one who boasts of the "spotless purity" of the Catholic priests in Ireland, and it is of these that he is speaking, when he admits that corrupt practices are committed by some of them. Now it is impossible that a church can be pure, if corrupt practices are known to exist among either priest or people, without instantly applying the divinely appointed means for the reformation, or expulsion of the corrupt members. Popish writers, and Mr Andrews in particular, think they have sufficient ground for condemning the Reformation, when they have it admitted, that the Reformers may have erred, even in a speculative opinion. Now there is no error greater than "corrupt practice," of which some of the Irish priests are admitted to be guilty; and this guilt must attach to the whole body, seeing they hold communion with such corrupt members, and allow them to exercise every priestly function. The lowest priest is greater in the Church of Rome than Luther and Calvin were in the Reformed Churches; for he professes to be a successor of the apostles, and an infallible word-of-mouth teacher of the faith, which no Protestant believes the Reformers to have been. When, therefore, such priests err grievously in their practice, the Church of Rome is condemned, according to the reasoning of her own advocates. When such a circumstance as that which is here admitted of Romish priests, is known to exist in a Protestant church, her really sound members acknowledge and deplore her imperfection, and do what they can to remove it; but in a perfect and infallible church, without spot or wrinkle, as Mr Andrews affirms the Church of Rome to be, no such acknowledgment can consistently be made; and to admit that some of her clergy are guilty of corrupt practices, is at once to overthrow the whole fabric of the church's holiness and infallibility.

In quoting Mr Bourke, I gave sometimes his own words, and sometimes their substance in an abridged form. This was done professedly, and without marks of quotation, when I did not insert his own words. The Vindicator finds one paragraph thus abridged, which he quotes, col. 76, and which *he* thinks ought to have been given entire; and, because it is not so given, he exclaims, "What a pitiful! what a mean! what a disgraceful trick is this, to impose upon the credulous and unthinking!" The thing is of little importance in itself, and not worth occupying the space which it would require to quote and reply to the accusation at length. But if any of my readers who took in the Vindicator, have preserved the 5th Number, I request they will turn to the passage, and see if there be any thing like trick or imposition in it? whether I did not give the substance of the paragraph, without omitting a single article? and whether Popery would have gained, or Protestantism lost any thing, by inserting it at length?

This brings me to a more serious charge against the Vindicator himself than that of concealing the truth. It is the assertion of a downright falsehood. In Number 5, col. 80, he thus writes:—"By the terms of the solemn League and Covenant of the Kirk of Scotland, the Covenanters undertook to *extirpate all Papists by force of arms.*" I question if ever

the Church of Rome produced a more impudent forgery. The words of that solemn document are: "II. That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, prelacy, (of which a description is given in a long parenthesis,) superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of godliness; lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms." There is not a word about arms, or force of arms, in the whole deed; and the above is all that it contains about extirpation. What a face of brass, therefore, must that man have, who can write such a falsehood!

Again, the Covenanters did not engage to extirpate *Papists*, as the Vindicator falsely asserts; it was *Popery* that was the object of their hostility; as it ought to be of every honest man. These things are as different and distinguishable as a man and his errors; and the word *extirpate*, when applied to principles, not only does not imply force of arms, but cannot imply such a thing. According to Dr Johnson, it signifies, to root out, to eradicate, to exscind. Who ever heard of cutting off, or killing thoughts by a sword, or any other material weapon? To extirpate, in reference to error, is no more than to supplant false principles by true ones, by means of reason and argument. An eloquent advocate of the "Catholic Claims," in the late Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, said, he desired with all his heart to *extirpate Popery;* but no man will suspect him of the least hostility towards the persons of Papists; nay he distinctly declared his conviction, that to put them upon a footing of political equality with Protestants, would have the effect of winning them from their errors; which is the same thing as to extirpate Popery. I cannot agree with my reverend friend in the consequence which he anticipated; but I refer to this part of his speech as affording an excellent illustration of the distinction between persons and their principles. In short, he is the best friend of the human race who endeavours to extirpate false principles of every kind; and every real friend of Papists must desire to extirpate Popery.

The Vindicator then draws a horrible picture of the sufferings of Papists, under the penal statutes; and as this immediately follows his false assertion, that the Covenanters undertook to extirpate all Papists by force of arms, he means to insinuate, that this persecution was the practical effect of the solemn league; though he has not so much as attempted to show that there was any connection between this, and the sufferings of his favourites, the Jesuits. That much individual suffering was the consequence of the penal statutes against Papists, I do not deny; but they have their own church to thank for it, for the murderous principles which she inculcated, her no less murderous practices, and the turbulent, incessant plotting of her members, which rendered restrictions upon them a necessary measure of self-defence.

These statutes have been repealed long ago; but instead of expressing gratitude for their removal, such writers as Mr Andrews delight in keeping alive the memory of them, that they may perpetuate the hostility of their brethren against Protestants. In this country, Papists suffer no molestation whatever on account of their religion. This is in consequence of more enlightened ideas of liberty of conscience, which began to prevail about the middle of the last century. But the Church of Rome has not yet received one ray of light on this subject. It is scarcely a month since it was declared by the authorities in Portugal, to be unlawful to write any book against the established religion, which induced the editor of the Glasgow Courier to warn the Protestant to beware of venturing his person in that land of liberty. Hundreds of Jesuits are suffered, in this kingdom, to preach and write as much as they please against the established religion; and the law of the land will suffer no weapon heavier than a quill to be raised against them; and it is very certain that, if they had the administration of the law, they would soon "extirpate" THE PROTESTANT. They have been labouring for three years to extirpate his good name; and, not many weeks ago, the Jesuits in Preston declared to the Mayor of that town, that he was a stirrer up of sedition; that in short, the publication of the Protestant was the cause of the late riots in Glasgow, meaning, I suppose, the radical rebellion; and that, if he did not interfere to put down the Protestant Lectures preached occasionally in that town, the peace of the country would be disturbed. See the Protestant Advocate, attached to the Antijacobin Review for May. The editor adds, that the Mayor, much to his honour, refused to interfere. The application, however, was a direct attempt to suppress free discussion, and to commence a system of persecution with the influence which they have already acquired. Such freedoms have been used with my name in that quarter, that one of the preachers found it his duty to bear testimony, from the pulpit, in favour of my character. (See an excellent Sermon on Purgatory, by the Rev. Thomas Raffles, of Liverpool.) Thus, when incessantly complaining of being a persecuted people, all the persecution is practised by themselves; and, were it not for the restraints of law, they would soon carry it much farther than the scourge of the tongue.

In his sixth Number, the Vindicator represents the gunpowder plot as a mere invention of Protestants to bring odium upon the Papists, for which I do not know that he has any higher

authority than his great oracle and patron, Dr Milner. It would not require greater impudence to assert that the Pope invented the *fable* of King Henry's divorce. The plot is a matter of history to which every reader has access; and I should think it an insult to the understanding of my readers, to waste a minute in proving that it was a real conspiracy, planned by Papists, to murder the king and parliament, and overturn the Protestant establishment, in church and state, at a blow. History is nothing in the hands of such writers as Andrews. They have only to assert a thing was, or was not; and the dupes of a bigoted superstition take their word as enough.

In this Number, we have another important admission by the Vindicator. It is a matter of history too, but so recent, that even his assurance will not enable him to deny it. I had been remarking, that it was the manner of Popish bishops to approve of any thing, however repugnant, that served their purpose. "We know," said I, "that the Pope approved the usurpation of Buonaparte, so far as to crown him and bless him as his dear son in the faith, because he could not help it. Neither can he help his adherents in Britain, or procure for them the privileges which they desire, without their taking the oath of allegiance, which the law requires; he therefore approves of their taking it. But as he has never, by any public act that I know of, renounced his right to dispense with the oaths of his adherents we have no security that he will not do what was often done by his predecessors, whenever he shall think proper ;especially when he finds that it will promote the interest of the holy see." The Vindicator makes no attempt to refute what I here assert about the Pope's dispensing power; but replies as follows:—

"Reader, candid and unprejudiced reader, canst thou restrain the feelings of just indignation at this base and malevolent insinuation against the fidelity and loyalty of the Catholic prelates and people of this kingdom, and against the character of a pontiff, whose unbending integrity and heroic firmness have gained him the praise of every friend and admirer of virtue and probity? *What if the Pope did crown Buonaparte,* he did not by that act confer one atom of power to him more than he already possessed. It was merely the performance of a religious ceremony, the splendour of which was heightened by the presence of the head of the church, but conveyed no greater authority or security to the crowned head, than if the act had been done by a prelate of his own creation. But the Pope complied with the desire of Buonaparte 'because he could not help it!' He certainly would have resisted the request, if he had thought it contrary to his situation, the same as he resisted the command of the despot to declare war against this country, and lost both his territory and personal liberty, rather than violate the dictates of his conscience." Alas, for the conscience of a Pope that will not allow him to declare war against a people whom he excommunicates every year, on holy Thursday! and against a sovereign, whose predecessors were, by his predecessors, dethroned and denounced by successive bulls, not one of which has been recalled or reversed. There is reason to suspect that it was something more imperative than the dictates of his conscience, that prevented him from declaring war against Great Britain, seeing it must have been a very elastic conscience indeed, that could stretch so far as to prostitute what every Papist must regard as a solemn religious rite, at the will of a usurper, and to consecrate his usurpation: though he "certainly could have resisted the request, if he thought it contrary to his situation." I admit that he certainly could have resisted it; for it is not in the power of men, or devils either, to compel a man to do wrong, or to violate his conscience. When I said the Pope did so because he could not help it, I used the words hypothetically; that is, if he wished to preserve his life, or his dignity, he could not resist the usurper's command; but he might have resigned both dignity and life, and preserved his integrity, if he had any.

The Vindicator's apology for his holiness is like that of the boy, who, finding his companions bent on robbing an orchard, and would not be persuaded to desist, thought he might as well go with them, and give them his countenance. They were already numerous enough to carry off every apple; there would not be a whit more mischief done by his going, or less by his staying away. So Pius VII. lent the sanction of his high and pretended divine authority, to the usurpation of one of the most ruthless tyrants that ever afflicted the world, because, in doing so, he did not add one atom of power to him more than he already possessed. But did not the Pope know that the design of the thing was, and that the effect would be, to confirm the power which the tyrant had acquired, in the minds of all who attached any importance to the splendid religious ceremony of crowning and anointing in the name of the Lord? Thus he actually made himself, by his silly compliance, a party; or to use language fit for such a transaction, art and part guilty with the murderer and the plunderer of Europe.

As I have said, the Vindicator does not reply to what I had written about the Pope's dispensing power. He does not deny that he possesses this prerogative; he seems even to admit and justify it, in a long defence of the bull, by which the Pope granted to the kings and queens of France, and their successors for ever, the privilege of breaking such vows as "they cannot profitably keep;" or of exchanging them for something else that may be agreeable and profitable to them. The Vindi-

cator has a long and laboured article in defence of this bull, which he rests chiefly on the assertion, that it was vows about religion that the Pope had in view, as if these were less binding than oaths between man and man; and because the favoured pair were to enjoy their privilege under the control of their confessor, which I did not conceal or deny: but when they were allowed to choose for confessor, any creature who was in priest's orders, they could easily find one whose conscience would be as accommodating as the Pope's in the case of Buonaparte. I consider any farther notice of this article unnecessary. Any man who regards truth and integrity, will find, in the Vindicator's own words, a sufficient refutation of his Jesuitical sophistry.

But as usual, he has a great many *ifs*:—*if* the Pope has such power, how do such and such things take place? and by putting a question in this way, hundreds of times, he leaves the object of his attack, or proposed refutation, just as he found it. Thus:— "If the Pope possesses this right of dispensing with our oaths, what occasion had he to approve that of 1791? Could he not have procured for us all the privileges we desire, by dispensing with our taking (i. e. permitting us to take) the oath of supremacy and abjuration, and the declaration against transubstantiation?" No doubt he could do this, and perhaps he would, were it compatible with the security of his children, and retaining them in filial subjection. But no man can take the oath of abjuration, without renouncing both the Pope's temporal and spiritual authority; and though most of our British Papists profess to renounce the temporal, they cannot renounce the spiritual, without renouncing the Pope altogether, and ceasing to be Papists. There may be some who do so, and continue Papists at heart; but they must not profess themselves such, else they would instantly be marked as perjured persons; and the same thing would attach to any priest, who should receive consecration, or any spiritual faculty, from his holiness. In short, if the oath of abjuration were universally taken, the Church of Rome would have no visible existence in this kingdom; and we are not to suppose the Pope will permit that to be done, which would subvert his own spiritual dominion.

There are some Papists who would not scruple to take the oath of supremacy, if they were allowed to attach their own meaning to the words. I showed, in a late Number, that one of Mr Andrews' correspondents, in the Orthodox Journal, argued the lawfulness of swearing that the king is the head of the Church *of* England: but he would not swear that he was the head of the church *in* England; for, in his opinion, the head of *the church* every where is the Pope. There is a very strong reason why the Pope should not permit his subjects to make the declaration against transubstantiation, and why they should not make it though he were to permit them: for suppose a man to declare upon oath to-day, that he does not believe that the bread and wine in the eucharist are changed into the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; and suppose him to appear at the altar to-morrow, and worship the bread and wine, and hold them up to be worshipped with divine honour, he would be under the necessity of making his choice, whether the world should set him down for a perjured person or an idolater; for it would be impossible to clear himself of both; and no man, in his right senses, would choose to acknowledge himself guilty of either.

I request the reader's serious attention to these hints; for the argument which I am combating has much higher authority than that of Mr Andrews; it has been used by members of both houses of parliament, who gravely maintain that Papists must be very honest men, and may safely be admitted into places of power and trust, seeing they will not swear the oaths to which they have conscientious objections, though, by the swearing of them, they would become eligible to all places and honours. But there is no merit in refusing to do that by which one would instantly become felo de se; or would instantly make himself infamous; for no Papist can take the oath of supremacy, without ceasing to be a Papist; and no believer in transubstantiation can swear that he does not believe it, without convicting himself of perjury.

No. CLV.

SATURDAY, JUNE 30TH, 1821.

THE last four numbers of The Protestant were occupied by replies to the principal topics in the first six Numbers of the Catholic Vindicator. I have passed over a number of little personal matters, which are not worth the answering, because any reader who understands the subject may answer them for himself; and because I am very little concerned about the Vindicator's *assertions* with regard to my character and motives, seeing I have convicted him of gross falsehood, as the reader will see, in my last Number. I am as little concerned about the opinion he has formed and expressed with regard to my principles, seeing he maintains the principle that Christianity owes its rise to the influence of Popery, as I have shown from his own words, in the Number before last. If there be such things as works of supererogation, certainly it must be a work of this kind, to make a serious reply to the writings of such a man, because they carry their own refutation in the very face of them. His favourite, and often repeated reply to those parts of my work which convict Papists of impiety and absurdity is, *If* this were so, then Papists are the most besotted and stupid creatures in the world;

and I must say, it is even so, if they continue to adhere to him as their champion and oracle.

I am now come to a part of his work in which there is something like system, in which, at least, he keeps a long while by a subject; that is, the doctrine of not keeping faith with heretics, which I accused his church of holding. To this subject he seems to have applied his whole strength; and I strongly suspect that he had the aid of abler pens than his own. After a great many proofs from Romish writers of great eminence, who all certified that the above was a commonly received doctrine of the church in their day, I agreed to rest the whole weight of the cause on one single point, namely, the declaration of the Council of Constance. I repeat it here, for the sake of connection, and to save the trouble of reference:—

"The holy Synod of Constance declares, concerning every safe conduct granted by the emperor, kings, and other temporal princes, *to heretics*, or persons *accused of heresy*, in hopes of reclaiming them, that it ought not to be of any prejudice to the catholic faith, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor to hinder but that such persons may and ought to be examined, judged, and punished, according as justice shall require, if those heretics shall refuse to revoke their errors, although they shall have come to the place of judgment relying on their safe conduct, and without which they would not have come thither; and the persons who have promised them security, *shall not, in this case, be obliged to keep his promise, by whatsoever tie he may have been engaged*, when he has done all that is in his power to do."

The design of this canon was evidently to establish a specialty in the rule with regard to heretics, which did not apply to other persons, such as prisoners of war, or even robbers, and other such malefactors, for it does not appear ever to have been counted lawful to break faith with them, in any circumstances. But with heretics no promise was to be kept, if it should in any wise prejudice the catholic faith and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The canon farther proceeds upon a principle held indisputable by the Council, that heretics were to be examined, judged, and *punished*, if they refused to revoke their heresy; that is, some *opinion* which they held, not quite consistent with the faith of Rome; and, if convicted of holding any such opinion, however blameless in their lives, the emperor, or any magistrate, who had advised them to come to the Council, with a passport, and solemn oath, that he would see them conveyed safely home again, was relieved from this solemn obligation, provided his protegee was convicted of heresy, and he had done all that he could for him. In short, the canon clearly establishes,—first, that persons holding any opinion different from the established faith of Rome, are to be punished as heretics, which is, to be burnt to death, as the fact proved in the case of Huss, for which it was framed; and, secondly, that persons convicted of heresy, and who, conscious of their innocence as to any crime, came to a tribunal to which they were summoned to answer for something laid to their charge, under a solemn pledge that no ill should befall them, and who would not have come without such pledge, are yet, by a solemn declaration of the Council, deprived of the benefit of the promise and oath of the magistrate, on which they had depended for their personal safety. This, I say, was a special rule made for heretics alone, for nothing of the kind appears ever to have been decreed against thieves or murderers.

Now The Catholic Vindicator, the accredited organ of our Glasgow Papists, approves and defends the above canon in every iota of it, and yet he is incessantly calling for liberty of conscience, and abusing our government for withholding it. Here, to prevent the least suspicion of doing him injustice, I shall give his own words:—"Here then we have the doctrine of the Council of Constance, as given by THE PROTESTANT; and by what perversion of language can he make out that *this* decree *established* the tenet, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, and that, as it has *never been repealed*, it *remains* as much a law of the church as communion without the cup? What is there odious in the words of this decree? What that can be offensive to the most fastidious Protestant? The synod declares that every *safe conduct* granted, ought not to prejudice the catholic faith, or church authority, nor hinder the individual holding the passport from being examined, judged, and punished, as JUSTICE shall require. And what *injustice* can be in this? The particular object in question was John Huss, who was then a professed member of the Catholic Church, but disagreeing with the church on some fundamental principles of doctrine, she assembled her judges to decide on his opinions, and call upon him to correct his error, if found to be such, on pain of being put out of her communion. Now *this right* THE PROTESTANT has declared exists in every society, by virtue of the writings of St Paul, and surely he will not deny it to the Church of Rome, nor blame the fathers of the Council of Constance for asserting such right, which is all that they did in the first part of the decree. And what is the *correct* inference to be drawn from the concluding part of it? Why nothing farther than that the civil magistrate, if he has engaged to perform *more* than he has *authority* to do, is not obliged to keep his promise, provided he has done all that he can do, to fulfil those conditions of it *which he can and ought to perform*. This is the *true* construction of this famous decree which The Protestant has produced, to convict the Church of Rome of teaching antichristian doctrine, inimical to the happiness of society, and the divines of six of her universities of false-

hood, in denying the fact! Turn and twist the meaning as he pleases, the writer cannot make more of it than that it was confined to a specified local object, and by no means intended to (be) a general rule. It related *solely* to the construction and power of *free passports*, from the lawful and just obligations of which none could be released, according to the decree itself, until 'he had done all that was in his power' to do, to fulfil them; there is no mention or allusion whatever, directly or indirectly, to any other promises or contracts, and therefore they could not be comprehended in it." col. 121, 122.

Here the decree in question is defended in every point, from which it is clear the Vindicator thinks it just and lawful to examine, judge, and *punish* men for difference of opinion. He quotes my own doctrine, that, according to Paul's writings, every church has a right to put out of her communion those who disagree with her in fundamental points; and he would have his readers believe this was all that was done to Huss by the Council of Constance. But there is a trifling circumstance which he did not think proper to mention in this connection;—had Huss been tried by such a church as The Protestant was speaking of, and put out of her communion, he would have been allowed to go home without molestation, under the safe conduct which he had received from the emperor; whereas, the Council of Constance delivered him up to be burnt to death; and persuaded the emperor that, seeing he was a heretic, he was not bound to keep faith with him.

The Vindicator would have us believe that the emperor Segismund had promised more than he had authority to perform, and therefore his promise was not binding. Now what the emperor did was this:—he required one of his own subjects, living in Bohemia, to appear at the Council of Constance, and answer to some accusations preferred against him, in relation to certain points of doctrine which he was alleged to have preached, not quite accordant with the reigning standard of orthodoxy. Huss, knowing the temper of the Council, was afraid that some mischief would befall him. In order to remove his apprehension, the emperor gave him, in writing, what was called a *safe conduct*, or passport for going to the Council, sojourning at Constance, and safe return home. After the Council had condemned Huss, and delivered him over to the secular power to be burnt, the emperor actually pleaded his solemn promise of security to the Bohemian; but the Council told him in effect, that he had now no business with him, but to see that he was burnt to death. He had done all he *could do;* he had no power to interfere with regard to any sentence of the church. This is the fair construction, which, according to Mr Andrews, is to be put upon that nefarious transaction; by which it appears that sovereign princes were the bond slaves of a band of insolent priests; and that even an emperor had not power to keep his promise, by protecting one of his own subjects from priestly rage, though that subject had put himself within their power, relying upon the promise of his sovereign, that he should be conducted home in safety. The emperor would have acted like a sovereign prince, if, instead of yielding to their sophistry, and gratifying their malice, by murdering an innocent man, he had surrounded the Council by an armed force, broken up their sitting, and sent every one of them about his business. This is what he *had power* to do, and what he would have done, had he been a man of spirit, and a man of his word.

The law of the holy church about not keeping faith with heretics was thus explicitly declared. I challenged the Church of Rome to show when it was repealed, or condemned by equal authority, and promised that, if any person could show this, I would give up the point, and allow that the Church of Rome was better now than she was of old. Mr Andrews, absurdly enough, calls this a challenge to prove a negative; but it is no such thing; the repeal, or authoritative condemnation of a law, is as positive a thing as the enactment of it. He undertakes, however, to prove that the doctrine in question was condemned by the Council of Constance itself; and the following is the manner in which he does it:—

"Although, as the theologues of Alcala say, there was nothing *defined* concerning breach of faith by the Council of Constance, yet the fathers of that assembly, by the following decree, passed by them in the very session alluded to by THE PROTESTANT, most clearly condemned the very doctrine which they have been accused of establishing and maintaining:—'This most holy synod, being solicitous, as it is in duty bound, (having been assembled for that especial purpose,) to provide for the extirpation of error and heresies in various parts of the world, has, of late, heard that certain propositions erroneous in faith, and adverse to good morals, highly scandalous, and tending to subvert the order of governments, have been publicly taught, and, amongst others, this especial one has been reported to it:—

"'Any tyrant, as he may licitly and meritoriously, so he ought to be slain by his subjects or vassals, without awaiting the sentence or order of any judicial authority, though his death be effected by secret fraud, insidious flattery, and blandishments, and *be in violation of a pledged oath or engagement entered into with him.*

"'This holy synod, anxious to oppose itself to this error, and effectually to eradicate the same, after having maturely considered it, decrees, determines, and declares this doctrine to be erroneous in faith and in morals; and reprobates and condemns it as heretical, scandalous, and leading to frauds, deceit, lies, and treach-

ery. .It moreover determines, decrees, and declares, that all persons pertinaciously holding this most dangerous opinion, are heretics, and ought to be punished as such, according to canonical regulations.' *Concil. Studio Labbei.* tom. xii. p. 143. Edit. Par. 1672.

"Surely," says Mr Andrews, "this declaration is sufficient to convince even the sceptic, that this charge brought against the Church of Rome is totally groundless, and that it was invented for the basest of purposes." col. 158, 159. Now let the reader remember, that the Council of Constance is charged with having laid it down as a genuine principle, that it was lawful to break faith with *heretics;* and, in particular, that the emperor was not bound to keep faith with a *heretical* subject. This was the decision, or decree, call it what you will, concerning which I challenged the Church of Rome to show that it had ever been repealed or condemned by equal authority, promising that if this were shown, I would give up the point. The Vindicator accepted the challenge; and he triumphantly produced the decree which I have just quoted, as sufficient to convince even the sceptic, that my accusation of the Council was unfounded. I acknowledge it to be a very good and wholesome decree. It declares it unlawful for *subjects* to assassinate their *princes*, though they be tyrants "*in violation of a pledged oath or engagement entered into with them.*" But this is very different from the question of a prince, a priest, or any other tyrant breaking faith with heretics, of which this decree says not a word: and, therefore, it cannot be a repeal or condemnation of the other decree past in the same session, by which it was declared that the emperor, kings, and other temporal princes, who had given promises of safety to heretics, were not obliged to keep their promises, *by whatever tie they might be engaged.*

The above is all that the Vindicator had to adduce in answer to my challenge; and, as it relates to a very different subject, it must stand for no answer at all. The charge, therefore, is completely substantiated. It *was* decreed by the Council of Constance, that engagements with heretics were not binding; that is, that faith was not to be kept with them. The Vindicator, with the aid of his patron, Bishop Milner, and all the Jesuits in England, has not been able to produce a document that so much as implies a subsequent condemnation, or disavowal of this doctrine; but has attempted to divert the public mind from the point at issue, by citing a decree upon a quite different subject; from which it clearly follows, that my point is established; and what was declared by so great a Council, as the doctrine of the church, *was*, and *is*, and must be her doctrine, while she exists; for she is unchangeable and infallible. For a great deal of collateral evidence on this subject, I refer to my first fifty Numbers; in which I showed, from great authors of their own, that the principle was undisputed, and was acted upon, without shame or scruple, for hundreds of years.

This point established, I decline having any thing to do with the various cases which the Vindicator adduces, to show that Protestants also have been guilty of breach of faith; such for instance, as the Bank of England breaking faith with the public, when she suspended specie payments, which seems to occasion the Vindicator great triumph, as a complete set off against the decree of the Council of Constance. The Bank of England is not a Christian church; and, though it were, I have no voice in it, and am not responsible for its doings, any more than for its notes. If this great national corporation had passed a law, declaring that they would pay no note that was presented by a Papist, for that no faith was to be kept with Papists, I grant that there would have been some analogy between that and the canon of Constance; but this was not the case; and I venture to assure Mr Andrews, that if he will go to the Bank of England with one of her notes, he will receive payment in gold, without being asked whether he is a heretic or not.

I suppose I need not use many more words to show that my accusation of the Church of Rome, with regard to not keeping faith with heretics, is completely established; and that the Vindicator has failed in his attempt at rebutting it. I shall advert to only one article more on this subject, as affording a fair specimen of the Vindicator's mode of evading a question, and of arguing from one thing to another. He approves of all Bishop Lanigan's reasons for breaking promises, for which see his 12th and 13th Numbers. I had said, that Lanigan's elastic morality would allow me to refuse to accept the bill of a correspondent in Dublin, from whom I had ordered a lot of linen, and to whom I had given a promise of honouring his draft, if circumstances were so changed, that the price of linen had fallen in Glasgow, before that which I ordered had arrived. Every merchant knows that such refusal would be a breach of faith; but I showed that Dr Lanigan's doctrine, supported by St Thomas, would bear me out in breaking my promise, because "the circumstances are changed; and because I intended to fulfil my promise when I made it, I am guilty of no untruth, though I should now break it." To this the Vindicator replies:— "What a flimsy sophister! what a dull reasoner! but what a bold asserter! And could not THE PROTESTANT find an argument more in point than his lot of linen, and his correspondent's bill? St Thomas, when giving his case, knew very little of commercial affairs, and did not contemplate, I will answer for it, the meaning which the accuser has given to it. However, supposing he did, Papists are not so ignorant as to be unacquainted with the civil

laws of the country, which will enforce a compliance, should they be inclined to such swindling propensities. But they know that such a circumstance will not free them from the obligation, although there are other circumstances, which I am sure THE PROTESTANT would most readily avail himself of, were he under a promise of the kind. For example; suppose him to order a quantity of linen of a certain *quality*, and he promises to accept his correspondent's bill for the same; but, suppose his correspondent to send him a lot *inferior* to the sample he ordered and expected, but at the same price, would he accept the bill according to promise? Or would he not demur because the circumstances are changed? Would he be guilty of an untruth, by *thus* breaking his promise, as he intended to fulfil it, had the contract been executed according to order? He will not answer me in the affirmative; and, if he did, no one, I am sure, would believe him. No, no; he would be glad to shelter himself under St Thomas' case; and, if that did not protect him, he would apply to some lawyer, to enforce the doctrines of the theologians and canonists, read by the Rev. James Lanigan." col. 202, 203.

Let the reader remember, that St Thomas' doctrine, applied and exemplified by bishop Lanigan, is, that a man is freed from the obligation of his promise on a *change of circumstances;* that is, any providential change that may happen, without blame being attachable to either party. But the Vindicator proceeds upon the supposition, that one party has not fulfilled the condition with which the promise was connected, and then he argues that in such a case I would break my promise as well as any Papist. Here, however, the intelligent merchant will perceive that there is no promise to break. If I order fine linen, and promise to accept my correspondent's bill for the value of fine linen; and if he sends me *coarse* linen at the *price of fine,* and draws accordingly, I break no promise by refusing to accept his draft, for he has not obeyed the order to which my promise was annexed. He has committed a fraud, or indiscretion at least, for which he himself ought to be responsible. I am afraid that I shall be accused of trifling with my readers, by adverting to such an absurdity in the form of an argument; but I cannot adduce a fairer specimen of the manner in which Mr Andrews endeavours to reply to THE PROTESTANT.

I conclude the present Number by informing the reader, that the long depending action between Mr Scott and me was decided in the Jury Court, Edinburgh, on the morning of Tuesday last, after a trial of seventeen hours. Mr Scott laid his damages at £3000 for injury which he alleged to have sustained by some passages in my work; and the Jury awarded him £100 for my share of the mischief, £20 against Mr Sym, of the town's hospital, for his share in it, and 1*s.* against each of my printers, for their share. I have not time to give a more particular account of the trial in the present Number; but it shall occupy a large space in a future one.

No. CLVI.

SATURDAY, JULY 7TH, 1821.

A FRIEND informs me that he lately overheard two Papists conversing on the subject of THE PROTESTANT, when the one said to the other, "That fellow is driving our religion all to *jaup*, but Mr Scott will get the better of him at the law." There happens to be more truth in this, than we usually hear from the mouth of Papists. The reader is able to judge of the truth of the first part of it, when he sees the *jaupy* appearance that Popery makes when exhibited in her naked deformity; and for the truth of the second part of the observation, I have to inform him, that Mr Scott has indeed got the better of me at the law. I mentioned this in a short notice at the end of my last Number; and as my readers at a distance will not be able to comprehend how this should have happened, I shall proceed to inform them.

At the commencement of my work, I stated what was then the subject of general belief and conversation, that the Chapel in Clyde Street was built at the expense of a poor and starving people. In my Ninth Number, I related some anecdotes to confirm the fact; and Mr Scott, considering himself aggrieved by what I had written, raised an action of damages against me about a year ago.* His complaint included the letter of Mr Sym, contained in my LXXII. Number, and this gentleman was comprehended in the action. When the cause came to be tried, I was allowed a proof of some of my statements, but not of others, because I could not condescend on dates of things which I had published three years ago, and which had happened a long time before that; and from some rule of court, quite new to my Counsel, and which I cannot comprehend, I was not allowed to prove the truth of Mr Sym's statement. Things of this nature, when brought to trial, whatever they be in fact, are considered false in law, if not positively proved by competent witnesses; which, as a general principle, I am by no means disposed to condemn. I was allowed to prove four issues, as they are called, three of which were declared by the chief commissioner of the court, in his address to the jury, to have had evidence adduced in their support, and the fourth not proved, inasmuch as that which was stated in the issue to

* The passages complained of by Mr Scott have, as formerly stated, been left out in this edition: the author's remarks on the trial, however, in this No. and some succeeding ones, are retained.

have happened about six years ago, could not have taken place since the year 1813. The court were decidedly of opinion that certain words which I had used in reference to the manner, and the means by which Mr Scott levied money from his poor people, were libellous; and the jury being of the same opinion to a certain extent, found a verdict for the pursuer, as mentioned in my last. The trial excited an uncommon degree of interest; and much eloquence was displayed by counsel on both sides. A report of it has been published in all the newspapers, with which it is needless to occupy my pages; but I intend to publish, as soon as possible, in a separate form, a more detailed account, with several documents connected with it. I thought at one time of giving it at length in THE PROTESTANT, but as it could not be contained in one Number, the connection would be so broken as not to afford a fair view of the case.

I am aware that the fact of Mr Scott having "got the better of me at the law," will occasion great triumph among all the Papists in the three kingdoms. It will be considered as a complete set-off against all that I have written about Popish idolatry, error, and superstition. Much need they had of something of the nature of a triumph. They have picked out a few sentences in three large volumes of weekly papers, all written during the intervals of business, and amidst innumerable interruptions; and these sentences not being worded with that caution which a writer better acquainted with the law would have used, they have found me liable in damages, and exposed me to an enormous expense. This is all their triumph; but Popery remains as it was, unvindicated and undefended; —a bloated system of idolatry, superstition, and cruelty. As such I have been, for three years, holding it up to the scorn and derision of the world; as such I shall continue to expose it; and the trial which has taken place, with the verdict against me, will have this happy effect, that greater interest in the cause will be excited, and my work more extensively circulated.

The trial has given me one advantage which I did not formerly possess,—that of identifying Mr Scott, in some measure, with the Catholic Vindicator. I was never before able to ascertain this, else it would perhaps have been a sufficient defence against any claim of damages that he could make, because the language of the Vindicator is infinitely more abusive of me, than ever mine was of Mr Scott. Aware of this, the pursuer was at great pains to make it appear that he had no hand in that work. His counsel in the strongest language disavowed, and, I think, even condemned it; and Bishop Cameron, the first witness examined on his side, deponed that he disapproved of both Andrews and his writings; that he believed no Catholic clergyman in Scotland approved of them; and farther, that of the four Vicars Apostolic in England, they were approved by only one, namely Dr Milner. Mr Scott had been at the pains to get a deposition from Mr Andrews himself, which was read in court, in which he declared that he had been informed that at first Mr Scott approved of the Vindicator as a work of controversy, but that towards the conclusion, he had discouraged it, and that he was not the writer of any part of it. But Mr Henniker, another of his witnesses, deponed that Mr Scott, one Sunday, after Christian doctrine, that is, after sermon in his chapel, actually exhorted his people to buy the work, in order to indemnify the committee who had become bound to Mr Andrews for the expense of it, and who were suffering loss in consequence of its not selling. I am therefore entitled to consider him as an approver of the CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, and a party concerned in all the libellous matter which it contains; and had I known the fact in time to have taken an issue upon it, I am persuaded he would not have obtained a farthing of damages.

I shall here quote a few pasages from the work which Mr Scott recommended to his people, to show the freedoms which have been used with my name. I am afraid of disgusting the reader, but he is well off in being called upon to suffer nothing but disgust. It never came into my head to bring the calumniator into a court of law, to answer for his libellous productions, because I felt conscious that none of his calumnies applied to me; and that I was able to answer him by facts and arguments; and it is only those who are conscious that they have not this advantage that would take advantage of the law to silence an adversary:—

"If," says Mr Andrews, speaking of the Protestant, "if he thinks me an infidel and a heathen, I have *proved* him to be a *fabricator* and a *forger;* and before he again asserts that I worship the devil, I would recommend *him* seriously to break off *his* connection with the father of lies. If he does not attend to my advice it will be the worse for him, and he will, before long, wish that he had been as incapable of writing, as his three credible witnesses; for then he would not have exposed himself, as he has now done; nor given the honest citizens of Glasgow the opportunity of pointing their finger at him, and saying, There goes the calumniator of Catholicity, and lying advocate of Protestantism," col. 480.

In col. 511, I am called a "convicted fabricator and confuted liar." In 548, a rancorous bigot and "a cowardly assassin." In 557, an "unprincipled libeller." In 567, I am represented as "a convicted forger, and protector of an adulterous strumpet."* This surely is

* This refers to the woman whose husband left her because she would not become a Papist. Her character is

bad enough, and had I said any thing like this of Mr Scott, I deserved to pay heavy damages. The following is equally calumnious, but more artfully laid. The Vindicator, by a sort of side wind, endeavours to identify me with the first of the radicals, as if I were one of that noisy and turbulent fraternity. In col. 607 we read as follows:—

"How came The Protestant to forget the trials of Mr Thomas Muir, before the supreme court of Justiciary at Edinburgh, and the Rev. Mr Palmer, a dissenting minister of Dundee, before the circuit court of Justiciary, in the year 1793; the first of whom was sentenced to be transported fourteen years, and the latter seven? Has he forgotten the trial and execution of Mr Robert Watt for high treason at Edinburgh, in the year following? What, however, I wish particularly to ask him is, if he does not recollect 'the British Convention, which assembled about this period; and whether he does not know a person then residing at Paisley, who became a member of this political assembly, and after possessing himself of its secrets and proceedings, went to the office of the Sheriff court, and there basely betrayed his former associates, by which disgraceful proceeding some of them were transported beyond the seas for sedition, of whom a Mr Margarot, I believe, for I write from memory, was one, and who returned from exile but two or three years since? I hope The Protestant will not refuse me a plain and unequivocal answer to these questions, nor delay satisfying me so long as he did in the case of the man in the Wynd."

This is evidently meant to insinuate that I was a member of the famous British Convention, held at Edinburgh in 1793, of which, and of its consequences, Mr Andrews seems to know much more than I do, for certainly I was not then of age to be a member of so grave an assembly, though I do recollect something of it. He insinuates also, that I became an informer, and that I betrayed my associates, so that some of them were banished. In a subsequent part of his work, he proceeds upon the assumption of this being a fact, which he at first puts forth as a matter of enquiry, and he affects to be afraid lest I should inform against him at the Sheriff's Office, col. 657. I can scarcely call this libellous matter, because, upon the supposition that I had been a member of a political assembly, and that I had unexpectedly found them seditiously disposed, it would have been my duty to inform against them, and to put the magistrates upon their guard. In point of fact, however, no such event ever took place in my history. The thing was a mere fabrication of Mr Andrews, or of his Glasgow committee; and the intention of it evidently was to mark me out as an object of vengeance to the radicals, who then considered themselves as lords of the ascendant, and about to become proprietors of the soil. From his Glasgow correspondents he would learn that I was extremely active in opposing the machinations of the radicals, and in exciting the citizens to take up arms for their defence; for which purpose I went from house to house through a whole ward of the city, and superintended the distribution of arms from the barracks. In order, therefore, to mark me out as an object of vengeance, he, or his correspondents, invented the above story; and had I raised an action of damages against him and them at that time, I have no doubt I should have been able to make some of them leave the country, or to continue in it against their will under lock and key. But it was never the persons or the property of Papists that I suffered to occupy my attention, but only their errors; of which it was indeed my wish to denude them, not for my advantage, but for their profit.

But I shall give a specimen or two more of the libellous manner in which the Vindicator writes; and let it not be forgotten, that this is the work which Mr Scott recommended to his people, one Sunday, "after Christian doctrine;"—"I tell you, Mr William M'Gavin, this will not do: you must come forward and clear yourself from the many gross contradictions, and misrepresentations, and *falsehoods*, which I have proved against you, or the work which you have undertaken will only be considered, what it really is, a tissue of inconsistencies and untruths, penned by a *convicted fabricator*, and *retailer of lies*," col. 672.

Towards the conclusion of his work, the Vindicator gives my name and surname in connec-

without reproach in the neighbourhood in which she has long resided; yet Mr Andrews never, or scarcely ever mentions her name, or refers to her, but in such language as the above. If she had the means of taking him and his committee to the law, there can be no doubt she would obtain damages suitable to their ability and her circumstances. By "protector," as applied to me, nothing more can be meant, consistently with truth, than that I have taken this woman's part against her enemies; but he knows that the word has a *fashionable* meaning, especially when connected with such words as he has made to follow it; and no doubt he wishes it to be applied to me in this fashionable sense; and if Popery shall exist next century, these words will be raked up out of the dust; and such writers as the Vindicator will boldly maintain that "THE PROTESTANT," who wrote against *Catholicity* in the nineteenth century, was literally such a man as these slanderous words indicate. Luther and other reformers, in this manner, are slandered by Papists at this day; and it does not appear that any cotemporary writer laid such a foundation for it as the Vindicator has here laid for the abuse of my name, if the remembrance of it shall survive myself. Here the malignant character of Popery appears in its true light. This is a species of persecution more cruel than that of the stake or the gibbet; and who can doubt that these will be put in requisition also whenever Papists obtain the power? I am not speaking of Papists in Spain or Italy, but of those who live in the midst of us, who hired and paid the Vindicator for writing such abominable calumnies, who gave them all the publicity in their power, and had the work containing them recommended on a Sunday in their chapel.

tion with all that is vile and infamous; and not content with this, he, or his committee, had me posted upon the corners of the streets every week, in great hand bills, as a coward, a forger, a defender of adultery, &c. &c. all which I suffered without ever thinking it worth while to apply to a court of law, because I was sure that those who knew me did not believe that I was guilty of such things. I hoped to live down, and to write down all such calumnies. I have done so; and had I taken any other way to silence my adversaries, had I raised an action of damages against them, it would have laid the foundation of a reasonable suspicion that I really was what they represented me to be, that is, "a *deceiver* and a *cheat*, and as such, deserving the *execration* of all honest men," col. 674.

I am persuaded the reader is heartily tired of such coarse and scurrilous abuse, and I should have spared him the pain of reading it, had I not ascertained the fact that it was approved and paid for by a committee of Glasgow Papists, and actually recommended to them, "one Sunday, after Christian doctrine."

The Catholic Vindicator contains, amidst all its abuse, some curious disclosures, relating both to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome. It was my intention to have touched but slightly on these, and to have made the third volume the last of my work, extending it a few Numbers beyond the size of the first and second; but the flattering approbation which I continue to receive from all quarters, Rome always excepted, and the extraordinary degree of interest which I have been honoured to excite in behalf of the Protestant cause, which I consider the same as genuine Christianity, have determined me to persevere for a longer period, and to commence a fourth volume, of which the first Number will be published on Saturday next, the 14th instant, to be continued weekly as heretofore.

The question, cui bono? is not asked so frequently now, as it was when I began to write three years ago. The public mind is more alive to the subject than it was then. Events have risen in the course of providence which have drawn the minds of many to serious reflection, and to anticipate the possibility of danger to our civil and religious privileges, from the countenance that is given to Popery in different quarters. We hear not indeed of many conversions to Popery, at least among persons of education and respectable rank in society; but there is a very prevailing indifference to Bible Christianity among all ranks, which leads men to the verge of Popery before they are aware of it. Having the name of Christian, without the thing signified by it, persons are in a state the most favourable for embracing Popery, because it flatters them with the notion that they have the thing, if they are but observant of certain forms, which they can easily be, without any change of heart; without giving up their love of sin, or even the practice of it; without love to God or deadness to the world, or any of the features of that holiness, without which, it is declared, no man shall see the Lord.

Add to this prevailing indifference to real Christianity, the extraordinary degree of favour into which Papists have wrought themselves with many of our senators, I may say a majority of them, in the lower house; insomuch that a bill actually passed that house, which, had it passed into a law, would have brought Papists in among them, and into the upper house also, and into all places of power and trust, with one or two exceptions, which exceptions would not long have remained, had Papists themselves been brought in to legislate along with persons already prepared to go all lengths in concessions to the "Roman Catholics," as they are now almost universally denominated, and whose virtues are praised in such terms as if it were believed that virtue would die with them.

I have often said that the subject of "Catholic emancipation" did not belong to my plan, though I have at different times slightly touched upon it; and I venture to affirm, that no person is capable of judging of the merits of that question, until he has studied the character of Popery as exhibited in the writings and in the practice of Papists. I affirm this with the more confidence, seeing I know both sides of the question, and because a careful study of the system has overcome my own prepossessions, which, at the time I began to write, were all on the side of emancipation. Ever since I was capable of reflection, I have abhorred every species of persecution for conscience' sake, or for the sake of religion; and I abhor it at this hour as much as ever I did; but my mistake lay in considering that persecution which is not so. It is not persecution to prevent aliens from sitting in parliament, or in our courts of justice, because every state requires, for its own security, that those who legislate, or administer its laws, be in a condition to maintain undivided allegiance to the sovereign. This an alien cannot do, for he is under a previous obligation of allegiance to a foreign power, which may levy war against the state under which he enjoys protection. A Papist is precisely in this state. Let him declare allegiance to the crown of Great Britain and Ireland, in terms as strong as words can make them, they cannot set aside a previous allegiance which he owes to the Pope, in virtue of a grant which he believes Jesus Christ to have given to him through the medium of St Peter. This is an allegiance to which every other must of necessity give place. They say it is only spiritual allegiance, but it is impossible to render spiritual allegiance to a creature without being liable to render temporal allegiance also,

whenever the spiritual power shall require it. To suppose the contrary, would be to suppose that a man's spiritual interests have no influence over his temporal ones; or that his religion is not the rule of his conduct. When, therefore, a dispute should arise between the King of Britain and the Pope, a thing which has happened oftener than once, and may happen again, a Papist would be under a spiritual obligation to the Pope, from which nothing of a temporal nature could relieve him; and to exclude such a person from power in a Protestant state, is not persecution, but a necessary measure of self-defence.

Besides, a genuine Papist is not a free agent. He is not at liberty to act according to his own convictions, farther than it may be agreeable to his priest and confessor. His confessor is lord of his conscience, to whom he is obliged, under pain of being held guilty of mortal sin, to reveal his most secret thoughts. Depending upon his ghostly father for the forgiveness of his sins, and what are called the consolations of his religion, without which he must live without comfort, and die without hope, he must of necessity conduct himself, in every respect, so as to stand upon good terms with his priest. If intrusted with power in a Protestant country, he must exert himself to promote the interest of the holy church; that is, the interest of the court and see of Rome. Every priest is under a solemn oath to do this, to the utmost of his power: and how could he do it better, than by using the influence which he might possess over the consciences of men in power, if any of his penitents were in that situation? I say, then, it is not persecution to exclude such persons from places of power and trust; because they have not power over their own actions; they have resigned themselves to the will of others; and are, therefore, not in a situation to legislate and administer justice. There are three parties: themselves, their priests, and the public at large: they are the slaves of the second, and cannot safely be intrusted with the interests of the third. Those who legislate and administer the laws of men, ought to be independent of men, and free from all human influence. This a Papist cannot be: he wants an indispensable qualification for a public trust; and it is not persecution to exclude him from it, any more than it is persecution to exclude the deaf and dumb from parliament.

No. CLVII.

SATURDAY, JULY, 14TH, 1821.

IN some previous numbers I discussed, at considerable length, the subject of withholding the bible from the common people, of which the Church of Rome has been notoriously guilty. I quoted the rule of the Council of Trent, in which it is positively forbidden that any layman should possess a bible in the vulgar tongue, without a license in writing from the bishop, or some other functionary. And now that Papists, who live in Protestant countries, have been shamed into the measure of allowing the reading of the bible, as Dr Hodgson justly remarks in his excellent sermon on the subject, they make a boast of the permission, granted, in certain cases, by the Trent Council. They take the exception for the rule; and boldly maintain, that it never was a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that the common people should be denied the use of the bible. Amicus Veritatis made the strange assertion, that the church did no more in this respect than the Bible Society does, that will not permit the distribution of any but the authorized version of the scriptures. This was representing the Bible Society as interfering with the freedom of the press, and prohibiting the circulation of every translation of the Bible in English, but one. But all the world knows that this is not the fact; and all persons of common sense may know, that the rule of the Bible Society, by which they bind themselves to distribute the authorized English version only, does not prohibit the distribution of any other version that persons may choose to sell or give away. I thought I had made this sufficiently plain in my reply to Amicus Veritatis; but the Catholic Vindicator does not, or will not understand it. Thus he writes, speaking of THE PROTESTANT.:—

"He accuses his former opponent, Amicus Veritatis, of 'falsely asserting that the Bible Society will not permit the circulation of any but the authorized version of the scriptures;' but is not this a palpable falsehood of his own? The Bible society expressly confines its distribution to the version authorized by Act of Parliament; and, consequently, as far as its power and influence extends, the Society *excludes* all other versions but that approved by its rules. What is this, then, but following the example of the Church of Rome, which approves of the Vulgate as the most authentic and correct? As a body, the Bible Society permits the circulation of *one* edition *only*, and therefore the assertion of Amicus Veritatis is consistent with truth, unless THE PROTESTANT can show there is one rule in the Society to *limit* the circulation of the bible to the *approved* version, and another to *allow* the *promiscuous* distribution of any of the various editions now in existence." Col. 231.

I am almost ashamed to attempt a serious answer to such deplorable quibbling. The Bible Society never professed to allow or disallow the circulation of any version of the scriptures; and therefore there can be no analogy between its procedure and that of the Church of Rome, which authoritatively puts

the bible in the list of prohibited books; and declares that if any man shall presume to possess one without a license in writing from a bishop, or inquisitor, he shall not receive the absolution of his sins till he has returned it to the ordinary. *(De Libris Prohibitis, Regula IV.)* One thing, however, we learn from the Vindicator's pleading, that is, he is really ashamed of the conduct of his church in this matter. This appears from his attempt to show that she does nothing but what Protestants do, and it is reckoned sufficient justification of her conduct, to allege, that Protestants do the same thing. The allegation is false, to be sure; but the very making of it is an admission that there is something in Protestantism which Papists would fain attach to themselves, and have the credit of possessing. They wish to be thought friendly to the distribution of the bible; but it is easy to see from their writings, particularly those of the Vindicator, that they set little value on its authority.

That the word of God was addressed to all men, and intended to be read by all, I showed from the introduction to the lxxviii. Psalm, which is evidently an address of the God of Israel to his people, not to the priests in particular; and that address calls upon the people to attend, not to itself only, but to the whole of his word:—the words are, "Give ear, my people, to my law; incline your ears to the words of my mouth." The word *law* is a common expression for the whole of divine revelation, especially when connected with the word *testimony*, as it is in the 5th verse: "He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel." This testimony and law is that to which the people are called to attend: and Isaiah exhorts the people of his time to bring the doctrine of every teacher to the test of the written word; "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, there is no light in them." On this subject, the Vindicator remarks: "I think my opponent has chosen a most unfit text on which to rest his argument, because the words of the royal Prophet evidently convey a different meaning to that which THE PROTESTANT has put upon them; inasmuch as they relate to *traditional* communication, and not to any written or printed interchange of knowledge. How this proclamation is to establish the assertion of our accuser, that the word of God is to be *universally* READ, when there is not a word in the whole psalm about *reading*, requires deeper skill than this scriptural sage at present possesses, to explain to the satisfaction of any reasoning mind: little ingenuity, however, is required to dislodge our accuser from the high mound on which he imagines himself secure. Until the time of Moses, embracing a period of 2500 years of the world's existence, the will and law of God were made known to his chosen people through the *oral* communications of the patriarchs, and consequently could not then be universally *read*. When Moses received the *written* law of God on mount Sinai, he received but *one* copy, which he destroyed on witnessing the idolatry of the stiffnecked Israelites, and was obliged to supplicate the Almighty for another table; which having received, together with every instruction necessary for his own and the people's future conduct, he was not commanded to publish copies of it for the use of the people, but to build a tabernacle, which was to contain an ark in which was to be placed the table of the law; and to this ark none were to have access but those who were expressly chosen by God himself for the sacred purpose; —this ark was called the ark of testimony, and the ark of the covenant, by which name the law itself is often called in holy writ. From this fact alone, then, it is convincingly plain, that, although the law was in the first instance (Exod. xix.) published by God to the whole people of Israel, yet succeeding generations were to receive it from those who were appointed to *teach* them it, not by distributing multiplied copies of it, to interpret it according to their own fancies, but by oral communication; and in case of any division or dispute, recourse was to be had to those who were selected to *decide* on the subject." Col. 238, 239.

It is the *reading* of the law and testimony that occasions so much anxiety and alarm among modern Papists. They conceive that all would be safe, if every thing were left to the word-of-mouth teaching of their priests, for then care would be taken that nothing should be promulgated that might be prejudicial to their church. Thus they try to evade the force of what is contained in the lxxviii. Psalm, by maintaining that it does not contain a word about *reading*. Very true: but then what was the use of writing it? The fact that the psalm was written for the use of the people, necessarily implies that it was to be read by the people, else the writing of it was needless. If all religious instruction was necessarily to be *oral*, as Mr Andrews seems to allege, then David should have merely recited the psalm to the priests, and commanded them to recite it to the people; but the simple fact of its being written under divine inspiration, implies the obligation of reading it upon all to whom it is addressed.

I admit, that until the time of Moses, it does not appear that there was any written revelation of the will of God, and of course no obligation upon the people to read it. The Almighty was then pleased to hold direct communications with the patriarchs, in a manner quite unknown to us; and the Popish priests would have the people to believe that they stand in the same relation to God as the patriarchs did: and that their word-of-mouth teaching is entitled to the same respect as that of Noah,

of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: but this proves nothing but the impiety and impudence of these priests; for they are not able to show, by any sign or miracle, that they have received such power or authority; and their general character is not such as to induce us to believe that they have more direct communication with heaven than other men.

Whenever we bring a Papist to the bible, we are sure to find him in error; and this shows it to be their wisdom to keep at as great a distance from the bible as possible. The Vindicator has fallen into several mistakes in his account of Moses and of the law. For instance, he tells us, that Moses having broken the two tables, "was obliged to supplicate the Almighty for another table." This is a mere invention of his own, or of some other Papist, from whom he has taken it; for it does not appear that Moses ever thought of supplicating the Almighty to replace that which, in his anger, he had destroyed. The renewing of the two tables was as much of God himself, as the giving of the law at first; and it was without any supplication on the part of Moses, as the reader may see, Exod. xxxiv. 1.; Deut. x. 1.

Again, the Vindicator would have us believe, that when Moses received the law, he was commanded to lock it up, and to conceal it from the people, just as the Church of Rome concealed the bible, and that nobody was to see it but the priests, who were to declare it to the people by word of mouth. It is admitted, that the identical tables, written by the finger of God, were to be deposited in the ark of the covenant; but Moses engrossed the very words in his book of Exodus, and again in the book of Deuteronomy, which shows that he understood it to be his duty to commit the law to writing, that it might be read by all the people. Nay, he gave a commandment that every head of a family should write it, or have it written, that all his household might have it constantly before their eyes as well as sounded in their ears. "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart. And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt *write* them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates;" Deut. vi. 4—9. The Vindicator says, Moses was not *commanded* to publish copies of the law for the use of the people; but it is all the same if he did, acting under divine direction, publish copies of it, and command every family to have a copy of it. He entertained no fear that the people would misinterpret it, or wrest it to their own destruction, as the Church of Rome always affects to fear that her children will do with the bible. It is probable that many a Jew did misinterpret and wrest the law to his own destruction, by trusting in *it*, instead of trusting in *Him* who is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth; but that was no reason why every Jew should not possess a copy of the law; so the possibility of persons wresting the bible to their own destruction, is no reason why they should not possess, and be allowed to read, a bible.

In reply to the cavils of a writer in the Orthodox Journal, I had said, that if any man was so wickedly inclined, as to wrest the scripture to any sense or nonsense he pleased, I knew no power on earth that had a right to hinder him; that God reserved judgment in such a case to himself; and that though every church had a right to put away from among them, those who should pervert the scriptures, no man or body of men had a right to prevent the exercise of private judgment. The amount of this is, that every man has a right to judge for himself; and that if he happens to judge differently from the church to which he belongs, they have a right to put him away, if they think the difference of such importance, as to affect the fundamental principles of their association. They have no right to say, you shall not believe so and so; but if such be your faith, that we cannot have fellowship with you, you must depart from us. This they have a right to say; and this a church ought to say to every one who departs from the faith, or holy practice enjoined by Christ, and illustrated by his apostles. In this simple statement of a very obvious principle laid down in the New Testament, the Vindicator can find nothing but a mass of contradictions and inconsistences. The following are his words; and though the passage is long, I hope the reader will have patience to peruse it with attention:—

"Well, were the Church of Rome to exhibit such a mass of nonsense as 'THE PROTESTANT' would fain persuade himself and his readers she does, I am sure it does not, it cannot be, equal, be it what it will, to the absurd, ridiculous, and contradictory rhapsody I have just quoted from his 32d Number, p. 255, 256. The sapient writer knows no power on earth that has a right to hinder a man from turning the word of God into nonsense, if he is so inclined; and yet he admits that God has *authorized* his churches to exclude him from their communion for so doing! What inconsistency is this! If men choose to turn the truth of God's word into falsehood, they must answer to God not to man, because he has reserved *judgment in this case to himself;* and yet he has also *authorized* his churhes to pass judgment upon a case which he expressly reserves to himself; for this they must do, if they have power to put the offend-

ers from their body for their gross perversion and wickedness. Well, reader, having allowed that God has authorized his churches to put away the wilful perverter and falsifier of his sacred word, he denies in the very same sentence that He has given any man or body of men on earth, the power either to allow or prevent the free exercise of private judgment. Were ever such barefaced contradictions before submitted to a British public in an age so enlightened as the present is presumed to be? Talk of the monstrous nonsense of the Church of Rome, truly; why what are we to call this specimen of 'new light' logic?—'THE PROTESTANT' intimates in his 31st Number, p. 348, 'it is vain to expect that Mr Andrews will argue upon *scriptural* principles;' I wish he would endeavour to argue on *rational* ones. That there *is* a power on earth to disallow the free exercise of private judgment on matters of faith, *is as clear from scripture* as the sun at noon-day, and nothing but ignorance or wilful perversion could instigate my opponent to advance so palpable an untruth. Does not our Saviour in a before-quoted text from Matt. xviii. declare, that *the church has this power* of allowing and preventing the exercise of private judgment? If a man presumed to differ from those things which he commanded his apostles to teach all nations, did not Christ order him to be reported to the *church*, and if he would not *hear* the church, that is, if he did not relinquish his private judgment to the public decision of those who are appointed to be judges in Israel, was he not to be cast out as an unworthy member, and consigned to infamy? What is this but conferring a power on a body of men to disallow and prevent the exercise of private judgment? The men from Judea, mentioned in a preceding page, exercised their *private judgment;* but did not the apostles and elders condemn them for so doing? And did not Peter inform the multitude, that God had chosen them to convey the words of the gospel by *word of mouth*, that *hearing* they might *believe?* Again, 'THE PROTESTANT' avers, that the bible, if perused with an unbiassed mind, is '*the plainest book in the world;*' that it '*is perfectly level to the capacity of a child.*' But is not this setting up his *own* arrogant opinion in opposition to the sentiments of the apostle St Peter, who, in his second epistle, iii. 15, 16, writes, 'Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you. As also in *all his epistles* speaking in them of these things, in which are *some things hard to be understood*, which they that are *unlearned* and *unstable* wrest, *as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.*' These words clearly dmonstrate that the scripture is *not* so plain a book, is *not* so perfectly level to the capacity of a child, as 'THE PROTESTANT' affirms it is, and therefore he stands convicted of twisting and perverting scripture to a contrary sense than what an inspired apostle declares it to be. Whether the biblical sage was fearful he had overstepped the bounds of truth in this assertion, I cannot say; but I find him, in his 33d Number, p. 261, admitting, that 'while he maintains that *such* parts of the bible as relate *directly* to the *salvation of sinners* are level to the capacity of *a child*, he must *allow* that *there are some things not easily understood*, particularly prophecies not yet accomplished, and of which (he says) the priests are as ignorant as the meanest of their people.' Well, this is an admission which I think operates against the system of *universal distribution and universal reading*.—St Peter says, that in *all* the epistles of his chosen co-apostle Paul there are some things hard to be understood, which men wrest to their own destruction, as they do also other parts of the scripture; and is it not therefore clear that these epistles were *not* intended for the multitude, but that the people were to confide in those who were appointed bishops and pastors of their souls? If the scriptures were meant to be accessible to all men, would not copies of them have been multiplied before the apostles were sent on their commission? And yet the New Testament was not even penned until a vast number of Jews and Gentiles had been converted to the faith of Christ. Surely this fact is sufficient to overthrow the Protestant doctrine of *the bible, the bible alone, is the rule of faith*, and more particularly the newfangled and popular one of universal scripture *reading*. Let a bible be put into the hands of a child, or even of an adult, without note or comment, and let him be left to point out from the book, without any instruction from a second person, the passages which relate to the way of salvation, and I will answer for it, either of them will make a pretty hand of it."—Col. 246—249.

In this passage the reader will find the persecuting spirit of Popery explicitly defended. *There is*, says the Vindicator, *a power on earth to disallow the free exercise of private judgment.* This power he ascribes to the church, meaning of course the Church of Rome, all the authority of which is exercised by the Pope and his clergy. It is the Pope and the clergy, therefore, that have the power of disallowing the free exercise of private judgment; that is, to cast out, and *consign to infamy*, all who presume to find, in the word of God, any doctrine or ordinance which the Church of Rome does not teach; or who find that some of the doctrines of that church are contrary to what they read in the bible. We all know that the practice of the Church of Rome has been, to consign to infamy, and to flames too, a countless multitude, in many nations, for no other crime than the exercise of private judgment, which was nothing but the use of that understanding which God gave them, about matters

infinitely interesting to themselves. Modern Papists, at least British ones, have of late endeavoured to throw a veil over this part of their church's history; and it has become fashionable even among them to condemn persecution for conscience sake; but here is the organ of our Glasgow Papists laying it down as an incontrovertible principle, that his church has the power of *punishing* men for presuming to think for themselves upon matters which relate to the salvation of their own souls. This is the very essence of persecution for conscience sake; and we need no more to convince us, that if Papists had power over us, Protestants would be punished by being consigned to infamy and the flames.

There is a great quantity of nonsense in the above extract, which, I think, it is needless to notice, as every intelligent Protestant reader will be able to answer it for himself. What I mean to show by it, is, the deep-rooted dislike that Papists have to the bible, as a book of general instruction,—a dislike which they cannot conceal, even when affecting to respect it. They present, therefore, the very reverse of the character of the righteous man, described in the first Psalm, "whose delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law he meditates day and night." All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and it is so profitable for every Christian purpose, as to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. Of this perfection Papists practically can know nothing. It is of the very essence of it, to seek to promote the perfection of others; and if the priests had it, they would labour to impart the same blessing to the people; but by withholding the bible from them, or by dissuading them from the reading of it, they effectually keep them in an ignorant and carnal state.

No. CLVIII.

SATURDAY, JULY 21ST, 1821.

LET us now attend a little to the subject of apostolic succession. I had maintained, and I maintain still, that the apostles had no successors; meaning, as I distinctly explained my words, that their extraordinary and miraculous powers, as inspired men, were not transferred to others, but terminated with them, personally and respectively. The Vindicator maintains, with the Douay catechism, that every Popish priest is a successor of the apostles, and of course possessed of every apostolical power, for this must be implied in the word succession, when used without limitation; for it is a succession as complete as that of George the fourth to George the third.

"Against this doctrine," says the Vindicator, "the accuser expressively avers, that the apostles had no successors; but in this statement he is decidedly opposed by the very Scriptures, which he makes the rule of his faith. Does not the bible inform us, that the very first act of the apostles, after the ascension of Christ, and before the descent of the Holy Ghost, was the choice of a *successor* to fill up the vacancy occasioned by the death of the traitor Judas?" To which I answered, this is partly true; and if the Popish priests would limit their claim of succession to that of the apostle Judas, I would not dispute the point with them. But who does not know, that it was a necessary qualification in him who should be chosen to succeed even Judas, that he should have been a personal attendant on Christ's ministry on earth, and a companion of the other apostles, during "all the time that the Lord Jesus went out and in among them; beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from them;" Acts i. 21, 22. To this no pastor of any church after the first century could pretend; and of course no one could justly claim to be a successor of the apostles. Paul himself, though not one of Christ's companions, as the other apostles were, rests his title to apostleship upon the fact of his having seen Christ personally, and having received his commission directly from him, and not through the medium of other apostles; 1 Cor. ix. 1; Gal. i. 11—16. Here there is a broad line of distinction drawn between apostles and all other ministers of Christ. An apostle was one who had seen Christ in the flesh, and received commission from Christ's own mouth, and who had received farther, the extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, by which he became an infallible teacher of the truth, and was enabled to confirm the same by miracles and signs from heaven. It is not said that these gifts were confined to the twelve, or the thirteen, including Matthias and Paul, for there were seventy whom Christ distinguished among his followers, and commissioned to be preachers of the gospel, who would not probably be silenced after the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the hundred and twenty; and we find that some of the early converts, such as Barnabas, were endowed with extraordinary gifts, and associated with the apostles, under the same general name, for the propagation of the gospel; but still these were men divinely called, and miraculously endowed. As such, I maintain that they had no successors; and those that maintain that they had, and who profess at this day to be their living successors, ought to produce evidence of their having been so called. Until they shall do this by miracles or otherwise, we must continue to regard them as no better than impious impostors; especially as the personal character of most of them is so different from that of the men whose successors they profess to be.

I said that what the Vindicator alleged as to the choice of a successor to Judas was *partly* true; for it is not wholly true, as he states it. He says, it was to supply "the vacancy occasioned by *the death* of Judas." Now this is not the fact; for it was not the *death* but the *apostasy* and *treachery* of Judas that made the vacancy. It was not the office that *fell vacant* at the death of Judas; but the office "from which *Judas by transgression fell*," before his death, and independently of it, that was to be filled up. Superficial readers may think this a nice and unnecessary distinction, but it is not so by any means. The Church of Rome will have Judas to have retained the office of an apostle till his death, notwithstanding his treachery; and then she finds that persons in holy orders are officially holy, independently of their personal character; and if Judas had his office, at his death, devolved upon Matthias by the election of his brethren, then it follows, that any successor of St Peter, though as wicked as Judas, may, by the election of the college of cardinals, devolve all the holiness of St Peter's character, and all the authority of his apostleship, upon a new Pope. This is the doctrine of Rome; but there can be nothing more opposed to that of the New Testament.

I had said that Christ gave to his church apostles first; that is, men divinely inspired for the extraordinary work to which they were called, as witnesses for Him of what they had seen and heard; but that for the permanent edification of the church, and for preaching the gospel in after ages, he gave pastors and teachers, men whose business it is not to publish any new doctrine, but merely to preach and make known what is already published in the Scriptures. Seeing these pastors and teachers came after the apostles, and did not go before them, the Vindicator cannot understand why they were not their successors; and so, I suppose, he would not understand me, if I were to say he is not a successor of King George the third, seeing he lives after, and did not live before him. But let us have his own words: "Admitting that Christ gave to the church, after the decease of the apostles, pastors and teachers, merely to make known what had been already published, what were they but successors to them? They did not precede them; they were not coeval, but they followed them in the ministry; and therefore by all the rules of sound logic and common sense, they must be their *successors*."—Col. 262. Certainly, if they followed them in the same office, with the *same powers*. But this is what remains to be proved, and nothing that the Church of Rome has yet adduced, is so much as the shadow of a proof.

The apostles were divinely commissioned to declare what they had seen and heard, and which was *new* to the world; that the Saviour, long promised and expected, had actually come unto the world, and finished the work of salvation, by dying on the cross, and making himself an offering for sin; that he had risen from the dead, and had gone into heaven; that most of them had seen him alive after his resurrection, and witnessed his ascent from the earth; and that one of them had actually seen him and heard him speak from heaven. These things were not only new to the people, but they were also *new truths*, or rather facts, because they were things which had recently happened, of which the apostles were witnesses; and the peculiar work of their office was to bear witness of what they had seen and heard. In this it was impossible, in the nature of the thing, that they could have successors after their own age; and the fact that the extraordinary powers with which they were endowed were not transferred from them to others, shows that it was no part of the divine plan that they should have successors.

The Vindicator affects to be agreed with me on one point. "There is one avowal," says he, "made by The Protestant which I perfectly coincide with; that is, that God gave pastors and teachers, men whose business it is not to publish any NEW doctrine. Here we are agreed; this is a point for which all Catholics contend; it is the basis of their faith; it is the ground on which they rest the infallibility of their church; and it is the rock against which all those who are tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine are wrecked. On this point I am ready to take my stand; and to bring the matter to an issue with my opponent, I will detail, in as brief a manner as possible, the progress of Catholic teachers and missionaries, from the time of the apostles to that of Luther's pretended reformation, and contrast their mode of conversion to that of evangelical reformers, so that the reader may form his own opinion as to the claim which each has as to the merit of not publishing a *new* doctrine, and, of course, entitled to the character of pastors and teachers of the church."—Col. 263.

He begins by assuming, and asserting as a fact, what has never been proved, and I am sure, never will be proved while the world stands. "In the first place," says he, "Catholics can show an uninterrupted *succession* of bishops of Rome, from the martyrdom of St Peter in that city, in the year of Christ 36, to the present pontiff." Were this true, Peter could not have exercised his apostleship much more than two years; but I suppose the Vindicator did not know that the Christian era commences at the birth of Christ, not at the period of his death; and he did not know that writers of his own communion fix the date of Peter's martyrdom at least thirty years later than he has done. This is of very little importance, seeing it has not yet been proved that Peter ever saw Rome, much less that he was martyred there. The Vindicator next assumes it as

a thing indisputable, that the apostles and their successors were all staunch Papists; and that it was Popery that was by their ministry propagated through the different nations of the world, whose very names fill a column of his work. This is that sort of waste of words that is called beating the air, or thrashing the water; it leaves no impression, for there is no truth in it. Through a number of pages we have the changes rung upon the words "no *new* doctrine;" and here again the Vindicator proceeds upon the assumption, that the doctrine of Luther and the other reformers was *new*, and that of Rome was *old*. But this was never conceded by any Protestant; it is the very point at issue between Protestants and Papists, and therefore, the latter have no right to take it for granted, as the Vindicator does.

Protestants maintain, upon good grounds, that the peculiarities of Popery are mere novelties. They grant that the principle of it is as old as the entrance of sin into the world; but every thing in the Church of Rome, that can be distinguished from ancient heathenism, is a mere novelty. Such, for instance, is transubstantiation. There is nothing like this among the ancient heathen; for such an absurdity never entered the head of any of them that a man might eat the God that made him. For this the Church of Rome alone is answerable; and it was not established as a doctrine of this church earlier than the 13th century of the Christian era; I mean, by the Lateran council, which met, I think, in 1215.

This corner stone of Popery, therefore, is no better than a great novelty. It was a *new* doctrine brought into the church, by those who pretended to be successors of the apostles, but who had themselves apostatized from the truth and simplicity of the gospel. Luther and the other reformers introduced no *new* doctrine, or commandment, when they began the Reformation; but an old commandment which was from the beginning. They returned to the New Testament, and threw aside the rubbish which had been accumulating for ages. Having tasted of the old wine, they did not desire the new; for they said truly, the old is better; and this applies not merely to transubstantiation, but to every Popish peculiarity that happened to start up in the dark ages.

Notwithstanding that the Vindicator agrees with me, that pastors and teachers, the ordinary ministers of the church, are not to publish any *new* doctrine, he seems unable to understand what is the use of them, if they are not commissioned to do the very thing which he admits they cannot do. I had said that the business of the ordinary ministers of the church was not to publish any new doctrine, but merely to preach and make known what was already published in the Scriptures. This he admits; and yet he cannot comprehend the use of men making known what has been already published. "What," says he, "should we say of our government, if it were to appoint men to proclaim and expound laws which were already published, and which every man was at liberty to interpret according to his fancy?" This strikes at the foundation of a gospel ministry altogether, unless it be understood that every minister possesses the extraordinary powers of an apostle. This, I suppose, is what the Vindicator and every Popish priest would have us to believe; but we must demur a little; and we shall soon see that there is no occasion to concede so much.

Pastors and teachers, by which are meant the ordinary ministers of the gospel, are not appointed to publish new truths, but to make known those which are already published in the bible. On this subject, it may be worth while to dilate a little. The bible contains all that the Almighty has to say to the children of men until the day of judgment. Christ came not only to make an end of sin-offering—to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease; but also to seal up the vision and prophecy, Dan. ix. 24. that is, to close or complete the volume of inspiration. This he did by a revelation to the last of his apostles, whose concluding words direct Christians, not to expect any other prophecy, or revelation, but the revelation of Christ himself in person at the last day. The book thus completed contains every thing that is necessary to be known for the salvation of sinners, and for the edification, sanctification, and comfort of Christians. This is best known to those who are best acquainted with it; and no argument is necessary to prove the point to them. As for those who are not acquainted with the bible, I fear arguments on such a subject would be of little avail with them; just as arguments to prove that honey is sweet, would be thrown away upon a man who had never tasted honey. To every enlightened mind it must appear certain, without reasoning about the matter, that if God is pleased to give a revelation of his will, it must be a good and a sufficient one; for nothing that is bad, or *insufficient*, can proceed from Him, and the bible proves itself to be what I have here represented it, to all who really know it. This, therefore, I think I am entitled to take for granted in the present controversy; and the doctrine which I build upon it is, that the pastors and teachers of Christian congregations, as well as missionaries to the heathen, have no new truths to publish, but only the old truths which they find in the bible.

This truth, however, though old in the bible, is new to every man, when it is first presented to him; and here again the Vindicator will find many contradictions in my statements; because I admit, that what is old in one sense, is new in another; and he will affect to reason from my use of the word in the one sense, to the known use of it in the other sense; and so he

will flourish away about contradictions and inconsistencies without end. No matter. Pastors and teachers have nothing to do in the way of preaching, but to publish the old bible truth. Those of them who understand their business best, will be content with the work that is thus assigned to them. It is the truth that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures, that is the subject of their testimony. This truth is as old as the days of the apostles; and yet it is no older than yesterday, to him that did not know it till yesterday: and thus it is the business of every preacher of the gospel to make known the old truth, and nothing else, that those to whom it is made known may be saved by it.

The preaching of this truth is as necessary in the present day, as it was in the days of the apostles, because it is not yet universally known. It is not unknown, and therefore it is not new to men called Christians, that Christ died. All Christendom knows this; but that Christ died, *according to the Scriptures*, is not so generally known; and without this the general historical knowledge of the fact of his death is of no use to any man or woman under heaven. Now the pastors and teachers of Christian churches have enough to do in preaching this old truth, and in pressing it as *good news* upon the attention of all who will hear them, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that is, that he made the atonement for sin, which the Scriptures declare to have been necessary, in order to the pardon of sin, and the salvation of the sinner. This old truth is new to every sinner, when he at first receives it; and when it is afterwards repeated to him it has a new zest; and though in the ministrations of pastors and teachers, there were nothing else brought to view, he would find in this old truth, new comfort every time it was called to his remembrance. Plain honest Christians will know what this means; but I am afraid none of our Papists will understand it. My business is, to give them a reason and an argument, but I cannot give them an understanding.

The Vindicator winds up his 19th Number with a wonderful puff, which he ascribes to the Right Honourable the Irish Chief Secretary of State, who is represented to have spoken as follows, in the House of Commons, on the state of disease in Ireland, and the fact to which he referred is declared by the Vindicator to be a complete "refutation of the charge of *cruelty* and *wickedness* on the part of the catholic priesthood, advanced by the Protestant." "The clergy of the established church (said Mr Grant) had distinguished themselves by the most exemplary exertions, and the Catholic priesthood had not been found inferior to their Protestant brethren. *Their religion*, indeed, called them to the closest contagion with the dead and dying: and not a single instance occurred wherein they shrunk from their duty. One instance, and he did not mean to say it was a solitary one, of excelling virtue, had fallen within the sphere of his own knowledge, and was of such a nature, that he could not refrain from disclosing it to the House. A Roman Catholic priest was called upon to visit a small cabin, in which six individuals were lying, all violently afflicted with the typhus fever. The priest had no other means of receiving the dying man's communication, and of administering to him the consolations of religion, than by throwing himself on the wretched pallet upon which the sick man lay, and thus inhaling contagion from its source." "Would The Protestant," says the Vindicator, "or any of his friends, have acted thus *kindly* and affectionately towards this dying Papist?"

I have quoted this passage for the purpose of affording me an opportunity of giving an answer in the affirmative to the question at the end of it. I see no great merit in the conduct of the priest, who is praised so highly, seeing that, upon his own principles, he could not refuse to do what he did, without violating his most solemn engagements, and making himself guilty of the damnation of the person who should have died without the aid of his ministry. But I can tell the reader, and the Vindicator too, that when this said typhus fever, which was imported from Ireland, was raging in Glasgow, at the very time that THE PROTESTANT began his work, he and his friends were doing the very things which the Vindicator asks if they would do. It is a fact, that for several months I was exposed almost every day to the contagion, by coming in contact, in Hutcheson's Hospital, with persons come from infected houses, with petitions to have their diseased relatives removed to the Infirmary, or Relief Hospital; and yet the risk which I ran, and the trouble which I took, on that occasion, was as nothing in comparison of the trouble and risk of some of my friends, who voluntarily exposed their lives for the sake of their poor fellow-creatures, many of whom were Papists, by going into their houses, and actually turning up beds in which infected persons lay, concealed by their friends, lest the knowledge of the fever being there, should subject them to the disagreeable operation of cleansing and fumigation. I could give the name of one of our late magistrates who was at all this pains, at the hazard of his life. In short, I could give the names of upwards of twenty gentlemen, who laboured and exposed their lives in this good work; who, notwithstanding many discouragements, nobly persevered in their benevolent and well-directed operations, until they accomplished their object,—the extirpation of the disease.

These facts are known to our whole city; and seeing my own part in them was compara-

tively small, (being merely secretary of the committee, and not a visitor of the sick in their apartments,) I can with more confidence present them in contrast with the boasted individual case of *one single* priest in the kingdom of Ireland, doing no more than his official duty, in circumstances of similar affliction among the poor of his flock.

No. CLIX.

SATURDAY, JULY 28TH, 1821

I HAVE lived long enough in the world to know something of the character and manners of persons around me; and I have uniformly found, that the best men are those who are best acquainted with the word of God,—who read the bible most carefully, and who recommend the reading of it to others. Official duties of various kinds, particularly as manager of a Female Penitentiary, have given me opportunities of studying the temper, character, and manners of the most profligate and degraded of my fellow-creatures; and I have found, without a single exception, so far as I recollect, that these were not bible readers. Many of them could not read at all; and by those who could, I have been told that they seldom or never looked into the bible. I have known instances of such persons reforming, and leading a virtuous life; some of whom, I believe, have died in the faith, and others are honouring the profession of it. This happy change, I know, was connected with their reading the bible; and I never knew an instance of one being injured by this exercise, or being induced by it to injure others. I appeal to the managers of Bridewell, and other public penitentiaries, whether the same things have not come under their knowledge? Nay, I may appeal to every man who has paid any attention to the subject, whether he ever knew a good man become bad, or even a bad man become worse, in consequence of his reading the bible? I am persuaded, I shall never receive an answer in the affirmative from any man who can discern between good and evil.

But, if we believe Papists, their experience is so very different, that we might almost doubt if they be of the same species, or if their acquaintance be with creatures like ourselves, and those with whom we are acquainted. According to them, the reading of the bible is like the opening of Pandora's box. The Catholic Vindicator fills several of his Numbers (see XV. to XXV.) with minute details of the horrible effects of bible reading. He ascribes almost all the evils which have afflicted Europe for the last three hundred years to this single cause; and he is not in jest, but in furious earnest. The simple statement of this fact will, I think, be considered a sufficient exposure of it, at least with all those who value the word of God. It is not necessary that I should enter particularly into this subject again, as I could add little to what I have already said, on the duty of reading the scriptures; and on the excellence and divine authority of the word of God; see particularly, Nos. XXX. to XXXVII. and Nos. CXXXII. to CXXXV.

I come now to the Vindicator's defence of saint worship, which is laboured with more care; and it possesses a greater show of argument than his declarations against bible reading. He is extremely indignant at the charge of idolatry which I brought very plainly against his church. I affirmed that the Virgin Mary was as really an object of worship in the Church of Rome, as Diana was in Ephesus, or Venus in Paphos, or any other god or goddess in any heathen nation of the world. This he denies in language sufficiently coarse; and yet the thing is known to be true by every person acquainted with Popish worship, or who has read their books of devotion. "No one," says he, "is ignorant that the heathens worshipped Diana and Venus with *divine* honours as *deities:* but to say that the Church of Rome pays the *same* adoration to the blessed Virgin Mary, is contrary to truth, and incapable of proof, unless indeed the unsupported assertions of The Protestant are to be taken for facts, and his gross perversions of the sentiments of Catholic writers, for correct definitions of Catholic doctrine." He then favours us with his friend Dr Milner's sentiments respecting saint and image worship, concluding with Gother's heavy curses against "every goddess worshipper, that believes the blessed Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature; that worships her, or puts his trust in her *more than in God*, and that believes her *above her Son*, or that she can *in any thing command him.*"

"Let the candid reader," proceeds Mr Andrews, "compare the above definition of Catholic doctrine with the assertion of The Protestant, and say which is most entitled to credit: the solemn and plain exposition of a Catholic prelate, or the unsupported declaration of a rattling puritan? If the Catholic believes that the man who puts his trust in the saints as his redeemers; who prays to them as such; or gives to them that honour which is due to God alone, is guilty of a damnable sin: If the Catholic believes that every goddess worshipper, whether this worship be applied to the Virgin Mary, or to any saint, or to any created being whatsoever, incurs the sentence of damnation,—*can* he be an *idolater* by principle, or can his creed be idolatrous? It is impossible. And yet our accuser unblushingly asserts, that the holy mother of God is as really an object of worship in the Church of Rome, as Diana was in Ephesus," &c. col. 408.

The reader will perceive that the Vindica-

tor goes farther in stating what Papists believe on this subject, than he is warranted by the authority of Gother, as cited by Bishop Milner. This great oracle of English Papists does not say that it is damnable to trust in the Virgin Mary; it is damnable only if he trust in her *more than in God.* He does not say it is damnable to look upon her as equal to her son; it is damnable only to say she is *above him,* and can in any thing command him. This leaves room enough for idolatrous worship without incurring the frightful curse which is here denounced against it; for it is direct idolatry to trust, in a religious sense, in any creature whatever; or to associate with the Supreme Being, in religious worship, the highest creature, though in the lowest degree of devotion; and we cannot read a page of their prayers and hymns to the Virgin and other saints, without being disgusted with the grossness of the idolatry.

I made a quotation from a book written by Mr Andrews for the use of schools, in which he plainly inculcates idol worship upon the very children, by recommending devotion to the blessed Virgin, and trust in her for the attainment of virtue in youth. Of this work the Vindicator writes:—"Without any vanity I hereby invite The Protestant to produce a book better calculated to inspire a love of God, which is the essence of religion, in the minds of those who use it, than that which has incurred his censure. But, unluckily, I introduced a chapter, which also inculcated, *as a mean of attaining virtue,* an inferior respect and devotion to that immaculate Virgin, who bore the Son of God in her chaste womb; and this single precept is sufficient to condemn us for idolatry, and stamp me and my fellow-Catholics as base goddess-worshippers as the heathens of old. Now the Pagans, as I have before observed, offered *sacrifice* to their goddesses, and attributed to them the powers of a deity; this, however, is not the case with Catholics, who look upon the blessed Virgin certainly as the most exalted of all creatures that God has ever created, and, in quality of her being the mother of the Son of God, *a powerful mediator for sinners in heaven.* But in so doing The Protestant will have it that we invest this *idol* with the attributes of deity; that the Virgin must be omniscient and omnipresent." Col. 412. Most certainly, she is invested with the attributes of deity, if she be "a powerful mediator for sinners in heaven;" and if she be able to hear and answer the prayers which are addressed to her from this world. I appeal to every one who understands the terms, whether the Vindicator does not in these very words convict himself and his church of gross idolatry. That there is but ONE mediator for sinners, is as prominent a truth of divine revelation as that there is but ONE God. The Vindicator transfers the title from the Son of God to a mere creature, who was honoured to be his mother according to the flesh; and he is thus guilty of robbing Christ of his glory and giving it to a creature, who, in this connection, must be an idol. I know it will be replied, that to honour the mother is not to rob the Son; but I know also that this is a mere Popish figment; for Jesus never commanded, or even encouraged his disciples to give more honour to his mother than to any other woman who did the will of his Father.

Papists, it seems, do not offer sacrifice to the saints, and this is reckoned to exculpate them from the charge of idolatry; but there are other acts of worship as direct as that of sacrifice, such as prayers and hymns of praise; and besides these, it is well known that Papists build altars, and present votive offerings to the saints, which is little better than offering sacrifice to them. Such, for instance, was the worship paid to St Thomas-a-Becket at Canterbury, that Hume tells us, "The devotion towards him had quite effaced in that place the adoration of the Deity; nay, even that of the Virgin. At God's altar, for instance, there were offered in one year three pounds two shillings and sixpence; at the Virgin's, sixty-three pounds five shillings and sixpence; at St Thomas's, eight hundred and thirty-two pounds twelve shillings and threepence. But next year the disproportion was still greater: There was not a penny offered at God's altar; the Virgin's gained only four pounds one shilling and eightpence; but St Thomas had got for his share, nine hundred and fifty-four pounds six shillings and threepence."—*Hist. Eng.* vol. vi. ch. i. I believe a pound was then about three times its present value, *viz.* sixty shillings, and ten times its present efficiency; so that there was a sum equal to nine thousand pounds of our present money, devoted in one year to one single idol in England.

I find the Vindicator cannot be trusted even in quoting his own words. In the above-cited passage, he represents his school book as recommending an *inferior* respect and devotion to the immaculate Virgin. But there is no such qualifying word in the original. It is "devotion to the Blessed Virgin," absolutely and without any qualification, that is enjoined; and it is enjoined, "because it affords at the same time the *most powerful intercession* in the sight of God for obtaining his favour."* *Most powerful,* is not language suitable to that which is *inferior.* It is therefore divine wor-

* The Vindicator afterwards makes a distinction between mediators of intercession, and a mediator of redemption, and informs us that the latter is peculiar to Christ, while the former belongs also to the saints; but this distinction is a mere invention of Popery. The apostle Paul declares that Christ is able to save unto the uttermost, *because* he ever liveth to make *intercession;* so that, if the saints are able to be mediators of intercession, they must also be able to save to the uttermost.

ship, in the highest sense of which he is capable, that the Vindicator addresses to a mere creature.

This is confirmed by what he says elsewhere. Speaking of my representing him as holding up the Virgin Mary as an object of religious worship, he says, "I am not ashamed to own it, and that I mean it in a religious sense. By the term devotion is meant strong affection, ardent love; and who, I ask, can help feeling both love and affection towards that spotless woman, in whose womb the divinity itself chose to dwell, when he took upon himself our nature, in order to redeem us from sin and death?" Col. 443. It is one of the greatest abominations of Popery, that it places certain important gospel truths in contact with the most pernicious errors, and that it makes these truths a covert for the errors which it means to establish. Here the incarnation of Jesus Christ, and the redemption which he effected are distinctly recognised; and thus the dupes of Romish superstition are made to believe that their church holds the bible doctrine; but then the incarnation of Christ, and the redemption effected by him, are brought into view, not for the purpose of honouring Christ by exciting love and devotion to him; but for the purpose of honouring the Virgin Mary by exciting love and affection for her. This withdraws the mind from the Saviour as effectually as if we were to put the crocodile in his place; for while we give the mother of Jesus all the honour that is justly due to her, we are sure that she is no more entitled to worship or devotion, in a religious sense, than the crocodile, or any reptile that creeps on the earth. When religious worship is the subject under discussion; and when the question is, Shall this worship be given to any but the true God? the difference between the highest creature and the lowest,—between the angel Gabriel, or the Virgin Mary, on the one hand, and a worm of the dust, on the other, the difference shrinks into nothing. The reptile is as much entitled to devotion, in a religious sense, as the Virgin Mary, or the angel Gabriel; and no man can deny this who believes these words of the God of Israel, "I am the Lord thy God; *thou shalt worship* ONLY *me*."

By this romantic devotion to the Virgin, Mr Andrews shows himself to be a true disciple of Loyola; that is, a true Jesuit. He believes in the immaculate conception, seeing he calls her, "that *spotless* woman;" and, no doubt, like Loyola, he is ready to knock on the head any man who denies that she was born without sin; though in that case he would shut her out of heaven altogether; for we are sure there are none of the race of Adam there, but those who acknowledge and declare, that they owe their salvation to him that loved them, and *washed them from their sins* in his own blood.

In reply to what I had said about the saints in heaven having done with worldly cares, the Vindicator maintains "that the saints do trouble themselves with worldly matters, since it is written in the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse of St John, ver. 9, 10. 'And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them who were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and revenge our blood *on them that dwell on the earth?*' This passage from holy writ convincingly shows that the blessed in heaven do concern themselves with the things of this world, for if they cry out to God to avenge their blood on their enemies, common sense tells us they are as likely to supplicate for blessings on their friends. Lest, however, our adversary should not be satisfied with the testimony of the beloved disciple of Christ, I will give him the word of God himself as recorded by St Luke, chap. xv. 10.—'I say unto you there shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance.'"* Col. 422, 423. Here I must cut my opponent short, for he is, as usual, running quite away from the point, and asserting things which are not disputed. What I said was, the saints in heaven are at rest with their Saviour, and have done with *worldly cares;* meaning the little affairs of this world, such as herding swine, feeding geese, and such other undignified employment as Papists assign to them; see page 208. But the glory of God by the punishment of his enemies, and the increase of the church by the repentance and salvation of sinners, are not *worldly cares*, but spiritual and heavenly things, which certainly do engage the attention of both saints and angels. In this way the Vindicator evades all the main points at issue; that is, by writing about one thing instead of another; and thus he draws away his reader's attention from those deformities in his system, which even he has not the face to defend. He does not say a word about the ridiculous drudgery with which the Church of Rome employs the saints in heaven, as exposed at the conclusion of my forty-fifth Number. He slurs it all over, without the least notice, as he does many other things which he cannot deny, and which he has not the grace to acknowledge. Nay, though he boasts that he has gone over, and answered my work, paragraph by paragraph, there is scarcely a paragraph in twenty that he has touched.

It is not necessary that I inform the intelli-

* This is the Douay translation; and, like every thing else that is peculiarly Popish, it degrades the subject to which it relates. Angels rejoice when a sinner *repents*, which implies a change of mind that is connected with salvation; but the Douay version would represent the angels as rejoicing when a sinner *torments himself*, which is an exercise with which salvation has no necessary connection.

gent reader, that the above two passages of scripture give no countenance whatever to the practice of praying to either saints or angels. Let us see if the Vindicator is more successful in his other references to the bible. "A glorified saint," our accuser says, "is but a finite creature. He cannot be in more than one place at one time, any more than a sinner on earth can be. I certainly do not pretend like this presumptuous man, to know the mysteries of heaven, or to limit the omnipotence of God. I know that the saints in heaven are in a state of perfection and glory, that they know what passes in the hearts of men upon earth, but *how* is not for me to inquire or explain; for, as I said in my last Vindicator, it is not for man to scan the wondrous works of his Creator." "As to the impossibility of a saint being in more than one place at one time, this is no obstacle to his knowing of what is going forward in the world. If Eliseus could see the ambush which the king of Syria had prepared for the Israelites, without being on the spot, (4 Kings vi. 9.) surely the saints in heaven, by the same divine power, can tell whether a Papist is praying to him or not." Col. 423, 424.

Here the Vindicator again ascribes an attribute of deity to his idols. He says, "they know what passes in the hearts of men upon earth." This prerogative the Almighty challenges for himself as peculiarly as the work of creation; and the saints in heaven can know no more of what is passing in my heart than Mr Andrews does, unless God is pleased to reveal it to them; and they cannot know who is, and who is not, praying to them, but by such a revelation. In the passage respecting Elisha, which, in our version of the bible, is 2 Kings vi. 9—12, there is not a word about the prophet *seeing* what he was not on the spot to see; or hearing what he was not present to hear. It is said, indeed, that he could tell the king of Israel the words which the king of Syria spoke in his bed chamber; but this was not by any extraordinary faculty of seeing or hearing with which he was endowed, but because God, who knows all things, had revealed it to him. This, therefore, is no proof that the saints in heaven hear the prayers which are addressed to them by their votaries on the earth.

"Universal *presence*," says the Vindicator, "is not necessary, if *knowledge* and *power* is given to the saints and angels by the omnipotent Lord of all; and we have the bible in our favour in support of this belief.—Jacob prayed the angel that delivered him from all evil, to bless the children of Joseph, (Gen. xlviii.) But will THE PROTESTANT charge the holy patriarch with idolatry, and blasphemy for thus invoking the assistance of an angel? I imagine he is not quite so presumptuous; and yet, notwithstanding Catholics do *no more* than what Jacob did, they must be idolaters. Is this impartiality and justice?" Col. 424. The Vindicator has said, that he would not be surprised by any thing that I should write, else I would surprise him by saying, that I would have the presumption to charge the holy patriarch with idolatry, had he, like modern Papists, invoked a created angel, in the language which he used in blessing the sons of Joseph; but every intelligent reader of the bible knows, that *The* Angel whom Jacob invoked, was no other than Jehovah the God of Israel, who appeared to him as the Angel of the everlasting covenant; and therefore, the words of the holy patriarch furnish no example for praying to saints or created angels.

"The royal prophet David," says the Vindicator, "teaches that whosoever puts his truth in God, *angels shall defend him, and keep him from harm.* Here are his words, 'He shall give his angels charge over thee, in all thy ways; they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone,' Ps. xci. 11, 12." Col. 423. But what has this to do with worshipping of angels, who, on every recorded instance of its being offered to them, peremptorily rejected it? see Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9; see also Col. ii. 18, in which it is expressly condemned. Angels are ministering spirits sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation; but this is no reason why we should worship them any more than the elements which are employed by Christ in the same service. He made the stars in their courses fight against the enemies of Israel; and he makes fire, hail, snow, vapour, and stormy winds fulfil his word; but this is no reason why we should worship the winds, the fire, or the snow.

The Vindicator next refers to a prayer of an angel for Jerusalem, Zec. i. 12; but though it were admitted that this was a created angel, it would be no warrant for men to pray to angels.

We are now come to his last and concluding argument for the lawfulness of praying to angels. It is taken from the apocryphal book of Tobit:—"In the 12th chapter of Tobias, and 12th verse, the angel Raphael tells that holy man,—'When thou didst pray with tears and bury the dead, and didst leave thy dinner, and hide the dead by day in thy house, and by night buried them, I OFFERED THY PRAYER TO OUR LORD.'" Col. 425. Though this were admitted to be real canonical scripture, it would scarcely make out the lawfulness of a practice which is so positively condemned in other passages. It is needless, however, to insist on this, seeing the book of Tobit is of no authority whatever. It is indeed such an absurd and contemptible romance, that none but persons who take a creature for their god, could ever take it for the word of God. That Papists so take it, is another proof that the

state of intellect and taste, as well as knowledge, among them must be deplorably low.

The contemptible character of the book of Tobit appears even from the short quotation which is given above. Vast importance is attached to the holy man's *leaving his dinner* in order to carry the body of a dead brother off the street. One would think the angel Raphael had mistaken Tobit for a London Alderman, or some such worshipper of the good things of the table, which is a very ancient species of idolatry; as the apostle Paul says, there were many in his time whose god was their belly. Few days pass in which I am not called to leave my dinner to attend to far less important business than that of burying a dead friend, by persons who have an idea that the dinner hour is the most likely time to find me *disengaged*. I never thought of attaching merit to this, or supposing it would give weight to my prayers, as the angel is represented, very absurdly, to address the holy man who could no doubt return to his dinner, as easily as I can do, when he had done his duty.

No. CLX.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 4TH, 1821.

A MAN who worships the true God in spirit and in truth, needs no other object of worship. The perfections of the divine nature, revealed in the scriptures, present enough for the devout contemplation, and grateful adoration of the soul of man to all eternity. The mind that is truly engaged in the worship of God has no room for any creature, however exalted; and cannot look upon angels and glorified saints in any other light than as fellow-worshippers, and fellow-servants of Him who is God over all, and blessed for ever. God was pleased to make himself known in the character of the just God and the Saviour to our first parents, immediately after the fall. It became their duty to teach this knowledge to their children; but *they* did not like to retain God in their knowledge, in those characters by which he was pleased to make himself known; for which cause he gave them over to a reprobate mind. They became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things, Rom. i. 20—32. The same thing happened again after the ascension of Christ and the promulgation of the gospel by his apostles. Men called Christians, not liking to retain God in their knowledge, in those characters in which the gospel presents him, fell into the very same errors; they were given over to the same reprobate state of mind; and they soon came to pay their devotions to objects as low as creeping things and four-footed beasts. Their voluntary humility led them first, indeed, to worship angels; from these they descended to dead men and women;—then to their rotten bones, and remnants of their clothes;—then to objects still more vile and loathsome.

In my last Number, I gave the Catholic Vindicator's vindication of the Popish practice of worshipping angels; on concluding which he proceeds as follows:—"So much in defence of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, so far as angels are concerned: that saints are also to be included we may gather from the Revelations of St John, who writes, chap. viii. 3, 4, 'I saw another angel that stood before an altar, having a golden censer: and there were given to him much incense, that he should offer of *the prayers of all saints* upon the altar of gold, which is before the throne of God. And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God, from the hand of the angel.' From hence it is clear that the prayers of the saints are propitious in heaven, and as they can have nothing to ask in favour of themselves, having received their reward, their supplications, common sense leads us to infer, are made in behalf of those they have left behind, and their prayers are delivered by the hand of the officiating angel, according to the testimony of St John.

"In further corroboration of this opinion we have the evidence of the apostles, who, in forming the creed which goes by their name, and is the symbol of Catholic faith, expressly enjoin a belief of *the communion of saints*, which has always been understood, from their time to the present day, as embracing prayers to them. That the apostles invoked and prayed to the blessed Virgin Mary and other saints, I think cannot be doubted, when it is known, that in all the most ancient liturgies of the church, commemoration is made of her by name, as well as the saints. I know it will be objected by some, that mention is not made in scripture of praying to the Virgin Mary and the apostles, but to this I answer, no mention could be made of this circumstance, because the objects of veneration were living on earth when the New Testament was written. In the gospel of St Luke, however, chap. i. 28, we find the angel Gabriel saluting the holy Virgin with these words,—'Hail, *full of grace*, the Lord is with thee! Blessed art thou among women.' In the same chapter too, ver. 42, we see that her cousin Elizabeth, inspired with the Holy Ghost, cried out, as the Virgin Mary was approaching to visit her,—'Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.' The immaculate Virgin is also related in the same chapter, to have said, ver. 48, under the spirit of prophecy,—

'Behold, from henceforth all generations shall be blessed.' Accordingly, the apostles honoured her memory by invoking her aid, and teaching those who believed in the doctrines they taught to follow their example. So early as the first century we have the writings of St Clement the third Pope, who was the disciple of St Peter, and fellow-labourer with St Paul, and is mentioned by him in his epistle to the Philippians, ch. iv. 3, as having his name in the book of life. These writings testify, that in the liturgies then in use among the Christians, commemoration was made of the saints. In the liturgy of St James the apostle, who was the first bishop of Jerusalem, there is this mention made of the blessed Virgin—'We make commemoration of our most immaculate, most glorious and blessed Lady, Mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary, and of all the saints and just, that by their prayers and intercessions we may obtain mercy.' St Dennis, the Areopagite, who was a disciple of St Paul, in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, notices the practice of invoking the saints. Lindanus says, that commemoration of our blessed Lady was the same in St Peter's liturgy as the Latins have it now. The Ethiopian liturgy (which is attributed to St Philip the apostle) hath the following prayer:—'O Virgin, in all times Mother of God and Christ, offer up on high our prayer, with the elect of thy Son, that our sins may be remitted. Rejoice, O Lady, who hast born to us the true light, Jesus Christ our Lord; pray for us to God, that he may have mercy on our souls; pray for us in the sight of the throne of thy Son Jesus Christ. Rejoice, O immaculate queen, O true mediatrix before our Lord Jesus Christ, we humbly beseech thee that thou be mindful of us, pray for us, that our iniquities may be blotted out.'—Thus we see the doctrine of praying to the holy Mother of God and to the saints, taught and practised by the apostles, who were given by Christ to his church as 'witnesses for Him, of what they had seen and heard.'—(See Protestant, No. XXXV.)" Col. 425—427.

I have made this long extract that I might give, at one view, the absurdities and idolatries which are practised in the Church of Rome, and which are defended by the Vindicator. It is true Bishop Cameron deponed, that he disapproved of both Andrews and his writings; and that he believed no Catholic clergyman in Scotland approved of them; but how then did it happen that he was hired, and paid for writing this very work, by some of the leading men among our Glasgow Papists? and how came Mr Scott to exhort his people to buy this very work? It was to indemnify the committee who were suffering loss in consequence of its not selling. But was this a sufficient motive for recommending the book, had it contained any thing contrary to "Catholic doctrine?" Was the loss of a few pounds by the committee a matter of so much importance, that to spare their purses, the Papists in Glasgow were exhorted by their ghostly father to buy a bad book, a book which no "Catholic clergyman in Scotland approved?" Nothing of the kind ought to be supposed; and, therefore, I consider Mr Scott and his committee as consenting to the whole doctrine laid down by the Vindicator, and responsible for it.

I request the reader to attend particularly to the use which the Vindicator makes of the passage, Rev. viii. 3, 4. He says, "from hence it is clear that the prayers of the saints are *propitious* in heaven;" but the words themselves bear no more than that they are presented in heaven by the angel, with much incense. And it is evidently the prayers of saints on earth which are thus presented, while he makes them only those of the saints in heaven, who have nothing to pray for on their own account. This is indeed natural enough in a Papist, who perhaps does not believe that there are any saints in this world at all, or even in heaven, till the Pope has made them such by canonization, which cannot now take place for a hundred years after their death; but every man who understands the bible, knows that every believer in Christ, that is, every real Christian, is a saint; and it is his privilege to know that his prayers are acceptable to God through the merit of Christ, which is signified by the much incense that ascends from the golden altar before the throne. Mr Andrews makes it the incense of the prayers of saints that ascends from the altar, which is indeed according to the Douay version; but this proves no more than that Papists can mistranslate the word of God, in order to prop up their system of falsehood and error. The prayers of saints have no incense, that is, no merit belonging to them; but in virtue of Christ's merit they are accepted, and not forgotten, which is all that they desire in relation to them.

In the creed ascribed to the apostles, though I believe none of the apostles ever heard of it while in this world, (see pages 629, 630.) the expression "communion of saints" occurs, which, says the Vindicator, "has always been understood from their time to the present day, as embracing prayers to them." Col. 425. He gives no higher authority than his own for this general understanding of the words; and if he were correct in his assertion, it would be the duty of saints on earth to pray to one another, and of those in heaven, to pray to those on the earth, as much as of the latter to pray to the former. There is a communion of saints in praying with, and for one another; but their praying *to* one another in the sense of religious worship, has no countenance in the word of God; and in short, it could have no place in the mind of any man but an idolater. This is a mere assertion; but it is enough to oppose to a mere assertion; and the intelligent

reader will judge which is most agreeable to the general tenor of scripture. I have cited the command of God, thou shalt worship *only* me. I have shown, by reference to several passages, that he condemns *all* creature-worship; and the Vindicator has not adduced a single passage to show that he approves of it. Surely then it requires more than his bare word to establish the doctrine, that the saints may be prayed to; and that the expression, "communion of saints," has always been understood, from the apostles' time, to imply that this high degree of worship may be addressed to mere creatures.

"That the apostles," says my opponent, "invoked and prayed to the blessed Virgin Mary and other saints, I think, cannot be doubted, when it is known, that in all the most ancient liturgies of the church, commemoration is made of her by name, as well as the saints." Col. 426. This assertion would have gained nothing in point of impudence, though he had added, that the apostles invoked the great goddess Diana; or had he asserted, like the Jesuits in China, that the story of the crucifixion was a fable, invented by the Jews to discredit Christianity. It is enough that I deny that the apostles invoked the Virgin Mary, or any creature; and I challenge him to the proof of his assertion. I challenge also the recommender of his book, and the committee that procured it to be written, and that paid for it, and gave circulation to it, to prove the point. If they shall not do this, I shall hold them not only convicted of idolatry themselves, but also of the shocking impiety of charging idolatry upon Christ's inspired ambassadors. I say, I challenge them; and if they shall not answer me, I shall, to use the language of Mr Andrews for once, hold them as guilty, by suffering judgment to go by default.

We shall see by and by what credit is due to what are called "the most ancient liturgies of the church." In the meantime let us attend to those passages of scripture which are alleged to teach the invocation of the Virgin Mary. These are, Luke i. 28, "Hail, *full of grace*, the Lord is with thee! Blessed art thou among women;" ver. 42, "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." And ver. 48, "Behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." From the first of these three verses is formed the *Ave Maria*, or Hail Mary, in repeating which a great part of Popish devotion consists; though there is not a word in all the three passages that gives the smallest hint that prayer was to be addressed to her. The word *Hail*, is a friendly salutation; and can never be understood to imply religious worship, else Christ, after his resurrection, must have worshipped his own disciples; see Mat. xxviii. 9.

There is nothing in the other words of the salutation of the angel that can afford the least foundation for worshipping the Virgin Mary. "Full of grace," is a literal translation of the vulgate, *Gratiæ plena;* our common version is, "thou art highly favoured;" Dr Campbell translates it, "Favourite of heaven." Perhaps "Full of grace" is the strongest, and suppose we concede to Rome that it is the truest rendering of Κεχαριτωμενη, there is nothing in it that implies that we ought to pray to the person so favoured. Every Christian is exhorted to be "filled with the Spirit," which is, to be full of grace. Nay, more, Paul prays for the believing Ephesians, "That they may be filled with all the fulness of God." Surely it was not meant by this that they were to become objects of worship; yet the language respecting the Virgin is not so strong as this.

The next clause of the sentence, "the Lord *is* with thee;" or, "the Lord *be* with thee," as Dr Campbell renders it, certainly lays no ground for offering worship to the Virgin, for take it either way, it expresses no more than what any Christian may say to any other Christian.

In the words which follow I grant there is a peculiarity of expression, which cannot be applied to any other individual of the human race:—"Blessed art thou among women," and "Blessed is the fruit of thy womb;" and "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." From the time that the promise was made to our first parents, that a Saviour should be born of woman, it became the desire of every believing woman, that she might be the honoured, the happy, the *blessed* individual; and it was the deprivation of this blessedness that constituted the curse of barrenness, which was so keenly felt by Sarah, and other holy women, from her time down to the time of Zacharias and Elizabeth. This feeling was not confined to the mothers in Israel; it extended to every member of every family in which the knowledge of the God of Israel remained, and in which he was worshipped in a spiritual manner. In short, it was the desire of every true Israelite that the promised Messiah might be born in the family to which he belonged. Hence the impassioned language of Solomon, in one of his inspired writings, which is, I am afraid, little understood, "O that thou wert as my brother, that sucked the breasts of my mother!" Cant. viii. 1.

Mary, the espoused wife of Joseph of Nazareth, when the appointed time arrived, was declared to be the distinguished individual. She was what every woman in Israel would call the *blessed woman;* blessed above all other women, as honoured above them all, being chosen of God to be what every one of them wished to be; and when the thing was announced to herself, and when she began to feel in herself that the promise had begun to be accomplished, she acknowledged the great mercy of God to her; and taking her faith and

her feelings together, she very naturally anticipated the remembrance of her name in the church to the end of the world, as the honoured instrument of giving birth to the Messiah; and thus in the joy and grateful fulness of her heart she exclaimed, "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." All generations of Christians have done so hitherto, and they shall do so to the end of the world, if Papists would not divert them from it by putting her forth as a goddess, and an object of worship; for then those who worship only one God feel themselves obliged to oppose her claims, and to argue against her title. These claims, however, are not her's; but those of false friends, who, by putting her out of her place, do more to dishonour her than Protestants ever did.

In the above-cited passages, there is not a word of encouragement to pray to the Virgin, or to worship her in any sense whatever; and there is very little of her subsequent history recorded. Indeed, we are apt to wonder that so little is said about her; but He who knew the propensity of the Israelites to idolatry, and who concealed the place where Moses was buried, has also drawn a veil over the history of this blessed individual, in order that no occasion might be furnished for honouring her in an idolatrous manner; and that if men would depart so far from the truth as to give divine honours to this creature, the whole guilt of it might rest upon themselves. None of it can be charged directly, or by implication, on any part of the apostolic writings, for no apostle or evangelist has written a word that by fair construction, or even by force, can be made to express any such meaning. That Jesus discouraged his followers from doing honour to Mary on account of her being his mother, is evident from Mark iii. 31—35. for an illustration of which see page 194,—one of the numerous passages to which the Vindicator made no reply.

The Vindicator proceeds in the following confident tone of assertion, not doubting that his readers will implicitly believe him:—"Accordingly the apostles honoured her memory by invoking her aid, and teaching those who believed in the doctrines they taught to follow their example." I call again upon Mr Scott and his committee to make good this assertion of their hired advocate. Let them show when, and in what form of speech, the apostles of Christ invoked, and taught others to invoke, the Virgin Mary. The knowledge of the simple fact which I have thus brought to view; namely, that such an assertion is made by a living Popish writer, hired to write by our Glasgow Papists, and who has had his work recommended by their priest, will, I hope, convince every person who applies his mind to the subject, that Popery remains as it was in the dark ages; and that it is not divested of one particle of its grossness, falsehood, and impudence.

The Vindicator refers to a writing of St Clement, in order to show that, as early as the first century, "in the liturgies then in use, commemoration was made of the saints." Every ecclesiastical historian knows this to be a gross imposition; but though it were otherwise, we have no such name as Clement in the list of inspired writers; and, therefore, we are not obliged to submit to his authority. But it is of more importance to attend to the following:—"In the liturgy of St James the apostle, who was the first bishop of Jerusalem, there is this mention made of the blessed Virgin,—'We make commemoration of our most immaculate, most glorious and blessed lady, mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary, and of all the saints and just, that by their prayers and intercessions we may obtain mercy.'" Here I ask Mr Scott and his committee, if they really believe that the apostle James wrote such words as the above? If they answer in the affirmative, they will be ready to give a reason for their faith; if in the negative, then I ask how could they recommend, pay for, and give circulation to such abominable nonsense?

There has, indeed, been such a forgery palmed upon the world as the liturgy of St James, with a short account of which I shall here entertain the reader. It is without doubt a composition of considerable antiquity; but I have seen no evidence of its being older than the beginning of the 8th century. It contains the impious expression, "Mother of God," which was not in use in the apostle's time. It contains several citations from Paul's epistles, of some of which it is doubtful if they were written before the death of James:—It contains the word "consubstantial," in reference to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which, so far as appears, was not in use before the council of Nice, at least not fathered upon an apostle, else it would have been used with overwhelming effect in the controversies of that period. It contains the *Trisagion*, (thrice holy) and the *Gloria patri*, (glory to the Father,) which were not commonly used in the church till the 5th century. In this pretended apostolical liturgy, there is a prayer for those who are shut up in monasteries, but I defy Mr Scott and his committee united, to prove that there were monasteries in St James' time. There is mention made of confessors, a designation which Cardinal Bellarmine himself acknowledges was not in use for a great while after St James' time. This liturgy speaks of temples, and incensing of altars, words which, if used in St James' time, it must have been by Pagans. Upon the whole, the ceremonies which it prescribes by no means agree with what we know to have been the practice of apostolic churches. These things are acknowledged by Dupin, one of the most respectable historians which the Church

of Rome has produced.—*See Preservative against Popery*, Tit. xii. page 8.

The Vindicator writes as if he had a copy of this liturgy before him, seeing he gives the very words of it with marks of quotation. If he had really read it, he must have seen that it was a downright forgery; and yet he adduces it as confidently as if it were of equally undisputed authority with the Acts of the Apostles. Happily the monks of the dark ages could not write any work of considerable length, without making anachronisms, and other blunders, which have served to detect their impositions: and this is one of those collateral evidences which satisfy the inquisitive mind, that none of the books of the New Testament are of later date than the apostolic age; for no anachronisms have been detected in them; and nothing inconsistent with the character of the writers, or of the age in which they wrote.

No. CLXI.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 11TH, 1821.

My last Number contained some remarks on the liturgy of St James, showing that it is a forgery of a much later age than that of the apostle. I have a remark or two more to make on the subject of pretended liturgies. The Vindicator treats us with a prayer to the Virgin, from the Ethiopian one, which, he says, is ascribed to St Philip. We happen to know that others have ascribed it to St Matthew; but it is very evident that it had no existence for hundreds of years after these holy men had gone to their rest. Those who use this liturgy are taught to pray for the *Popes*, as well as for kings, patriarchs, and archbishops. Now it is certain the word *Pope* was not used to designate any particular bishop for ages after the apostles' days. Nay, in this liturgy the apostles themselves are invoked, or prayed to, which they would not have consented to while they were alive. Besides, this pretended apostolical form of worship contains the Nicene creed, with the famous particle *Filioque*, which was the subject of so much controversy in the fourth century; and it condescends even to mention the names of certain Romish saints, such as Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory, who certainly were not cotemporary with any of the apostles. —(*See Preservative against Popery*, Tit. xii. p. 8.) Yet upon the authority of this absurd and impious forgery does the Vindicator declare as follows: "Thus we see the doctrine of praying to the holy Mother of God, and to the saints, taught and practised by the apostles, who were given by Christ to his church as witnesses for him of what they had seen and heard."

A passing allusion is made to a liturgy ascribed to St Peter; and it is a fact, that a work under this title was published by Lindanus in 1589, and republished in Paris in 1595. The former professes to be taken from a manuscript of Cardinal Sirlet, of no great antiquity; and the work bears internal evidence, like the other two, that it is an impudent forgery. It is by means of such impositions, that the author of the book which Mr Scott exhorted his people to buy, endeavours to defend the worship of the great Popish idol, the queen of heaven. I shall now proceed to show how she came to take the place of the true God, and to engross almost the whole devotion of the Church of Rome.

Some of the fathers of the second and third centuries, whose writings are extant, speak with great respect of the Virgin Mary, as it became them and all Christians to do. Some of them indeed amused themselves, and perhaps meant to instruct others, by drawing fanciful parallels between her and Eve; and, sometimes, equally fanciful contrasts. Justin Martyr writes as follows; and there is little more about her to be found in his works:—"Eve, being a virgin, conceived by the word of the serpent, and brought forth death: but the Virgin Mary, receiving the message of the angel, conceived in faith; therefore, that which was born of her was holy, to wit, the son of God." After Justin comes Irenæus who pursues the comparison at greater length. He opposes the cheat that was put upon Eve, to the truth that was told to Mary. He opposes the Virgin Eve, now designed to be a wife, to the Virgin Mary, who was also espoused; and the Virgin Eve, deceived by an evil angel, to the Virgin Mary, believing a good angel. And, says he, "As Eve was seduced and forsook God, so Mary was induced to obey God, that the Virgin Mary might be a comforter of the Virgin Eve; and that as mankind was, through a Virgin, bound over to death; so they should be released through a Virgin. One thing being thus rightly balanced against another, the disobedience of a Virgin by the obedience of a Virgin."

This conceit seems to have been wonderfully pleasing to these great men. It was used by one after another, just as many good people in the present day insensibly adopt and use the phraseology of their favourite author or preacher. Thus Tertullian took it up from Irenæus; and added something of his own, a little more extravagant: "Eve had believed the serpent, Mary hath believed Gabriel: the offence which the former hath committed in believing, the latter hath blotted out by believing." If Tertullian had stopped here, he could not be acquitted of teaching that Mary was the Saviour; and the church of Rome might justly have claimed him as one of her children; but from what follows it is evident that he meant no more, by blotting out Eve's offence, than "that Mary brought forth him who was to save even

his murderers; and that Christ was to come of her for the salvation of men."

I will admit that this conceit of the fathers was exceedingly childish; and the churches were to be pitied whose pastors had forgotten the simplicity of the gospel so far as to amuse them with such reveries. I will even admit, that ascribing so much to Mary's agency, as opposed to Eve's transgression, laid the foundation, and prepared the way for all the idolatrous worship that has since been addressed to her; but none of the fathers whom I have mentioned seem ever to have taken it into their heads that Mary was to be invoked, or worshipped, in any sense whatever.—*See a Discourse by Dr Clagett, in Preservative against Popery,* Tit. vi. p. 194.

From this able work it is shown very clearly, that Mary was by no means the first with whom the apostate church began to commit idolatry. Numerous martyrs had the start of her; but when she had once got her name in the list, she soon overtopped them all; and came, in the course of ages, to engross almost all the devotion of the Church of Rome, as she does at this day in Popish countries. Some, perhaps most of the apostles, and many of the pastors whom they appointed over churches, and many of the successors of these pastors, were honoured to be martyrs for the truth. The memory of such was cherished with peculiar veneration by the Christians who survived them; and perhaps they erred in attaching more respect to the memory of those who were put to death for the truth, than to that of those who were equally laborious and faithful, and who had really suffered more for it, during their lives, but who happened to die a natural death. The memory of the just *is* blessed. It is of little importance to them what death they die; and the churches ought not to apportion the honour with which they remember them according to the manner of their death, but according to the activity of their lives.

What, however, was at first a very natural, and perhaps a very amiable feeling, in reference to those whose blood was shed for the truth, was, through human corruption, made an occasion of very great abuses; and, from venerating the memory of the martyrs, men came by degrees to call upon their names,—to address prayers and supplications to them. Matters came not to this detestable height of idolatry all at once. It required ages of darkness to perfect the system, as it appeared in Europe at the time of the Reformation, and as it still appears in a great part of what is called Christendom.

The first shade of departure from the simplicity of gospel worship that can be traced in ecclesiastical history, (for I speak of this as a matter of history,) was that of Christians meeting for prayer, and other religious exercises, at the graves of martyrs. The thing was perhaps quite harmless in itself; and under the direction of enlightened and spiritually-minded men it may have been profitable to many, as religious exercises may always be, at the burial, or over the graves, of Christian friends. But unless such exercises are conducted by enlightened men, they will almost to a certainty degenerate into superstition. Now there is reason to think, that many of the earlier Christians were not very enlightened. They knew the truth by which they were saved; but when we consider their scanty means of acquiring general knowledge, we may conclude that they knew little more than the first principles of Christianity. They had also their Jewish and their heathen prejudices to contend with; and were, in short, in circumstances to become an easy prey to false teachers, whatever name they might assume. "It had been a very ancient custom," says the writer above quoted, page 200, "for Christians to meet at the cemeteries, or burying places of the martyrs, and the rest of the faithful, there to celebrate anniversary commemorations of the martyrs. Thus the church of Smyrna having intimated that they had buried the body of St Polycarp in the usual place, they added, 'that in that place, God willing, they should assemble together to celebrate the birth-day of his martyrdom with all the joy they could express.' And the reason of this custom, they express in this manner: 'Both to commemorate those who had already undergone the trial of martyrdom, and to exercise, and to prepare those who were to follow, for the like conflicts.' But they did not meet here to celebrate the memories of the martyrs only, but at other times also for the celebration of divine service."

By and by, the graves of the martyrs came to be considered as places more holy than the ordinary places of worship. Churches were built over them; and, in course of time, he was reckoned the most pious man who should go the greatest length in advancing the glory of the martyrs and the honour of the holy places built over their tombs, and consecrated to their memory.

If the places where the bodies of martyrs lay were thus believed to be holy, it was easy to believe that any remaining fragment of their bodies must be holier still. Then the graves were opened; the bones of the martyrs were dug up; they were kissed with religious reverence; miraculous powers were ascribed to them; many diseases they were believed to cure,—not that the cures were at first ascribed to any virtue in the rotten bones, but to the power of God who thus honoured the relics of his saints;—the sale of these relics became a very lucrative employment to the multitudes of lazy monks who spread over the world; and the saints whose bones they were said to be, became as much objects of religious worship as heroes and demi-gods had been among the

heathen. The reader will perceive, that by this time the glory was departed from the churches. ICHABOD was written upon them. All of them had apostatized; but that of Rome began to appear pre-eminent as the leader in the march towards perdition; and, like the serpent into which the rod of Aaron was transformed, she swallowed up almost all the rest.

During a great part of the period to which these remarks refer, the Virgin Mary was of comparatively little account. She was not a martyr, and therefore she was not entitled to that peculiar honour which belonged to the martyrs. But after objects of worship had begun to multiply to an indefinite extent, it was found that the popular devotion, so much divided, was in danger of languishing, for want of some one individual saint, who should surpass all the rest in dignity, and possess some peculiarity to which no other could lay claim, and in whose favour all voices might be united. Exactly such a one was the Virgin Mary; and as the heathen had their Jupiter, father of gods and men, so the Papists adopted their Virgin, queen of heaven, who has been worshipped most devoutly during the dark ages, and who is declared at this very day, by the organ of our Glasgow Papists, to afford the most *powerful intercession*, in the sight of God, for obtaining his favour.

As early as the fourth century, it is related by Epiphanius, "that some Arabian women worshipped the Virgin Mary, by laying a cake before her for some days, and offering it up to her, and then eating it among themselves." This was evidently a relic of that idolatrous devotion to the queen of heaven, mentioned by Jeremiah, chap. xliv. 17. and the practice was strongly condemned by Epiphanius, in the following terms:—"Let us put on the spirits of men, and beat down the madness of these women. For who of the prophets ever allowed that a man should be worshipped, much less a woman? Though the Virgin be a chosen vessel, she is yet but a woman. The old error shall not reign among us, to leave the living God, and to worship things, that he has made: for if he will not suffer the angels to be adored, how much less the daughter of Joachim and Ann, who was born to them as other mortals are born, of a father and a mother?"—*Preservative, &c.* as above, p. 213.

The salutation, *Ave Maria*, which has been for ages reckoned as solemn a part of religious worship as the Lord's prayer, seems to have been quite unknown in the fourth century: and there is not in any genuine record the slightest hint of prayer being addressed to the Virgin till long after that period. There are indeed many forgeries in the names of certain fathers, as early as the second century, which speak of Mary in the most fulsome style of adulation; but these forgeries detect themselves, as I showed in my last Number. There is credible evidence, that about the end of the fifth, or beginning of the sixth century, the Virgin was prayed to; and the innovation is ascribed to one Peter Fullo, a Eutychian heretic, who, according to Nicephorus, a later writer, "found out four very profitable things, one of which was, that *the holy name of the Virgin should be called upon in every prayer.*" From this time, all that is recorded on the subject tends to show the growing reputation of this idol. The minds of all men were turned towards her. She took precedence of all the martyrs, not excepting the apostles, who were now reckoned to be sufficiently honoured by being allowed to follow in her train. Thus, about the middle of the seventh century, Pope Martin ordained, that "whoever does not honour and *adore* the blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, let him be accursed." Soon thereafter she began to be addressed in such blasphemous titles as these: —The queen of the world,—The window of heaven,—The gate of paradise,—The tabernacle of God,—The star of the sea,—The heavenly ladder, &c. &c.—*Preservative, &c.* p. 214, 215.

It will reasonably be inquired, how it was possible to get the world, besotted as it was during the dark ages, to consent to such shocking impieties? There was, no doubt, much of judicial infatuation in it. Because they received not the love of the truth, God gave them up to strong delusion to believe a lie: and that the thing should happen in the dark ages is not so wonderful as that the infatuation should continue to this day, in the most enlightened country, and not the least enlightened city, in the world, even in our own city of Glasgow, where a congregation exists, with a priest at their head, out of which a committee was formed for the express purpose of recommending, and giving circulation to a work, which inculcates the worship of a mere creature, in such extravagant language as this:—"O Virgin, in all times Mother of God and Christ, offer up on high our prayer, with the elect of thy son, that our sins may be remitted. Rejoice, O Lady, who hast born to us the true light, Jesus Christ our Lord; pray for us to God, that he may have mercy on our souls; pray for us in the sight of the throne of thy son Jesus Christ. Rejoice, O immaculate queen, O true Mediatrix before our Lord Jesus Christ, we humbly beseech thee that thou be mindful of us, pray for us, that our iniquities may be blotted out."—*Cath. Vind.* col. 427.

The Virgin came to be distinguished above other saints by a system of sheer lying and imposition; and yet it was such lying as scarcely to have the merit of originality or invention; for there was not much original invention in it. It consisted chiefly in the application to her, or more properly speaking, the misapplication of what is prophesied, and of what is recorded concerning Christ. I have before me a long

narrative of what was thus attributed to her,—such as her birth being foretold,—its being announced by angels,—her being presented in the temple, &c. &c. all which is borrowed, or rather stolen, from what is related of our Saviour himself. Without going into the details of each particular, I shall content myself with giving a summary of about twenty articles, by which the Virgin was said to be distinguished from all other saints: 1. She was not only elected by God, but pre-elected before all others, Cant. vi. 8, 9. 2. That she was promised by heaven to the fathers. 3. That she sprang by the kindness of God from barren parents, (of which a long and ludicrous history is given by monkish writers.) 4. That she only of all the children of Adam, that descended from him by the ordinary way of propagation, was free from original sin. 5. That in the very beginning of her immaculate conception, she was so confirmed in grace, that ever after she was without stain of actual, though but venial sin. 6. That the *fomes peccati* was extinct in her. 7. That in her very conception she had the use of reason, and made a vow of virginity to God; from which instant also she began to merit, and that the merit of her works was never interrupted, no not so much as in her sleep. 8. That in the same conception of hers she was adorned with all the theological virtues. 9. That at the age of three years she was in the temple, according to her parents' vow, consecrated to God, and there most holily educated. 10. That this blessed person among women escaped all that curse, to which mankind, by reason of Adam's sin, was obnoxious. 11. That she alone did not undergo the irksomeness to which other women with child are subject. 12. That by a Virgin birth she brought forth God without pain. 13. That the Lord's body exhibited in the eucharist, is formed of her blood. 14. That she, in a singular manner, did many ways cooperate to our salvation. 15. That the fruit of Christ's passion was, in a singular manner, communicated to her. 16. That she was the instructor and mistress of the apostles and teachers. 17. That her body did not see corruption, but was taken up into heaven. 18. That her presence brought a great deal of accidental joy to the blessed in heaven. 19. That she is queen of heaven, and lady of all the angels and saints. 20. That she is the common advocate of sinners, the mother of mercy, the mediatrix to intercede for them; and that she is also the mother of the living, and promotes the salvation of all men. 21. That she is so formidable and terrible to the devils, that they presently fly away at the mention of her name, and much more at her command; and that she hath powerfully broken their head. 22. That all the graces and privileges that are dispersed among their saints, are found united in her, after a far more perfect manner.—*Maria Thronus Dei*, chap. xx. p. 252, 253, as quoted from Spinellus by Bishop Patrick, in his discourse on "the Virgin Mary misrepresented." I have used the freedom of abridging some of the articles which are indecently minute. The bishop tells us that one Paul Comitolus reckons up one hundred and thirty privileges peculiar to the Virgin.

The virgin Mary is associated with Christ in man's supposed salvation, as in the following:—"Grievously, my beloved, were we hurt by one man and one woman; but thanks be to God, not less by one man and one woman are all things restored," &c. See the *Trent Catechism*.

In the bull of pope Sixtus, adopted by the council of Trent, she is styled "queen of the heavens," and her son is spoken of as "king." In the Breviary, she is also called "queen of heaven," and "domina omnium creaturarum." In the Devout Communicant, she is addressed as "daughter of the eternal father! mother of the eternal son! and spouse of the holy ghost."

In regard to worship of the virgin, the Trent catechism further says—"With good reason the holy church of God has added to this giving of thanks, prayers also, and imploration addressed to the most holy mother of God." The style of these thanks, prayers, and imploration, clearly shows, that if the virgin be addressed as a mediatrix, her intercession is yet deemed as powerful as if she granted every thing by her own power. Thus;—"Vouchsafe to allow me to praise thee, O sacred virgin! give me strength against thy enemies." "To thy protection we fly, O holy mother of God! Despise not our prayers in the time of our necessities, but from all dangers always deliver us, O virgin glorious and blessed!"

No. CLXII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 18TH, 1821.

IF I were to insert all that has been written upon the privileges of the Virgin Mary, enumerated in my last, it would occupy a large portion of this volume, though I were not to mention the remaining hundred and eight. The reader will find the substance of these legends in the Discourse of Bishop Patrick, in the Preservative, &c. Vol. III. Tit. xii. As a specimen, I shall here give an account of the Virgin's death and funeral. It is taken by the Bishop from Pelbart, who was alive in 1471, and who dedicated his book to Pope Sixtus IV.

"The Blessed Virgin lived upon the earth after her son till she was fifty-eight years old, as some say; sixty-three as others; and others, more by a great deal. At last she prayed very earnestly to her son, that she might depart from this place of pilgrimage on earth, and be gathered unto him; who thereupon sent an angel to her, promising that within three days

he would take her to himself. Together with this news, the angel delivered her a branch of palm which he had brought from paradise, and told her that she must have it carried before her bier to her interment; he gave her also a suit of mourning which her son had sent her. Of this angel she demanded two things; first, that she might be buried by all the apostles; secondly, that when her soul departed from her body, it might meet with none of the devils or malign spirits. Upon which last demand, the angel said unto her, *Madam*, why are you afraid to meet the devil, whose head it is that you have bruised? However, what you ask, you shall have. You shall meet with no devils, and the noble apostles shall inter you.

"The Virgin, full of joy at this good news, assembled all the virgins and saints together, and gave them to understand her death was now at hand, comforting them thereupon. At the same time was St John the apostle preaching at Ephesus, and in the middle of his sermon, came a clap of thunder, and a white cloud, that whisked him through the air, and set him down at the door of the Virgin Mary's house; where, being entered, he and the Virgin embraced each other with abundance of tears, and Mary recommended to his care her burial. At which words the good apostle threw himself down upon the earth, and with a great deal of passion, cried out and said, Alas! my God, my God! why dost thou lay this sore affliction upon us, to take away this holy mistress of our religion, the mirror of sanctity, and our only consolation? As he was thus lamenting, the blessed Virgin showed him the shining palm and mourning suit her son had sent her, and ordered him to take great care this branch were carried before her bier. St John desired, with all his heart, that all the apostles might accompany him at this solemn action; and immediately the apostles that were scattered in all the corners of the earth, were carried through the air on white clouds, and set down before the house, where, entering in, and meeting with St John, they were marvellously astonished," &c. &c. And well they might be astonished; but as I am tired with copying such diffuse nonsense, I shall give the sequel in my own way, which may be in the proportion of a word for a line. The apostles said their Ave Maria, and became composed. They did homage, and paid their adorations to the Virgin. Christ himself arrived with the nine orders of angels, &c. &c., and after they had sung admirable hymns, the Virgin rendered up her soul, with these words of the fortieth Psalm, "Lo, I come, in the volume of thy book," &c. Her funeral was conducted by the apostles; John going before, carrying the palm. The Jews thought this a good time to rid themselves of all the apostles at once; and, accordingly, with the high priest at their head, they made an attack on the funeral procession; but the high priest, on putting forth his hands to lay hold on the bier, found both his arms fall off by the elbows, on which he made a lamentable howling; and Peter told him honestly, that there was no way to save himself but by kissing the bier, and professing the Christian faith, which he accordingly did, and his arms were immediately fastened on again. The body was consigned to the tomb, but after three days, angels came and took it up to heaven; and the Church of Rome, solemnly believing all this, or professing to believe it, annually celebrates her assumption by a great festival. The above particulars are related by Pelbart with such an air of gravity, that no doubt he believed them all; and he was an author of such note in his day, that he is often cited by Father Crasset, a Jesuit, in his book of true devotion to the Virgin, printed as lately as 1679.

The story of the assumption of the blessed Virgin is related in different ways by different authors, and these are not very consistent with one another, which is of no great importance, seeing the thing is a fable throughout; and it could never have gained credit in the world but by means of forgery and imposition. Eusebius, and Austin, and Jerome have all been pressed into the service of the Church, or rather into the cause of the Virgin; but men of understanding, even in the Church of Rome, now admit that the passages ascribed to these writers, which favour the idea of the assumption, are false and spurious. During the dark ages, however, they served the purpose of promoting the adoration of the great idol which the Church of Rome was pleased to set up. This idol is reported to have done more miracles since her death than Christ and his apostles ever did. Many great volumes are filled with accounts of them; and the tendency of all is to excite men, women, and children to worship her.

There always has been, and ever will be, a correspondence between the character of men and that of the object of their worship. Those who worship God in spirit and in truth are reconciled to him, and made in some measure like him. But when persons not reconciled to God, and not conformed to his image, attempt any thing of the nature of religious worship, it will always be found to be directed to a being of a character like their own. The divine Being may be professedly the object; but if the nature of the worship of such persons be analyzed, it will be found that it is not addressed to God, in those characters of holiness and righteousness in which he makes himself known in the bible; but to him under certain characters which have a counterpart or resemblance in the vain imagination and corrupt affection of the worshipper. Thus there is much idolatry practised under the pretext of worshipping the true God; and under a mis-

taken idea that he is the object of devotion, when the mind of the worshipper rises no higher than to a creature of his own fancy.

This is the idolatry of carnal men in an enlightened state of society—enlightened, I mean, with regard to the things of this life, for here there is light enough to convince men of the folly of worshipping creatures like themselves: but in a state of gross darkness, like that which prevailed in Europe from the fourth to the fifteenth century, it was found convenient to have objects of worship more carnal; that is, more like depraved human nature, than it was possible to conceive the Deity to be. Men given up to vile affections, as all are who resist the truth, must have objects of worship corresponding with the state of their minds. Thus the gods of the heathen were monsters of impurity; and their worship consisted in unbounded licentiousness. Popery has improved on this in appearance, but not in reality. The Church of Rome holds up her great idol, the Virgin Mary, as a pattern of purity; and, therefore, she claims not to be compared with the votaries of impure deities; but she does not deny that the Virgin is a person still possessed of, and still under the influence of human passions. She possesses an extraordinary degree of ambition and self-love; for almost all her miracles are wrought for the purpose of advancing her own glory, and engaging men to admire and worship her. Every man possesses less or more of the same self-love and ambition, and if he could work miracles it would be to advance his own glory. While he continues under the influence of this carnal mind, and while he can persuade himself that the Virgin Mary possesses the power which Papists ascribe to her, she is just such a goddess as he wishes to have. He will flatter her, and offer her abundance of incense, in the hope that she will favour and advance him. Thus the Popish idol is used for the purpose of cherishing one of the vilest affections.

All modern Papists will disavow, on behalf of the Virgin, the grosser impurity of the heathen idols to which I have alluded; but some of their writers five hundred years ago, were not so scrupulous on this point. If I were to publish the familiarities which are said to have been practised between her and St Dominick, and other great saints, I should not be able to show my face in the company of virtuous persons. I shall not even refer to any English book in which these things are recorded, lest the world should be set on inquiring after it, and lest some profligate bookseller should republish it; but the learned will bear me witness that I am not writing without book, or bringing a false accusation against the Church of Rome, when I refer them to Alanus Redivivus, p. 2. c. 3, and 4. Hautin Angelus Custos, c. 4. No. 3, and Cæsarius, 1. 7. c. 13, &c. The state of morals among Papists must have been depraved beyond all expression, when such stories were currently reported and believed of the principal object of their worship, and her most favourite worshippers; and in point of fact, it appears from unquestionable authority, that the devout worshippers of the Virgin looked upon her as too tender and kind a mother, to be offended with them on account of any vice in which they might choose to indulge themselves, provided they were punctual in saying their Aves and counting their beads.

I shall here indulge the reader with one of the least offensive of the stories which are recorded of the Virgin Mary, in order to impress the people with an idea of the miraculous power which she possessed, and to encourage all to put their trust in her. The famous convent of Montserrat owes its origin to the following miraculous incident:—the first Count of Barcelona had an exceedingly handsome daughter, but she had the misfortune to be possessed with a devil. The Count one day carried her to a holy man in the neighbourhood, called Friar John Guerin, who was understood to have the power of casting out devils, in order that he might cast this one out of his daughter. The holy man soon did the job; but for fear the devil should return, he advised the Count to leave his daughter for some time in his keeping, which, like a fool as he was, he agreed to. Friar John, thus left alone with the young lady, fell in love with her, seduced her, and afterwards murdered her, at the instigation, as was said, of a devil disguised like a hermit. Having been guilty of these horrible crimes, the *holy man* went right to Rome, and confessed himself to the Pope, who, instead of sending him to the gallows, as he deserved, merely ordered him for penance, to return to Montserrat upon all four, like a beast as he was, and not to speak a word, and not to offer to get upon his legs, till a child about three months old should bid him rise, and tell him God had pardoned his offence. Seven years after this the Count of Barcelona was a hunting, when some of his men found out this Friar in a den, all over hairy like a bear, whom they took and chained, and brought away with them to the castle of Barcelona, where he was tied up in the stable like a monster. The Count soon after made a great feast, and to divert his company, ordered the monster to be brought forth; whom as soon as the earl's child saw, that was there in its nurse's arms, it said distinctly these words:—"Rise upon thy feet, Friar John Guerin, for God hath pardoned thy offence." And immediately the friar came to himself, began to speak, and tell the whole story. Upon which the Count told him, that since God had pardoned him, he could do no less; but he desired to know where he had buried his daughter, that he might take up her bones, and bury them in his father's sepulchre. The *good* Friar conducted the Count's servants to the place where

he had interred the lady, and opening the ground, they found her alive and well, as fresh and as handsome as ever, excepting a little kind of streak like a scarlet thread about her neck, where the mortal wound had been inflicted. The maid spoke, and told them she owed her life to the blessed Virgin, to whom she had been consecrated, and who had miraculously preserved her. There they built a convent, of which this young lady was the Abbess, and Friar John Guerin the Confessor. Near this place, in a certain grotto, was found an image of the blessed Virgin, exceeding bright and luminous, and perfumed with excellent sweets, which was discovered by angels' melody, that were worshipping it in a cave; this image, they that found it were for carrying away; but when they came as far as the place where the lady had been buried, it grew so heavy on their hands, that they were glad to leave it there with all their hearts. There they built a chapel over it, though it was a very desert place, and mighty inconvenient for the pilgrims resorting thither: and this is the rise of that famous chapel, where so many miracles and famous things have been done.—See an *Account of the Life and Death of the blessed Virgin, by Bishop Fleetwood, in the Preservative, &c.* Tit. xii. p. 18, 19.

After giving the names of a host of authors who have defended the practice of invoking the Virgin and other saints, the Vindicator proceeds:—"I shall add one witness more in favour of praying to the saints and angels, and this is the Protestant Church of England. In her book of common prayer is the following collect for the feast of St Michael and all angels, Sept. 29:—'O everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of *angels* and *men*, in a wonderful order, that as thy holy angels always do thee service in heaven, so by thy appointment, THEY MAY SUCCOUR AND DEFEND US ON EARTH,' &c." Col. 430. Much as Popish writers affect to despise and contemn Protestant churches, they are always happy to avail themselves of their authority, when they think it is in their favour; and if I found the Church of England teaching the worship of saints and angels, I would leave her to defend herself, as I have not undertaken to defend her any more than our own establishment; but, in point of fact, she does no such thing; and the words of the prayer which the Vindicator quotes in proof of his assertion, bear on the very front of them that they are an address to the "everlasting God," and to none else. Here, as in many other passages, Mr Andrews seems to write on the presumption that his readers will believe his word contrary to the evidence of their own eyes and ears. He gives a passage to prove that the Church of England prays to saints and angels; and there is not a syllable in the passage itself that can possibly be construed to imply such a thing. This is a fine specimen of Popish impudence; and it deserves to stand in the same sheet in which it is asserted that the apostles practised and taught the worship of the Virgin Mary; for the reader will find this in their writings, as soon as he will find the worship of angels and saints in the collect of the Church of England, which is cited to prove this church to agree with Rome on that point.

Christians know that angels are employed in the service of the church; that they are ministering spirits sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation; and when a man prays to God that he may enjoy the benefit of this ministry, it is no more a prayer to angels, than a petition that our daily bread may nourish and support our bodies, is a prayer to that which we eat and drink. At the same time, I think it is enough that we commit ourselves to God, and pray that he may succour and defend us, whether by the ministry of angels, or any other ministry which in his infinite wisdom and goodness he may be pleased to employ.

In former numbers, I gave copious extracts from the Garden of the Soul, and other books of Popish devotion, which clearly prove the Church of Rome idolatrous, inasmuch as she addresses the Virgin and other saints, in such language as is proper only in addressing the divine Being. On this The Vindicator remarks:—"I have no dislike whatever that the subject under discussion should be decided by the language of our authorized books of devotion, provided we are allowed to give the sense of that language in our own meaning, and not in the perverted construction which our adversary puts upon it. He has given, he says, copious extracts from our devotional books, and he challenges any man to 'say if it be possible to use any language of more *direct* address, in the form of prayer, to the divine Being himself, than is addressed to the Virgin Mary.' What he means by '*direct* address,' I am at a loss to understand. If he means, that when we pray to the Mother of God we *direct* our addresses to her, he is right; but if he means, that we invoke the holy Mother in the *same direct* language as we address her Son, he is under a most egregious error, and his assertion is totally false." Col. 435. The Vindicator then proceeds to give explanations, and make distinctions which I am sure he does not comprehend. It is enough for my purpose to have it acknowledged, that he and all the Papists in the world address their prayers *directly* to a creature like themselves. This creature they must invest with the perfections of deity, else she cannot hear the prayers which are addressed to her every hour, from all quarters of the earth. To pray to such a creature is downright idolatry, else there never was idolatry in the world. I use the word in its plain grammatical meaning; and I am not willing to allow Mr Andrews the privilege of

putting "his own meaning" upon the words of his devotional books. I take the words as I find them; I allow them to have the same power that I would allow them in any other book; and I appeal to every unprejudiced person, who understands the meaning of the words, whether they do not make out the charge of idolatry against the Church of Rome as completely as ever it was made out against Pagan Rome, or Greece, or Babylon itself.

The principal distinction which the Vindicator makes between Mary and Christ, as objects of prayer, is, that the former is a mediator of intercession, while the latter is the mediator of salvation; but, as I showed in a late Number, this distinction is a mere invention of Popery; for the bible speaks of only one intercessor in heaven, as of one mediator. The work of making atonement, and the work of interceding for us, are invested in the same divine person, Jesus Christ, our only Saviour; and the Church of Rome would not show greater impiety were she to take the work of atoning also out of the hands of Christ, and ascribe it to her idol. The Vindicator adverts to Paul's request to the Christians at Rome to pray for him, and to the command of God to Job to pray for his three friends, as bearing him out in his statement about mediators of intercession; but if this proves any thing at all, it proves that every Christian in the world is a mediator for every other Christian, for they all pray for one another, which certainly cannot make out the specialty which he means to establish with regard to the mediatorship of the Virgin Mary.

The Vindicator does not know, with all his powers of quibbling, how to explain away certain words which I quoted from great Popish divines, in which the Virgin Mary is exalted above the heavens, and in fact, represented as greater than the Saviour himself. He, therefore, disposes of them in the following summary manner: "In looking over the extracts to which he refers, I find he has quoted the writings of St Germain, St Bonaventure, St Bernardine, &c. but as they are professed to be taken from the works of Archbishop Usher, and one M'Culloch, both of whom were as staunch Anti-papists as the Protestant himself, he will allow me to suspect the correctness of his authority, as I have not the least doubt upon my mind, that they were as capable of garbling and misrepresenting the words and sentiments of the authors cited, as I have *proved* our adversary to be with regard to mine." Col. 436, 437. Quite as capable, and, I believe, not more so; and as the Vindicator has *not proved* any thing of the kind on my part, it is fair to conclude that nothing of the kind was practised by Usher or M'Culloch, the latter of whom is alive, and abundantly able to answer for himself. That he has *proved* me guilty of garbling and misrepresenting his words and sentiments, is another assertion of The Vindicator's, without any more foundation, than that the apostles, and the Church of England teach and practise the worship of saints and angels. I defy him and his Glasgow constituents, with Mr Scott at their head, to point out a single instance in which I have garbled and misrepresented either his words or his meaning; and I believe Usher and M'Culloch are equally innocent with regard to the authors whom they quoted. But why did he not go to these authors themselves, and see whether their words were correctly given? If he cannot read Latin, he knows that his friend and patron, Bishop Milner, can. Why not then have recourse to him? and why not overwhelm me with the exposure of mis-quotation, had any imposition of the kind been practised? There can be no doubt, the bishop knows the works referred to better than I do; and Mr Andrews knows what share he had in the Vindicator better than I do; or whether he had any share in it at all, which I cannot aver from my own knowledge, as he can do. I have my suspicions on the subject; and I have what may be considered a moral certainty, that if I had garbled and misrepresented the above-named saints, or copied garbled extracts from their works, some learned Jesuit would long ago have exposed the imposition: and as Archbishop Usher published his work when the order of Jesuits was in its glory, he would soon have been detected had he misquoted or misrepresented a single sentence.

No. CLXIII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 25TH, 1821.

THE Catholic Vindicator seems to be satisfied with his devotion to the Virgin Mary. He makes very little account of other saints, or even of their relics. He disposes of both in a very summary way. "I wish," says he, "the reader particularly to remark it: the Church of Rome *approves* and *recommends* the veneration of the saints and the honouring of their relics; but mark! she does not make it a law, nor does she consider it an essential part of Christianity. Neither does she encourage the superstitions and impositions which our adversary says she does. On the contrary, the guardians of her faith and doctrine are bound, upon the hazard of their eternal salvation, to exert themselves to destroy the abuses of superstition, and that cupidity which makes a shameful traffic of images and relics." Col. 565, 566. This is an admission, that in the holy and infallible Church of Rome, there have been abuses of superstition, and a shameful traffic in images and relics; and it is a very poor defence to say she does not make it a law,—she only *approves* and *recommends* the veneration of the saints, and the honouring of their relics, that is, the worshipping of both, for this is the practical

inference which every true Papist will draw from the words; and I apprehend that approving and recommending creature worship is enough to convict a church of idolatry, whether such worship be established by law or not.

I have already shown that if creature worship be at all admitted, it matters not what be the rank of the creature. It may be the Virgin Mary, or it may be a fragment of her handkerchief; the worship of the one is as really idolatry as the worship of the other; and seeing the Vindicator declares that he does regard the Virgin as an object of devotion *in a religious sense;* (col. 443.) and seeing he admits that Papists address their prayers *directly* to her, (col. 435.) it is needless for me to spend more time in proving Papists to be idolaters. Our Glasgow ones, at least, are convicted by the pen of their own advocate, whose book cost them so much money, and which even the recommendation of Mr Scott could not enable them to sell.

This subject being set at rest, before proceeding to another, I shall notice a little more of the Vindicator's trifling. I had said, in one of my Numbers, that "the sinner who believed in Christ yesterday for the first time, is as *really* a saint as Paul, or Peter, or even the Virgin Mary." The Vindicator affects to understand me as saying, as *great* a saint, instead of as *really* one; and to his own perversion of my words he replies at length, quoting scripture against me, about one star differing from another star in glory, which is usually understood to prove that there are degrees of glory among the saints in heaven, which, whether it be so or not, is a thing that I never disputed. If I were to say that Mr Andrews is as *really* a sinner as Judas Iscariot, I suppose, he would not deny the charge; but I question if he would admit that he is as *great* a one, which I do not by any means assert; but I might do so with the utmost propriety, if I were to reason as he does.

By a sinner believing in Christ, I mean one who has forsaken his sins, and who has begun to live a holy life. This person is a saint in the bible sense of the word; he may, indeed, be one of the very lowest rank of those who are called babes in Christ; but as an infant of a day old is as really a human person as the man of a hundred years, so he who began yesterday to live a holy life is as really a saint as any of the apostles were. He shall receive the reward of a saint if he persevere in holiness to the end; but the greatness of the reward, or degree of glory that shall be conferred, is quite another matter, and a matter with which we have nothing to do. I admit that the word of God seems to countenance the idea, that there shall be a distinction among the saints in heaven; for there are special promises to apostles and others who have been honoured to turn many to righteousness; but as their reward, first and last, is all of grace, it must not be calculated according to human reckoning, or according to merit in one more than in another. For any thing we know, the thief who confessed Christ on the cross has a higher place in heaven than the Virgin Mary. I do not say it is so, or that I believe it to be so; but I do say, that we know nothing of the matter: and, therefore, supposing it were proved that saints in heaven were proper objects of worship, no one could tell whether the thief or the Virgin had the highest claim to our devotion. Perhaps there are delicate minds that will feel hurt by placing these two individuals in such close contact; but the fact, that both were sinners saved by grace, ought to do away all such squeamishness. Nay, we have greater certainty of the thief's being in heaven than of the Virgin's being there. By inference from certain premises, we come to a charitable conclusion with regard to the latter, though we have no evidence of her persevering to the end in faith and holiness; but for the former we have the express words of our Saviour, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."

Speaking of the impossibility of the saints hearing and attending to all the prayers of their devout worshippers, I used a word or two, of which, perhaps, the Vindicator has cause to complain. My words were, "I suppose he very piously makes use of the prayers which he has composed for the worshippers of his favourite idol, St Wenefride; and he must know that a number of pilgrims are every day paying their devotions at her holy well; now, I ask him seriously, how she can attend to the prayers of all these pilgrims in Wales, and at the same time hear his prayers in Drake street, Red Lion Square, London? Or, supposing her to be in heaven, how she can attend to either the one or the other? If Mr Andrews shall make this intelligible and credible, he will show himself to be as great a man as the unanswerable Dr Milner himself." To this the Vindicator replies, apparently in great wrath, as follows:—"Such is the disgusting and contemptible stuff which my opponent compiles for the amusement of his readers; such his petty frivolous mode of conducting this important controversy. Would it not be more to his credit were he to employ himself in refuting my arguments, by cool reasoning, or justifying his own assertions by convincing truths, than in calling upon me to explain the *mysteries* of God?" col. 445. They happen, however, to be only the *mysteries* of Popery, for God has never told us that the saints in heaven do hear our prayers. If he had, we should have been bound to believe it, though he had not told us *how*. But a thing of human invention ought to be capable of human explanation; and seeing the adoration of St Wenefride is of no higher than human origin, the inventor, or the reommender of the invention, as Mr Andrews is, ought to be able

to tell us all about it. "As well," says he, "might I call upon him to explain the mysteries of the Trinity, or the incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity, as he, to inform him how the Almighty communicates his gifts to the blessed in heaven." Col. 445. But the question was not, how does the Almighty communicate his gifts to the saints? but, how does Mr Andrews communicate his prayers to them? This he ought to understand, and be able to explain, else the nature of his worship is unintelligible to himself, and must be unprofitable.

The following is the article in which he considers himself chiefly aggrieved:—"And here," says he, "I cannot help noticing the unfair and dishonest dealings of this scribbler towards me. In the passage I have last quoted from his work, he has attributed the composition of the prayer to St Wenefride to me, and he calls this saint my favourite idol. Now, I ask him in return, how he knows that St Wenefride is my favourite idol, or that she is an idol at all in my eyes? Can he tell what passes in my heart? Can he say that St Wenefride is a favourite of mine; or that I *adore* her and worship her as an idol, which, Johnson says, is an image worshipped as God; and which our accuser frontlessly charges Catholics with doing. But mark, reader, the blind ignorance or the wilful falsity of this abandoned writer. He accuses me of composing the prayers to St Wenefride which appear in her life, and yet the very first sentence in the book shows my edition is only a reprint from one which was published in the year 1712, and consequently I could not be the author. This being the plain fact, what reliance, I ask the reader, can be placed on the man who can thus sport with the sacredness of truth, in the hope of fixing a supposed odium on the shoulders of his antagonist? Oh! shame, where is thy blush!" Col. 446.

Many bad things the Vindicator lays to my charge; but this is the only one for which there is even an apparent foundation. I wrote as if the prayers which he gave in his edition of St Wenefride's life were composed by him, though it seems they were not. I knew perfectly well that it was a reprint of an old book; but it appeared to me to contain a good deal of new matter, composed by him, or some other modern author; particularly, a narrative of a miraculous cure, certified by his friend Dr Milner, to have been lately performed by the saint at her holy well. I naturally concluded that the prayers which followed, at least the one which contains the words, "Holy St Wenefride, even in this unbelieving generation, *still* miraculous, pray for us," was also his composition. This was a mistake, if he tells the truth; and it was nothing but a mistake. I defy the world to make more of it; and it was a mistake that could do him no harm, seeing it merely represented him as the author of what he approved, published, and recommended. He must have been much at a loss for matter of accusation against me, when he holds this forth as "blind ignorance," "wilful falsity," and "sporting with the sacredness of truth." My insinuation that Wenefride was his favourite idol, puts him into such a passion, that I suspect he was afraid of the jealousy of his other idol, the Virgin Mary, suspecting that she would be told by some of her Glasgow worshippers, what The Protestant had been saying about him and her Welsh rival. But he ought to pardon my mistake, seeing that when I wrote the offensive passage, he had not publicly declared his own devotion and attachment to the Virgin; for in his school book he only recommends her to others; and from the high encomiums which he had bestowed upon St Wenefride, it was impossible not to consider her as a very great favourite of his.

It is perhaps necessary to remind the reader once more, that nothing which I have here advanced is meant to derogate from the respect that is really due to the memory of Mary the Mother of Jesus. My remarks refer only to the idol to whom Papists have impiously given her name; though the Vindicator represents them as applicable to the Virgin herself. "It is impossible," says he, "not to be struck with horror and disgust at the irreligious and obscene manner in which The Protestant speaks of the holy Mother of God, of that admirable pattern of innocence and holiness, who was saluted by an angel of God as 'full of grace.' Were he to advance but a tithe of his filthy abuse against the memory of the mother of the regent, who, from her high station as queen of England, was an object of respect and reverence, he would soon feel the weight of the laws upon his guilty head; but, because the Catholic Church venerates with pious devotion the virtues and graces of the queen of heaven, the Mother of that God who came down from heaven, and died to redeem him, this impious scribbler indulges in a strain of invective and sarcasm against the character of the blessed Virgin, in the most base and contemptible language that can be used." Col. 517, 518. This is all downright falsehood and misrepresentation of my words. I never wrote a syllable disrespectful of the Virgin Mary. My invectives and sarcasms, as he calls them, were not against her, but against the absurd, impious, and idolatrous representations which Papists have made of her. When the idolatrous Israelites worshipped the sun under the image of Baal, the prophet Elijah spared neither invective nor sarcasm against both the idol and his worshippers; though there can be no doubt he admired the sun, and loved his light as much as any of them. No creature, animate or inanimate, is honoured by being put out of its proper place. It would be an insult to the greatest lady in the kingdom to be called queen of England, when England has no queen. Now, as there is no

queen of heaven, so far as we know, it is a gross insult to the Virgin Mary to give her that title: and supposing her to be a glorified saint in heaven, which I am willing to take for granted, though it cannot be proved, there can be nothing more insulting to her than to give her those honours which do not belong to her, but which are due only to Him who redeemed her and other sinners by his own blood. Every glorified saint in heaven, as well as every saved sinner on earth, is willing to be nothing, that Christ may be all and in all; and to suppose that the Virgin Mary is an exception to this rule, is to do her the greatest dishonour, and to suppose that she does not reverence the Saviour so much as others do. The devotion of Papists to her proceeds upon the supposition that she had no inconsiderable hand in the work of our redemption, which must be to her unspeakably insulting, seeing she herself needed redemption as much as any other daughter of Adam; and, supposing she is one of the redeemed, she must desire, like all the rest of the blessed company, that the glory of her salvation, and of that of all who are saved, should be ascribed to the Saviour, and to Him alone.

Besides, I am not the inventor of the stories concerning her which I have related, or to which I have alluded. These stories are related by grave doctors of the Romish Church; and I have referred to them, not for the purpose of abusing her memory, but for vindicating it, and condemning those who have so prostituted her name for the vilest purposes of avarice and lust. I did not say that she was "a pander of lewdness," as the Vindicator falsely insinuates; (col. 519.) but that great authors of his own communion represented her as such, when she accepted, and was gratified by the devotions of lewd persons, and promised them favour and protection so long as they paid their due respects to her. I have referred to the works in which such things are recorded; and it is no apology for him to say that I have cited books which *even he* has not seen, though he be a bookseller; for there can be no doubt the learned Bishop Milner, under whose patronage he wrote, and whose learning is equal to that of any Jesuit of the age, must be perfectly familiar with the books to which I have referred, in this and every other part of the controversy. Mr Andrews ought therefore to have been ashamed of his own ignorance, and to have taken advantage of the learning which must have been at his service in so good a cause.

The Vindicator seems almost willing to abandon the defence of Popish morals, so far as relates to the worship of the Virgin and its consequences, as related by ancient authors, and to bring the question to the test of my own experience; and here certainly, I can have no objection to meet him. "Where is the man," says he, "who does not know that the rigid adherent to the system of the Church of Rome is the very opposite character to that which has been given of him by our calumniator? Does he not know the falsehood of these charges? Has he not ocular demonstration of the truth of my assertion in his own city? Let him look around him, and he will see that those of his neighbours in Glasgow, who are the most devoted to the Virgin Mary, are also the most faithful in keeping the commandments of God." Col. 520.

Without stopping to admire the consummate impudence of this assertion, I proceed to remark, that as the Virgin has not yet got images of her set up in our streets, it is not possible to ascertain who are her most devout worshippers. But I suppose the Vindicator wishes me to consider all our Glasgow Papists as such; and he wishes their moral character to be contrasted with that of our Protestant population. This is very fair, and I am willing to put the question to this issue as upon a matter of fact. I declare then from my own knowledge, and for the truth of it I appeal to every man whose official duties have led him to investigate the state and character of the inhabitants of Glasgow and its vicinity, that the moral character of the Papists in general is unspeakably below that of our Protestant population. I admit that there are a few individuals of the Romish communion in Glasgow, who maintain a fair character in the world, and I wish there were a hundred to one of them of this description; but suppose the immense majority of those called Protestant removed, and the parties reduced to equality in point of number, I do not hesitate to affirm that the morally decent, not to say truly religious, among the worshippers of the Virgin, would be few indeed, in comparison with the number of persons of this description; that is, morally decent, called Protestant. According to Mr Cleland's report of the population of the city and suburbs, in 1819, of 150,000 inhabitants, there were little more than 8200 Papists, which is nearly in the proportion of one Papist to seventeen Protestants and a half. Supposing, therefore, the moral character of the parties to be equal, our criminal calendar would afford a list of at least seventeen Protestants for one Papist. But every one knows that this is far from being the case. I am not prepared to say what is the exact proportion, because a particular record is not kept of the religious denomination of criminals. Most of them profess no religion at all; and it is not usually ascertained which of them are Papists till they are about to be hanged. Then, to be sure, the pastor claims his wandering sheep; or they, trusting in his pretended power over the world to come, send for him, and submit to his discipline. He gives them a Douay catechism, by which every one of them is taught to say, in answer to the first question,—"By the grace of God I am a Christian." Then he proceeds

to treat them as Christians, to administer to them what he calls the Christian sacraments, and he tells them that he will not be answerable for their salvation, if they believe a single word of what any Protestant may say to them about the way of salvation. It is not many months since it was my lot to witness the leading out of four young men for execution, three of whom were Papists, who spent their last hour privately with Mr Scott, and were not suffered to join in public exercise with the other. I do not say that the proportion of Popish criminals is generally three to one; but all who take any charge of our jail know that it is sufficiently great to overwhelm with shame, if that were possible, the man who asserts that those who are "most devoted to the Virgin Mary, are also the most faithful in keeping the commandments of God."

The Vindicator will reply, perhaps, that these criminals were not piously devoted to the Virgin, and that it was from the neglect of her worship that they came to a miserable end. But for this he must give us more than his bare word. As I have already said, from the want of images, we have no criterion by which we can ascertain who are her most devoted worshippers. We can therefore take only those for her worshippers who are taught to be such; whose church approves and recommends the worship of mere creatures, and of this creature in particular. This is the Church of Rome; and I am willing the morals of her members be compared with those of Protestants all the world over; nay, I challenge the comparison; and I am sure the advantage will be found on the side of those who renounce all creature worship,—who acknowledge only one God and only one Mediator between God and man. This is so manifest all over Europe, that travellers are able to tell when they have passed out of a Popish province into a Protestant one, from the superior state of morals and comfort which they observe in the latter. As for Ireland, every person who has travelled the country knows, that all the decencies of life are to be found among the Protestant population in a tenfold degree more than among the Papists. I had lately an opportunity of hearing this proved in a rather extraordinary manner:—At a missionary meeting in the Bull Inn, a clergyman, a native of Ireland, drew a frightful picture of the state of religion and morals in that country, from which he had just come, having been there on a visit. When he had finished, another gentleman rose, and begged leave to address the meeting. He said he was an Irishman, and that he rose for the purpose of vindicating his country from what he considered an unjust representation of her character; for that he could declare, from his own observation, that the Irish were as religious and moral and loyal a people as any on the face of the earth. At first there seemed an unpleasant feeling in the meeting, from two gentlemen so flatly contradicting one another; but a moment's explanation set all right. It turned out that the first speaker referred to the south and west of Ireland, that is, the Popish part of it, where he had recently been; the second spoke of the north, or Protestant part, to which he belonged; and the witness of these two, who were unknown to each other, confirmed the fact of the vastly superior state of morals among the Protestants.

No. CLXIV.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 1st, 1821.

I HAVE done now with the Virgin Mary and her worship, as advocated by the CATHOLIC VINDICATOR, and I leave it to the reader to say, whether I have not shown that the Church of Rome is idolatrous, even according to the admissions of her own hired defender. The discussion of this subject brings me down to the Vindicator's twenty-ninth Number, in which he enters upon his favourite topic, that of the man in the Wynd, which had been his rallying point almost from the commencement of his work. At this stage, he enters upon it more systematically; and he keeps by it to the very conclusion, admitting little else in the way of reply to THE PROTESTANT, except a very feeble attempt to defend the doctrine of transubstantiation, which the reader may find in his forty-fifth Number, continued in a desultory manner to his fiftieth, to which I shall pay attention in due time.

For a full account of the man in the Wynd story, I refer to my fiftieth Number, and to my letter to Mr M'Hardy, published two years ago. The Vindicator labours through many a long page to make this story appear a forgery of mine. All his ingenuity, with that of his committee, here seems to have been directed to that single point. He and they have started difficulties about it, and invented inconsistencies, and put questions, and formed answers, which raise such a dust about it, that few persons will have patience to take a deliberate view of the subject. The fact is true notwithstanding, as any person may satisfy himself, by inquiring of the surviving party, who is sufficiently designated in the publications referred to; and the scurrilous abuse which Mr Andrews heaped upon this person, in almost every page of his work, indicated a conviction in his own mind, that I did not invent the story; for if he had really thought so, his invective would have been applied to me alone; and he has never so much as insinuated that the widow of his deceased brother invented it; for that would suppose her possessed of more intellect and literature than he will allow her.

There is not a fact recorded in history;—nay, there is not a fact which a hundred men

shall swear that they witnessed with their own eyes, which could not be rendered doubtful, or which might not be made out to be a forgery, by such quibbling and casuistry as the Vindidator has applied to this plain and simple story. A work was published about two years ago, entitled, Historical Doubts relative to the Existence of Napoleon Bonaparte, in which the author labours with great ingenuity, though ironically, to prove that there never was such a man in the world; at least, that there is not such evidence of his existence as to command the belief of an impartial and philosophical inquirer after truth.

"Let it be allowed us," says the writer, "as is surely reasonable, just to inquire, with respect to the extraordinary story I have been speaking of, on what evidence we believe it. We shall be told that it is *notorious; i. e.* in plain English, it is very *much talked about:* but as the generality of those who talk about Bonaparte do not even pretend to speak from *their own authority*, bnt merely to speak what they have casually heard, we cannot reckon them as in any degree witnesses."—"What then are we to believe? if we are disposed to credit all that is told us, we must believe in the existence not only of one, but of two or three Bonapartes; if we admit of nothing but what is well authenticated, we shall be compelled to doubt of the existence of any. It appears then, that those on whose testimony the existence and actions of Bonaparte are generally believed, fail in all the most essential points on which the credibility of witnesses depends: first, we have no assurance that they have access to correct information; secondly, they have an apparent interest in propagating falsehood; and, thirdly, they palpably contradict each other in the most important points."

But what shall we say to the testimony of those many respectable persons who went to Plymouth on purpose, and saw Bonaparte with their own eyes? must they not trust their senses? "I would not disparage either the eyesight or the veracity of these gentlemen. I am ready to allow that they went to Plymouth for the purpose of seeing Bonaparte; nay more, that they actually rowed out into the harbour in a boat, and came alongside of a man of war, on whose deck they saw a man in a cocked hat, who, they were told, was Bonaparte; this is the utmost point to which their testimony goes; how they ascertained that this man in the cocked hat had gone through all the marvellous and romantic adventures with which we have so long been amused, we are not told: did they perceive in his physiognomy his true name and authentic history? Truly this evidence is such as country people give one for a story of apparitions; if you show any signs of incredulity, they triumphantly show the very house where the ghost haunted, the identical dark corner where it used to vanish, and perhaps even the tomb-stone of the person whose death it foretold."

"Bonaparte prevailed over all the hostile states in turn, *except England;* in the zenith of his power, his fleets were swept from the sea *by England;* his troops always defeated an equal, and frequently even a superior number of any other nation, *except the English;* and with them it is just the reverse; twice, and twice only, he is personally engaged against an *English commander*, and both times he is totally defeated, at Acre, and at Waterloo; and, to crown all, *England* finally crushes this tremendous power, which has so long kept the Continent in subjection or in alarm, and to the English he surrenders himself prisoner! Thoroughly national to be sure. It *may* be all very true, but I would only ask, *if* a story *had* been fabricated for the express purpose of amusing the English nation, could it have been contrived more ingeniously?"—*See Eclectic Review for July*, 1819. Thus the author shows that the glory of England being in a great measure connected with the fable of Bonaparte, we have reason to doubt every Englishman's testimony on the subject; the same thing is equally true of Scotchmen and Irishmen; and twenty arguments equally cogent are adduced to show that we may very reasonably conclude that the whole story is a fabrication, intended to flatter our national vanity, and make us cheerfully pay our taxes.

Now, to compare small things with great, this is precisely the way Mr Andrews endeavours to discredit a story as true as the existence of Bonaparte. The reader will suppose he must be a very ingenious man who can do this; and I cheerfully admit that there is a sort of coarse cleverness in his management of the subject, which is sometimes amusing enough, but more frequently disgusting, from the impudence with which truth is denied, and falsehood asserted. We ought not, however, to give Mr Andrews himself credit for all this; for having the whole college of Jesuits at his back, he would no doubt have all the advantage that was to be derived from their well known craft and cunning.

The manner in which the Vindicator treats this subject, especially his bold attempts to make that appear false which I and fifty others know to be true, reminds me of a passage in a letter of a reverend correspondent in Ireland, to the following effect:—"Under the system that admits the lying casuistry of intention, and the principle that you may do evil that good may come, it is impossible to elicit truth from persons, whose object it is to hide truth, and who are too much every day under the power of their spiritual superiors, to dare to do any thing that might either offend them, or bring them into disrepute. I have seen enough of this. I have witnessed the most decided breach of oaths under this influence. I have had the

most decided *denial of facts of which I was as certain as that the sun shines, and of expressions which I heard with my own ears*, when they referred to any thing connected with priests and the church, or the cause of emancipation, &c. &c. Men unacquainted with those people cannot conceive this. It is long before an honest ingenuous Protestant mind can suppose it is possible; and nothing but the very clearest conviction can persuade some persons that it is so, and that a conviction from their own experience."

This conviction has been deeply impressed upon my mind from my experience of the manner in which The Vindicator and his Glasgow committee have treated this part of the controversy. It is not, however, my intention to resume that subject. It would be a work of supererogatiou to demonstrate again what I have proved in the publications above referred to, especially in my letter to Mr M'Hardy, which remains to this day without a reply, for the few nibbling sentences which occur here and there in the Vindicator, do not deserve that name. If that letter, however, shall receive a respectful answer, I shall be as ready to return to the subject as ever. In the meantime, as some parts of my letter were understood to reflect rather severely on that gentleman, it is but just that I insert his defence, as it appeared in the 34th Number of the Vindicator, professedly written by one who knows him well. And the Vindicator himself expresses thanks to his correspondent for giving him an opportunity of doing justice to a gentleman totally unknown to him, "but who has by his spirited and upright conduct in assisting to detect a foul fabrication, invented to calumniate his Catholic neighbours, raised himself in the esteem of all who admire probity and liberality, whether the possessor be a Protestant or a Catholic." Col. 543. If Mr M'Hardy had Mr Andrews against him instead of for him, it would be rather unfortunate that the certificate of his character is anonymous; for the certifier subscribes himself under the very general designation of "a Highlander and Catholic;" but I am more liberal than the Vindicator would be in similar circumstances. I give as full credit to every part of the testimony as if it had been subscribed by Mr Scott himself; and if I have not such profound admiration of "the high and important office which he now fills in the city of Glasgow," it is perhaps because I do not look up to it from such a "deep profound" as his Popish admirers do. The certificate is as follows:—

"As to the respectability of Mr M'Hardy, who was one of the deputation that waited on Mr M'Gavin, I can, from my own personal knowledge, bear testimony. Born in a remote corner of the Highland as well myself, in the same parish, I have had an opportunity of knowing his merits and demerits for a series of years. And from the high and important office which he now fills in the city of Glasgow with unimpeachable character, his bitterest enemies, not even 'THE PROTESTANT,' if he is one, dare avow that his honour, integrity, and high respectability, derogates in any one iota from that office. It would be much to the honour of 'THE PROTESTANT,' were he such a liberal minded and upright gentleman."—*Cath. Vind.* col. 544. I have no wish to derogate from either the character or the *dignity* of this gentleman; and he should never have been honoured by a stroke of my pen if he had not thrust himself forward in aid of our Glasgow Papists, and as a contributor to the CATHOLIC VINDICATOR; who, to use the language of the Vindicator, "so honourably, and so spiritedly, volunteered his services to detect the gross imposition of our accuser." Col. 487. Here I take leave of him and of the man in the Wynd, unless he or some friend of his shall revive the controversy; and with this short notice, I get over at once a large proportion of my opponent's volume; containing, indeed, a great deal of matter, but quite irrelevant; and, but for the incessant recurrence to the man in the Wynd, could scarcely be known to have any relation to THE PROTESTANT.

Amidst the mighty mass of irrevelant matter above referred to, we have one passage that merits a little notice in passing. In my fifty-first Number, I laid down what I believe to be the bible doctrine in relation to the method of salvation;—that it is through Christ alone, without any merit of ours. On this the Vindicator remarks as follows:—"Such are the principles laid down by 'THE PROTESTANT' in his controversy with the Papists, and principles of a more diabolical and impious nature it is impossible to invent or propagate. If a man is taught not to expect that he can contribute in the slightest degree towards his salvation, by obeying the commandments, what motive or what interest can he have in keeping them? If his own merits are not to avail him in the least, in obtaining the rewards of eternal life, what inducement can he have to pursue a life of virtue here on earth, to reap a life of glory hereafter? If the attempt to seek a justification by the performance of good works is to renounce the Son of God as a Saviour, will any man endeavour to quell the irregular motions of his nature? On the contrary, will he not rather give way to the evil inclinations of the flesh, relying on the atonement of the Saviour by *faith alone*? Talk of Popery being a system of wickedness, or permitting its adherents to live in a habitual state of iniquity, why what is the sum and substance of the doctrine here stated by the adversary of Popery? Does he not maintain, that to do good with a motive of securing salvation, is a horrible supposition,—that by *faith alone* can man be saved,—and that all other means is a derogation from the

merits of the Redeemer? And is not this an encouragement to live in habitual wickedness, provided you have faith to believe yourself a saved sinner?" col. 582. Against the doctrine which I laid down, the Vindicator here cites the authority of WILLIAM COBBETT, which, in his opinion, is, no doubt, sufficiently high and conclusive; and he seems not a little pleased to find such a *great man* on his side, and avowedly preferring the Popish practice of confessing to the methodistical doctrine of salvation by faith alone; but as I have never heard that Cobbett is acknowledged as an authority by any Protestant church; and as I certainly do not bow to his authority in matters of religion, or any other matters, I may be permitted to pass this over, allowing my opponent and his work all the credit which they can derive from such a name, though it will be alleged by some ill-natured readers, that in the matter *relics* and *rotten bones*, Cobbett is more than half a Papist.

Any man who understands the bible will perceive at once that the Vindicator is entirely ignorant of what he is writing about, though the subject is the most interesting that can be imagined. The doctrine which I laid down was, that Christ must be acknowledged by a sinner as a whole Saviour, else he is not his Saviour at all; in support of which I adduced certain passages of scripture. The Vindicator makes no account of these; but he rejects the doctrine, because he cannot understand how good works are good and necessary, unless we are to merit salvation by them. He knows no inducement which a man can have to do good works, if they are not to avail him in obtaining the rewards of eternal life; and he can perceive no interest that he can have in keeping God's commandments upon any other principle than as contributing to his salvation. Thus he sets his own doings beside the merits of Christ, as possessing the same quality, and having the same influence, at least, in a certain degree; and thus he enters his protest against the doctrine of the apostle, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he hath saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost;" Tit. iii. 5. It is at least in part by his own works that the Vindicator expects to be saved. It is a melancholy reflection that even one individual sinner on the face of the earth is living under such a fatal delusion, and proceeding to the grave with a lie in his heart; but when we reflect that this is a fundamental article of Popery, and that by teaching this doctrine the Church of Rome seduces and ruins all that confide in her teaching, we cannot help considering her as emphatically the Antichrist; that is, the mighty agent in the hand of the devil, raised up for the purpose of opposing the glory of Christ and the salvation of men.

Those who have read my papers with any degree of attention, must have seen that I do not undervalue good works; though the Vindicator always writes as if I did; and if he could make his readers believe this, they would very naturally look upon me as an enemy of both God and man; for whether men embrace one form of religion or another, or whether they embrace any religion at all, they will unanimously admit and maintain, that good is better than evil; and that if a man's conduct be bad, or if he teach men to be bad, he cannot be under the influence of a good religion. Now, I have not only insisted upon the necessity of good works, from the very commencement of my labours, but it has actually been my principal object, in writing against Popery, to expose the evil works which arise out of it; to show that it is the great enemy of all righteousness; and to persuade my readers to avoid it, to renounce it, and to embrace and hold fast the doctrine of Christ, which is really according to godliness, and which effectually teaches all who embrace it to abound in the fruits of righteousness, that is, in good works, to the praise and glory of God. The good works of a Christian are obedience to the commands of God, springing from love and gratitude for the blessings of the gospel; as such they are approved and accepted, and shall be crowned with a gracious reward, even with the crown of righteousness which Christ has prepared for them that love him. But the fancied good works of a Papist are not an expression of gratitude for blessings received, but proffered as the price of blessings expected; that is, in part at least, as the price of salvation; as such they must be abhorred and rejected, as if they were the greatest crimes, not because they are necessarily such in the matter of them, but because they are put in the place of Christ's merits, and deprive him of the honour which is due to him alone as the Saviour of sinners. It is the glory of Christ to be the Saviour of the guilty, and his glory he will not give to another; but Papists do what they can to wrest it from him, when they trust for salvation in whole or in part to their own merits. Every priest who teaches men to do this is an Antichrist; and let his cruelties and extortions, which affect only the bodies of men, be what they may, they are not to be compared to the fiend-like wickedness of deceiving and leading to perdition, millions of immortal souls. I call this fiend-like wickedness, for it is the very work of the devil, which he began in paradise when he seduced our first parents to sin against God; and which he continues by the agency of his ministers, preventing men from returning to God in the way which he has appointed; that is, confessing their sins,—accepting the salvation of the gospel, through the righteousness of Christ, without merit of their own, and then living to the glory of God by obeying his commandments.

Works may be good in the matter of them,

as it is a good thing to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. In this way substantial good is imparted to fellow-creatures, to whom such works will be always pleasing and acceptable; and they are pleasing to God also, if they proceed from principles and motives which he approves, but not otherwise. Professions of loyalty are good, and pleasing to a sovereign prince, provided they proceed from sincere affection for his person, and approbation of his government; but supposing the prince to see into the heart of a professedly loyal individual, and to perceive that his motive was to ingratiate himself with men in power, to subvert the government, and set aside the succession of the heir apparent, would not the loyalty of such a man, and all his professions of it, be more offensive to the prince than avowed treason? Now God knows the heart of every man and the motive of every action; and works materially good must be abhorred by him, when he knows that the motive and design of them is, to subvert the established order of his kingdom, and dishonour his beloved Son, by putting the merit of these works upon a footing with his merit, and refusing to submit to his righteousness which is alone sufficient for the salvation of the guilty. I hope my readers are aware that there is an established order in the kingdom of heaven. The fundamental principle of it is, that by sin, all men are ruined and lost. The gospel of Christ takes this for granted; and it comes to them as a proclamation of peace and reconciliation, inviting sinners to repent of their sins, to accept the mercy revealed to them, and be reconciled to God. It is expressly declared that there is salvation in no name but that of Christ,—that no merit or righteousness but his will be acknowledged, as of the least avail, in reference to the salvation of sinners. For men, then, to come on the footing of their own merit, is a direct insult to the God of heaven. It is to tell him to his face that they do not approve the way of salvation which his wisdom and mercy have provided: it is in short, to declare that they neither care for him nor his salvation. This the Church of Rome does every day, by teaching her members to merit salvation for themselves; and though she were to renounce all her other fooleries and impieties, this alone would fix the seal of perdition upon her.

No. CLXV.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8TH, 1821.

IN my fifty-third Number I wrote as follws:—"Papists themselves know that I do them no injustice by accusing them of lying; and they would only laugh at my simplicity if I were to affect to think otherwise of them. I speak of the *system* of Popery which is built upon falsehood, is supported by falsehood, and is in fact nothing but fraud and falsehood throughout; and, while admitting that there might be individuals in the Church of Rome who had a regard to truth in their dealings, I maintained that it was impossible for any man to be an active promoter or defender of Popery, without having recourse to lying and imposition." The Vindicator quotes these words, and more to the same purpose, col. 706, as if for refutation; but let the reader proceed, and he will find that there is not so much as an attempt to refute the heavy accusation. Indeed the Vindicator is perfectly aware that the thing is true; and he shuffles it off as usual by a great parade of words about the multitude and the dignity of Papists in all parts of the world, and by repeating, for the hundredth time, his pretended detection of falsehood on my part, in reference to the man in the Wynd, as if this were a complete set off against the universal system of fraud and falsehood practised by his church. But let us have his own words:—

"My principal object, however, in making these citations from his work is, to show the want of feeling and delicacy in this arrogant deacon of the tabernacle, in asserting, that the most numerous portion of mankind in the civilized globe, are educated and instructed in the detestable sin of lying. Thus emperors and kings, statesmen and prelates, from the first establishment of the Church of Rome to the present time, embracing an era of 1800 years, with the whole mass of people, are represented as a body of habitual liars, with here and there an exception. And who is the man that has made so base an assertion? Why, an individual who stands convicted by me with dealing out falsehoods and calumnies by wholesale, without the least shame or remorse: who has been detected in fabricating and forging a charge against a dead man (who, of course, cannot face his calumniator, and call upon him for justice) to blacken the religious principles of his Catholic neighbours: who stands suspected of conspiracy with persons of the meanest and vilest class in society, to assist him in bearing out his impositions: and who still insists upon the accuracy of his statements, in spite of his own contradictions, and the clearest testimony of his guilt. This is the man who hesitates not to affirm that it is impossible for any man to be an active promoter or defender of Popery without having recourse to lying and imposition! And yet, reader, this man, who writes under the title of The Protestant; this same man, I say, for the last ten months, has cowardly borne my taunts and my detections of his lies; has meanly and dastardly submitted to my goadings, without having ventured to point out one single lie,—one solitary imposition on my part, in my vindication of that system which he loads with such unfounded denunciations. Surely, he will not as impudently affirm that I am not an

active promoter or defender of Popery, after having styled me the champion of the system! —And yet he might, with as little violation of truth, say the one as the other. If it is impossible for any man to be an active promoter of Popery without having recourse to lying and imposition, it must be very easy for the antagonist of such a liar and impostor to detect and expose his falsehoods and impositions. If the promoters and defenders of Popery are systematic liars; if the system of Popery is built upon falsehood; how can the former escape detection, and the latter be free from exposure? This is a point far more mysterious to me than the doctrine of transubstantiation; and when The Protestant hazarded the assertion, he acted much more contrary to common sense, than Catholics do in believing that the body and blood of Christ is truly and really present in the sacrament of the eucharist, under the form of bread and wine." Col. 708.

Not a word more have we in the way of reply to the weighty charge which I brought against the Church of Rome on account of her falsehood and imposition. He shows indeed some wisdom in not formally professing to refute the charge, seeing he knows that it cannot be refuted. His principal object was, as he says, to show my want of feeling and delicacy in bearing so hard upon his Church, who, it seems, has practised fraud and falsehood so long, as to claim a sort of prescriptive right to these arts; and had I been a man of feeling and delicacy I would have spared her the reproaches which he is grieved to the heart to hear, but which he cannot ward off. He seems very angry because I would not let his Church alone, and commence an attack against him personally, which is, indeed, the most generous and knightly like thing that has yet come under my view in the course of this long protracted warfare. He affects to be very indignant, because I have not abandoned my avowed course of procedure against his holy mother, in order to expose his own lies, which he continued to throw out from week to week, in great abundance; many of which, I believe, were made for the very purpose of diverting my attention from the bloated system, for the sake of which he was willing to become a sort of scape-goat. The more plainly I told him that I had other matters to dispose of before I could make a particular reply to him, the more loudly he boasted of his mighty achievements, and of my not entering the lists with him. He wonders how I could bear his taunts so long, and what he calls his detections of my lies; but I felt no difficulty in bearing what I knew did not apply to me, and what I am sure he himself knew did not apply to me, from any thing of mine which he had read, but which was the mere invention of his own brain, and intended for no other purpose than to engage me in a controversy about my own character, which all who knew me were persuaded did not stand in need of any defence. Had I been silly enough to suppose that it did, I should have gratified him and his committee, and have long ago lost sight of the errors of Popery, my exposure of which has so highly provoked their wrath.

Having allowed him to exhaust his own passion, and his reader's patience; and having gone through the course which I had prescribed to myself in conducting the controversy, I came at last to the Vindicator, and agreeably to the promise which I made two years ago, I have replied to some of his calumnies, for I cannot call them arguments; and though I have not used the Billingsgate style of calling every thing a lie that deserved the name, I have exposed not a little which confirms what I said, that it is impossible to be an active promoter or defender of Popery without having recourse to lying and imposition. But, as I heartily dislike private and personal matters, I shall leave these things, for the present, with assuring my readers, that what the Vindicator calls my contradictions, are without an exception that I recollect, formed by his misquotation or misrepresentation of my words; nay, in numerous instances, he has given *as my words*, what are not mine, and which express sentiments that I never held. See particularly, the bottom of col. 765; about the middle of col. 778; towards the bottom of col. 779; twice in col. 781, *viz.* at the top, and about the middle; about the middle of 789; near the bottom of 792; near the top of 798, &c. In all these passages, I am represented as saying, and admitting, and laying down a rule about the power of the clergy to *prevent*, and *put down* the teaching of any new doctrine, nothing of which ever came into my head, and nothing of the kind did I ever write; but with the most hardened effrontery does the Vindicator lay those things at my door, and charge upon me by name. Thus the incessant efforts of the Church of Rome to prevent free inquiry, he says were "agreeable to the statement made by Mr Wm. M'Gavin that men were given (to the church) to *prevent new doctrines from arising*." And I do not know how often he speaks of heresies being "*condemned* and *proscribed*, agreeably to Mr M'Gavin's rule." Now the Vindicator must have been perfectly aware that he was inventing these things out of his own head; for there is not a word of my writing that can bear any such construction. Yet the invention, or fabrication, has no great merit in it, seeing it is made out by the perversion of a very harmless assertion, that the ordinary pastors of the Church were given, not to teach any new doctrine, but merely to make known what is contained in the bible. Again, I had expressed in my letter to Mr M'Hardy, a doubt how a "woman living in Ireland, could be the lawful *wife* of a man who *died last year*;" on which Mr Andrews writes thus:—"Reader, is the

man in his senses? Is he a rational creature, or is he an idiot? He will not inquire how a woman in Ireland can be the lawful wife of a man *in Glasgow!*" Col. 808. From which he would make it appear, that a *man in Glasgow* is precisely the same thing as a *man who died last year;* and most heartily do I wish he could make this belief prevalent in Ireland, as it would save us from shoals of begging Papists who are incessantly coming over to annoy us.

Thus I have shown in few words, that the Vindicator himself furnishes abundant evidence of the truth of the statement at the commencement of this Number. No doubt he thinks he took the best mode of defending Popery; and he knows that he did it by lies and imposition. I could have pointed out this two years ago as easily as now; but the thing has lost nothing by keeping; and I can expose it now with the advantage of identifying our Glasgow Papists with it, with more certainty than I could then have done. Indeed though I have it on proven record, that Mr Scott advised his people to buy the book, I have it equally proven, that he disapproved of it, and did not like it at all, perhaps from its furnishing too much evidence of what I meant to establish.

In charging lying and imposition so directly against the promoters and defenders of Popery, I had a particular reference to transubstantiation, which makes every priest tell a lie, every time he celebrates the eucharist, and thus thousands of lies are told every morning before breakfast; for, according to a law of the church, the eucharist must be taken fasting from midnight; it must be for the day, the first thing which the stomach receives, though, when Christ gave it to his disciples, we have reason to think it was the last. The priest declares the bread and wine on the altar before him, after pronouncing four Latin words, to be no longer bread and wine, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. A more barefaced lie was never told; and a great part of Popish worship consists in the incessant repetition of it. What is more, the priests themselves must know it to be a lie, at least such of them as live in England and Scotland; and Mr Fletcher tells us somewhere in his Lectures, that this is a principal article in their confession to one another. That is, they confess, perhaps once a year, the sin of deceiving the people by this abominable lie; they receive absolution, and go on telling lies as before. I have also been informed, by a reverend and learned correspondent in England, that the priests, finding it impossible to persuade the more enlightened of their people to believe transubstantiation, kindly allow them to disbelieve it, provided they keep their unbelief a secret, and not disturb the implicit faith of the common people: for if this were subverted, the whole system would be blown up, and the ghostly fathers might go a pilgrimaging whenever they pleased.

Mr Andrews, however, professes to believe this lie; but if he were a priest he would be conscious that he possessed no such power as that which transubstantiation supposes. It is admitted that the words *hoc est corpus meum,* have no power when pronounced by a layman; and every priest must be conscious, that when he received orders, he underwent no physical or moral change, by means of which the same sounds should have such power when pronounced by his lips. And yet he tells the people every day, that by the uttering of these words, he turns a piece of gross matter into the Saviour of the world. As such he worships it, and holds it up to be adored by the whole congregation.* Now I ask every man who possesses common sense, whether the priest must not be conscious that he is deceiving the people and telling them a lie? If it is not so, his mind must be differently constituted from that of other men.

At the beginning of his 45th Number, the Vindicator enters upon this subject in the following terms: "I shall now proceed to notice the monstrous absurdity which he accuses Papists of believing, namely, 'that their priest can make the God that made himself.' Were Papists, indeed, such dolts as The Protestant represents them; were they to believe their priest to do what Mr M'Gavin says he does; then must I acknowledge that they are more stupid than asses, and the doctrine they profess a gross and monstrous absurdity. But the fact is, Papists admit no such power in the priest; they look upon him only as the instrument, while God himself performs the change which takes place in the elements of bread and wine in the sacrament of the eucharist." Col. 705. Yes, indeed, the priest is only the instrument; but is he not a voluntary and a necessary instrument, without whose agency the thing would not be done? He has power to pronounce the mysterious words when he pleases; or when he pleases, not to pronounce them; and upon his doing this the whole work depends; so it is as really his doing as the formation of the bread is the work of the baker. Every loaf that we eat is the product of divine power; and yet, in common language, it is proper to say, a baker made it: so if we were to admit that transubstantiation is the work of God, still the doing of it depends upon a priest, as he must pronounce the words by which it is effected,

* By a late letter from Ireland, I am informed, that on the 23d of June last, there was a procession of the host, in the city of Derry, for the first time in the memory of man. That is, the consecrated bread was carried about to be worshipped as the Saviour of the world; and such Protestants as were present, and would not pay respect to it, were insulted in such a way as to teach them to be more submissive in future. This is the liberality of modern Papists; and this is the toleration that Protestants are to expect whenever they shall obtain power.

just as the making of a loaf depends upon human labour, in sowing, reaping, and every other necessary process. Those who believe in transubstantiation, therefore, must and do believe it to be the work of the priest and what none but a priest can do; and this is well known to be the chief ground on which priests claim to be exalted above all other men, and on account of which the people regard them as deities; for surely they must regard as gods those who can make God, or not make him, at their pleasure. It is one of the many disadvantages which attend this controversy, that one cannot expose such blasphemies without making use of language bordering upon blasphemy.

But suppose we admit transubstantiation to be the work of God as exclusively as the creation of the world, it does not diminish the impiety of the error; for it is not the conversion of bread and wine into a mere creature, as the body, and blood, and soul, but also into the *divinity* of Jesus Christ. Now divinity is not a subject of conversion or creation. It is blasphemy to ascribe the creation of divinity even to God; or to call that divinity which was not so from all eternity. But the Church of Rome, according to the solemn decision of her last general council, declares accursed all who do not believe that the bread and wine in the eucharist, are truly and substantially converted into the *divinity*, as well as into the real body, and blood, and soul of Jesus Christ. The Vindicator affects to revolt at my representation of his belief, "that a priest can make the God that made himself;" and his correction of it amounts only to this, that God is employed every day in making the God that made him; that is, converting the bread and wine into deity every time the eucharist is celebrated. It is impossible to conceive any thing more blasphemous and revolting; and there is no exaggeration here. It is the softened down and qualified representation of that dogma by which the Church of Rome is chiefly distinguished.

By the use of an indefinite expression the Vindicator is enabled to involve the subject in some obscurity, and even to make it appear that he has high authority on his side. "Catholics," says he, "know also that this doctrine of the *real presence* was held by the apostles themselves, which I shall hereafter prove." Col. 709. Then he refers to the Greek church, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Jacobites, &c. &c. But the *real presence* of Christ in the sacrament is not the point in question. It is certain the apostles believed in this, in the sense in which Christ promised his presence to be with them; but he is as really present in the preaching of the gospel as in the eucharist; nay, it is with the preaching that his promised presence is more immediately connected:— "Go, preach the gospel to every creature;— and, lo, I am with you always, to the end of the world;" but there can be no doubt the promise extends to the Lord's supper, which is indeed a most significant way of preaching the gospel; for showing forth Christ's death, is really to exhibit his gospel to all who witness the ordinance, as it is to enjoy the benefit of his death by all who in faith partake of it.

Now, I suppose, every Protestant church holds the doctrine of the *real presence*, while it is expressed in this general form. Luther taught the real presence of the body and blood of Christ, in the eucharist, in some such way as water is present in a moistened sponge, or fire in red-hot iron, without supposing one substance converted into another. This was called consubstantiation, which, though not so impious as the Popish dogma, is as little countenanced by scripture. Protestants in general believe in the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, not as corporeal in any sense whatever, but entirely in a spiritual manner; not only in his essence, which is present every where alike; but in those gracious manifestations of himself as the Saviour of sinners, which he makes to them who believe in him, and who understand what is meant by the ordinance; who, when they eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him, think of the breaking of his body, and the shedding of his blood, as an atonement for their sins, which is significantly represented by these elements, and the use which they make of them. To them he is *really present* in the most substantial manner; and Christians of every age and country will be found professing their belief in the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, for I like this word better than sacrament; and Popish authors having assumed almost the exclusive use of the expression *real presence*, and having it generally conceded to them, as peculiarly their own, like the word catholic, have taken advantage of it, so as to make appear on their side, ancient fathers and churches, whose principles were as far removed from the transubstantiation of the Church of Rome, as east is from west: for the thing, as defined by the council of Trent, is not that Christ is really present with the bread and wine, but that these are truly and substantially converted into the whole substance of Christ's humanity and divinity, insomuch that not a particle of the bread and wine remains in existence, while the astonished worshipper sees before him nothing but bread and wine, and these just as they were before the wonderful conversion was effected.

In discussing this subject in my 58th No. I laid it down as a rule, that we must have a perfect understanding of a thing before we can pronounce it contrary to reason. This I take to be an axiom that does not require to be proved. It is one of those things to which the mind of one who understands the terms must intuitively assent. I mentioned this in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, which, I said, we could not pronounce contrary to rea-

son, seeing we had not a perfect understanding of it; and as it was plainly revealed in Scripture, we were bound to believe, though we could not understand it; but as transubstantiation was *not* revealed in Scripture; and as it was a matter quite level to our understanding, we were entitled to pronounce it absurd and impossible. On this the Vindicator makes the following sage remarks:—"What a profundity of logic have we here displayed; or, in other words, and more strictly applicable to his language, what nonsense and rant has Mr M'Gavin exhibited in this passage! His meaning, if he really had any when writing the above, is far more unintelligible to me than the doctrine of transubstantiation. So then, according to Mr M'Gavin's logic, we must have a *perfect understanding* of a thing before we can pronounce it contrary to sense and reason. Now *I always thought it more rational to pronounce a thing contrary to sense and reason when it was out of our power to form a perfect understanding of it.*" Col. 723. Well, I suppose this is genuine Popish philosophy. Every man is entitled to pronounce what he does not, and cannot understand, contrary to reason! I leave it to scientific men to say what havoc this principle would make in subjects of natural science; and seeing Mr Andrews does not, I suppose, understand how an immortal spirit, and a reasoning faculty, can be united with a lump of clay, it must be contrary to reason to suppose that he is a rational creature, or any thing more than a mere clod. I request him to remember that this is not an inference of mine, as I seldom stoop so low for my metaphors; it must be his estimate of himself according to his own doctrine.

I spoke of the doctrine of the Trinity as plainly revealed in Scripture, and, at the same time, admitted that we could not understand it; and to this the Vindicator gives a conspicuous place among what he calls my contradictions, col. 723; not knowing, or not choosing to appear to know, that a thing may be plainly revealed as to the *reality* of its existence, while we cannot understand the *mode* of its existence, which is not revealed. If Mr Andrews make out this to be a contradiction, he will land himself in atheism; for either he must say that he understands the existence of Deity, or that the truth of it is not plainly revealed; and as the former is impossible, he must necessarily fall into the latter.

No. CLXVI.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15TH, 1821.

I AM informed by several of my readers, that they are heartily tired of my controversy with the Catholic Vindicator; that they wish I would have done with him; for passages of his which I, find it necessary to quote are so full of absurdity, impiety, and scurrility, as to excite disgust and abhorrence; and my readers think that I am doing him too much honour, and raising his work into too much importance, by the extent and particularity of my replies. I am aware that there is truth, and nothing but truth in these remarks; but they have not convinced me that I ought to have been less particular. It is argued, I know, that few persons read the Vindicator after the first two or three Numbers; that therefore his blasphemies could do little injury to the public, as his abuse could do no harm to me. But the limited circulation of the work is one principal reason why I think it necessary to take so much notice of it. Had it been read by all the readers of my Numbers, I might have spared myself the trouble of answering it, for they themselves would have seen its gross absurdity and impiety. The design of my writing is not to counteract the pernicious influence of blasphemies which have been read by few, and for which only an obscure individual is responsible; for if this were all I had in view, it were much better to let the work alone, that it might remain in the well-merited oblivion, into which it had sunk even before it expired.

I should think it not worth an hour of my time to continue a contest about mere private matters and personalities. But my controversy is well known to be a public one. My design is to expose the errors and the wickedness of Popery as a system, and the false pretences of those who give themselves out as of the holy and only true church, and, of course, as the only Christians in the kingdom; and who, if they shall acquire the ascendency to which they aspire, would not, if we may judge from past experience, suffer a Protestant to live. Now I think I cannot more effectually expose this abominable system of error and blasphemy, than by quoting and refuting the very words and sentiments of a living author, who was, only three years ago, selected by our Glasgow Papists, to be the advocate of the system which I was endeavouring to expose. According to his own affidavit, which the world will see by and by, he was engaged by a company of Glasgow Papists, for the express purpose of writing against "THE PROTESTANT," with the view, no doubt, of writing him down, as he commenced by declaring this to be his determination. His sentiments, therefore, must be considered those of the whole body, at this very day, in this enlightened city. The more revolting and disgusting they are, therefore, the better they serve my purpose. I know there are many Protestants who make light of my ancient authorities, from the mistaken notion that Popery is improved, and that Papists are more enlightened now. Such persons must be convinced of their mistake when they read the

passages which I have extracted from the Vindicator. They tell me they did not know that any man alive could seriously write such absurd and impious nonsense; then it was the more necessary that I should undeceive them, and let them know the real truth of the matter; and, seeing they now find that I have proved, by the writings of a living Papist, that Popery is a much worse thing than they supposed, I hope they will join me in desiring its speedy extirpation, not by means of violence, but by the diffusion of the truth.

The limited circulation of the Vindicator is no reason why his calumnies should pass without notice. The worst thing that can happen to an innocent person is to be calumniated within a small circle, for there the calumnies may lie unnoticed and gather strength, till the injured person be dead, and till all who were able to repel them be dead also, and then they may be revived and propagated as incontrovertible truths; whereas, if they are propagated at first upon a large scale, they are sure to meet with contradiction and refutation; and such testimonies will be left on record, as will enable the writers of a future age to do justice to the injured individual. These considerations have determined me to bring the Vindicator's calumnies against myself out of their obscurity, and to insert the very worst of them in my own pages, that all the world may know and examine them if they please. I cannot make room for them all; but the reader will find a pretty fair sample, and a good assortment of them, in No 156; some have been since introduced; and I shall probably introduce a few more before I have done.

There is still another reason for my extended notice of the Vindicator's work. It furnishes an excellent specimen of the manner in which Papists defend their religion; and it is such as to indicate a conviction in their own minds that it cannot be defended by fair means. One who is conscious that he has truth on his side, has no objection to the strictest examination of his principles. He will rather court free discussion, than be offended by it; and he is under no temptation to abuse and calumniate persons who differ from him; for, though he believes them to be in error, he knows that they are not accountable to him, and that every man must answer for himself to Him who has given a revelation of his will, which is, or ought to be, equally accessible to all. But Papists deprecate free discussion. Their peculiar dogmata must not be examined into, but implicitly embraced under pain of anathema; and he who shall dare to express a doubt, or call in question any thing which they profess to believe, becomes instantly the object of their hatred and wrath. If they are possessedof civil power, or if not under restraint of law, they will murder him; and when this is not safe and convenient, they will attempt to murder his character by every slanderous imputation which malice can invent. Of this the Vindicator furnishes abundant evidence; and he has merely followed the track of his predecessors, who wrote against the Reformation, who, instead of refuting what they called the new doctrines, though they were as old as the gospel, expressed their wrath against the Reformers, by the invention and propagation of lies and slanders, which Papists continue to repeat to this day. Though my work is published, and extensively circulated, in each of the three kingdoms, none but the Vindicator has attempted any thing in the way of reply. Whence can this proceed, but from a consciousness on the part of Papists themselves, that they cannot answer me by fair argument, or otherwise than by abuse, as Mr Andrews has done, which they know is not reputable in the present state of literature and taste? That they do not despise my work, or reckon The Protestant a contemptible adversary, is certain; seeing they denounced him from the pulpit; and engaged, at a vast expense, a champion to write him down; and have endeavoured by every means in their power to procure his silence. Whence is all this? and why is it that they have not recourse to the only honourable and lawful means of putting him down, if he be in error,—that of exposing his errors, and maintaining the truth, by means of the press, by fair argument? There are many able men among them, who have more learning and more leisure than The Protestant;—many, who know how, if necessary, to make "the worse appear the better reason." Why do not some of them step forward for the defence of their holy mother? They know perfectly well that they cannot defend her by arguments; and as nothing else will do, in the present state of British society, as they have learned by the failure of the Vindicator, it is their wisdom to be silent.

I am afraid this long apology for a very dull part of my work will be considered an addition to the grievance of which my readers complain; but for their comfort, I shall inform them, that it is not my intention to write more about the Vindicator than I consider necessary to fulfil my promise, that I would answer him when I had done with other matter; and I think a Number or two more will enable me to do this, and also to silence the boasting of such as thought it impossible for me to answer their champion.

In my last Number, I entered upon the Vindicator's defence of transubstantiation. His remaining Numbers are taken up chiefly with this subject; and in the 45th, he breaks through all order and rule; and though a mere layman, he treats us with a long commentary of his own, on the sixth chapter of John's Gospel; in which he labours at great length to show, that our Saviour inculcated the doctrine of transubstantiation; and that the language which he

used on that occasion, means nothing less than eating his flesh and drinking his blood, as literally as any cannibal would do the enemy that he had taken in battle. It is not necessary that I should reply to this long article, seeing our Lord himself replied to it, in the very same discourse, in answer to certain Jews, who affected to understand his words literally, as Papists do :—"It is the spirit that quickeneth ; *the flesh profiteth nothing ;* the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," verse 63. This is a pretty plain intimation, that Christ spoke of eating and drinking his flesh and blood in a figurative and spiritual manner ; and that the eating of his flesh, as the carnal Jews understood, and as modern Papists understand it, would profit nothing. More on this branch of the subject, I need not say.

In the 46th Number of the Vindicator, we have one of the finest pieces of eloquence that was ever written on the subject, at least that ever came in my way. It is by the Rev. Mr Gandolphy, a Popish priest in London, a writer in Mr Andrews' Orthodox Journal, and, for any thing I know, an assistant of the Vindicator. This priest made a conspicuous figure, a few years go, by affected zeal for distributing English bibles, if any Society would put it in the power of him and his brethren to distribute copies of the Douay version. Several gentlemen in London were simple enough to believe that he was in earnest, and proposed to form a society for the sole purpose of supplying English and Irish Papists with copies of their approved English version of the Scriptures. They very naturally applied to this priest for his concurrence ; but after a great deal of shuffling, he declared off, having found out that it was not a principle of his church to grant the use of the bible in their own language, to the people in general.—See PROT. page 157. This same priest printed a collection of discourses, a very expensive work, I think in four volumes; but, owing to some secret influence in Rome, the Pope would neither give his consent to their publication, nor tell the author why he would not; so the work lay on his hands, and I suppose contributed to his ruin ; such is the blessed state of freedom enjoyed by the clergy in the Church of Rome! I suppose the following is taken from one of these proscribed discourses, which Mr Andrews had somehow got possession of in spite of the Pope:—"The Rev. Mr Gandolphy, in his excellent sermon on transubstantiation, observes, 'Were I allowed to instruct you on questions of philosophy, much might be said to diminish the difficulty in admitting this stupendous miracle. It is an undoubted fact, for instance, that even in nature one substance is frequently changed into another; and it is well known, that objects often appear to us under an appearance different from their real form ; and that they often seem to exist where we prove they do not, which is the case with all objects we look at through the medium of water. We observe the juices of a plant converted into the hardest wood ; we see the grass of the field changed into the horns, bones, hair, and flesh of animals ;—we behold wood and other substances converted into stone by petrifaction ;—we observe the same grain of seed multiply to infinity ;—walls of brass are not impenetrable to the forked lightning ; and through the crystal, which appears a solid body, the light passes in every direction, as if it met with no resistance. The whole hemisphere of the heavens, with all its varieties, is regularly depicted upon the small pupil of the eye, where millions of rays cross each other without interruption. The sun, moon, and stars are immense bodies, yet they all find a place in that wonderful organ. Nay, philosophers have declared, that the whole expanse of matter may be compressed within a less space than a cubic inch. Again, let ten thousand look at one man, does he cease to be present to you, who is equally present to all ? Here is, therefore, a multiplication of appearances, though the object continues one, which may be considered a lively, although imperfect illustration of the ubiquity of the presence of Jesus Christ in this sacrament of the altar. These wonders may astonish us, and yet we believe them ; and can we say, it is more wonderful that we should taste and feel bread and wine, when we receive the substance of the body and blood of Christ ? When we say that we can see an object—feel a substance— or that we taste a thing, we only affirm, that at that moment there is that impression upon the soul. It is only by continual observation and experience, however, that we learn to understand these expressions of the senses, and refer them to their proper object. The language of the senses is the first that the soul of man has to study. Destroy those faculties, and every object will cease to exist in his regard. Change the operation of one of those faculties, in any single instance for example, and the object will appear changed to us, though unaltered in itself. Change the substance of the object, as in the case of the eucharist, leaving its operation on the senses, the same as before, and what had been bread and wine will still appear to us bread and wine, through all their respective relations, though they are *essentially* become and exist a different object. Much of what I have said is exemplified in those who have been deprived of one or more of their faculties, or who attend to the impression of one sense only. Remember, therefore, that in the holy eucharist, the change is not in the blessed body of Jesus Christ, which always exists as he rose illustrious from the dead, and ascended glorious into heaven,—the error is to be attributed to those senses, which, prevented from discerning his glorious and spiritualized body, would discover nothing at all, if he did not make himself sensible to us, under

some material sign. For it must be observed that it was only when he chose to work a miracle on these senses, that the apostles could see him, with their material eyes, after his resurrection. Thus Magdalene mistook him for a gardener. Thus, as the disciples passed to Emmaus, in his company, the scripture tells us, *their eyes were held that they should not know him,* and that afterwards, *at supper, their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight.* (*Luke* xxiv. 16—31.) It is always (concludes the learned preacher) through not distinguishing between the mortal and the glorified—the passible and the impassible—body of Jesus Christ, or between his *sacramental* and his *natural* presence—that men experience difficulties in assenting to this great mystery of faith.'" Col. 726—728.

"Here," says Mr Andrews, "we have philosophy as well as scripture in favour of the doctrine of transubstantiation." He supposes notwithstanding that Mr Wm. M'Gavin will not believe, in which he happens to be right for once; and I suppose every intelligent reader will agree with me, that this brilliant piece of eloquence is more calculated to dazzle and bewilder than to convince. The orator uses a great number and variety of figures, but unhappily for his cause there is not one of them that bears any analogy to the thing that was to be proved. Transubstantiation is a miraculous change of one substance into another, of matter into divinity, while yet no change appears. When the juices of a plant are converted into the hardest wood, does he still continue to see nothing but the said juices? When the grass of the field is converted into the horns of an ox, or the hoofs of a horse, does he still see nothing but grass? Unless he shall answer in the affirmative, he must acknowledge that these operations of divine power in the world of nature, have no resemblance to transubstantiation; and that he was merely amusing, or rather deceiving his hearers by a show of argument without a particle of substance. His other figures are equally inapplicable: and it would require a miracle like transubstantiation to convert them into sense. To say that the whole mass of matter may be compressed within a cubic inch, is to say no more than that He who made all matter out of nothing, could reduce it to nothing again if he pleased. This has nothing to do with transubstantiation. But if Mr Gandolphy shall say, that this globe of earth, with the sun and all the stars, *are actually* compressed within the space of a cubic inch, while they appear to our senses as big as ever, I shall admit that it would be something like transubstantiation, though it would not quite come up to the absurdity of the thing; for this doctrine supposes matter converted into divinity, and still continuing to appear nothing but matter, without the least change of form.

I have heard of a preacher, who, after delivering an excellent sermon, had a trick of undoing all he had said by an injudicious application. Mr Gandolphy appears guilty of something of this kind; for in the last sentence of the above extract, he oversets all the fine fabric he had been endeavouring to rear, by making an admission that subverts the doctrine at once. "It is always through not distinguishing between the mortal and glorified—the passible and the impassible—body of Jesus Christ,—or between his *sacramental* and his *natural* presence,—that men experience difficulties in assenting to this great mystery of faith." Now this is the very distinction that Protestants always make. They admit that Christ is present in the one sense, and not in the other;—that he is present *sacramentally,* or by a figurative representation; but not *naturally,* in his real body and blood. Mr Gandolphy admits the same thing, else he will be convicted of admitting something worse. He cannot mean that Christ is present *both* naturally and sacramentally, for if so, there is no need of the distinction which he lays down as of so much importance. He cannot mean that Christ is present naturally, and not sacramentally; for then there would be no sacrament. He is reduced therefore to the alternative of admitting that he is present sacramentally, and not naturally; which is the true Protestant doctrine.

This, perhaps, is the reason why the Pope will not permit him to sell his work, after he has been at the expense of printing it; and, if so, it proves two things; namely, that his holiness has all his eyes about him; and that they are clearer ones than those of Mr Andrews. And I can easily suppose, that this being the reason, the Pope should not choose to assign it as such, lest he should set the people a thinking and talking upon the subject, which might lead to such consequences as no Pope would like to hear of.

When showing that transubstantiation was not always believed by the Church of Rome, I professedly took Tillotson's discourse as my guide. He had travelled through the literature of many a century; and quoted passages from saints and fathers from the second century down to the thirteenth, showing clearly that the doctrine was unknown during the earlier ages, how it arose, and was "licked into form," as it now stands. See PROTESTANT, No. 57. I thought it perfectly lawful to avail myself of what was thus prepared to my hand, seeing it was done with due acknowledgment. But here the Vindicator affects to catch me napping, and confessing myself in need of a *director,* while I professed to allow no other guide in the choice of religion but the word of God; and thus I am convicted of inconsistency and contradiction. But I need not tell my protestant readers, that to choose a religion is something different from tracing a historical fact, or

a historical falsehood through a succession of ages: but those who do not believe their own senses, may not perceive the difference. In discussing this part of the subject, the Vindicator repeatedly accuses me of forging pasages in Tillotson's work, of which the eighth edition (the one in my possession) was printed in 1720, more than half a century before I was born, which must have been rather a miraculous operation; and, I suppose, if I were to embrace Popery, I might get canonized for it, a hundred years after my death.

No. CLXVII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 22ND, 1821.

I STATED in my last Number that the Vindicator accused me of forging several passages in Tillotson's Discourse on Transubstantiation. I shall now devote a few pages to this subject, in order to show on what sort of ground this defender of Popery founds the odious charge of forgery; and also to show how he fails in his attempt to make some of the ancient fathers appear teachers of transubstantiation.

At page 256, I gave the following, with marks of quotation, exactly as it stands in Tillotson's discourse, as the doctrine of Justin Martyr, with the title of the work, the edition, and the page, in which it is to be found,—"Our blood and flesh are nourished by the conversion of that food which we receive in the eucharist." From this I endeavoured to show, that this father did not believe that the bread and wine were converted into the body and blood of Christ, for it is not pretended that these are food by which our *bodies* are nourished. Instead of denying, or even attempting a reply to this very obvious inference, the Vindicator treats us with a whole column about Amicus Veritatis and Luther, endeavouring to defend the former from the charge of garbling the words of the latter, of which I convicted him, in the second Number of The Protestant. Then he turns round, and affects to find me guilty of the thing of which I convicted Amicus. He does not profess to have looked into Tillotson's work, which may be had in almost every library, to see whether or not I had quoted the words fairly. Perhaps he was afraid that he would not then have been able to fix the charge of forgery upon The Protestant with so good a grace, and to have charged it upon Tillotson would not have served his purpose, seeing he died a hundred years ago, and could not be injured by it; and seeing that had he been guilty of any such imposition, he would not have escaped being detected by some of the acute Jesuits of his own time:—

"But," says the Vindicator, "let us see if Mr M'Gavin has not made St Justin 'say what he did not mean to say,' and has thus by his own rule, committed another *real forgery*, in addition to the many which I have already detected. In a work which is now before me, called *The Annals of the Church from the death of Christ*, printed for T. Meigham, London, 1738, I find the following extract from the apology of this great Christian philosopher:—speaking of the eucharist he says, 'We do not receive it as *common* bread and wine. But as we know that our Saviour Jesus Christ by the word of God was made flesh, and took our flesh and blood upon him for our salvation, so we likewise know that *this* bread and wine, which nourish our flesh and blood, being *consecrated* by the prayers which *the same word has taught us*, BECOME the FLESH and BLOOD of the incarnate Jesus.' What shall we now say of Mr Wm. M'Gavin? Is it not clear that he has *garbled* the words of St Justin, and made him 'say what he did not mean to say?' Does he not stand clearly convicted, upon his own words, with having committed *a real forgery?* Whatever he may say of the unfairness of his former opponent, in placing a full point for a comma, and omitting part of the sentence, it is evident that in the case of St Justin, THE PROTESTANT has shamefully misquoted the words of the ancient father, by leaving out the context, and putting a sense upon them which is utterly unjustifiable. Taking the *whole* sentence of the learned philosopher and Christian martyr, it is demonstrably clear that he believed and taught the *real presence* of our Saviour in the blessed eucharist, and that it was the received opinion of the primitive Christians in his days." Col. 740, 741.

Then follows an account of St Justin and of his work, which was meant as an answer to those heathens who accused the Christians of being cannibals for eating the flesh of Christ. "In this work," says Mr Andrews, "he enters into a justification of the different doctrines and principles of the Christians, and, as I have before remarked, defines, in the plainest terms, the blessed eucharist to be the *real body* and *blood* of Christ, *truly* and *substantially changed* by the prayers taught by the same Word which took flesh of the blessed Virgin Mary. Had Mr Wm. M'Gavin given the whole context, instead of a detached part of the sentence, the conclusion which *he* has drawn would have been much more ridiculous and false than it now appears; but this would not answer his purpose. What, reader, I again ask, are we to think of Mr Wm. M'Gavin's veracity as a writer? He has been labouring hard to make it appear that Papists are not worthy to be trusted, even on their oaths, if they really believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation, because, he says, they must know it to be a lie, or they discredit their own senses. But who will henceforth give credit to his word, which has so often been found incorrect, but, I must add, intentionally so, and contrary to the evidence of truth and reason." Col. 742.

If my object were merely to vindicate myself, it would be enough to refer the reader to Tillotson's discourse on transubstantiation, in his volume of sermons, London, 1720, folio, page 266, where the passage will be found verbatim as I gave it. Upon the supposition that the words were unfairly given, this will satisfy the reader that there was no *garbling* or *forgery* on the part of Mr Wm. M'Gavin, on whom the Vindicator is so anxions to fix the odious calumny; but in point of fact there is no unfairness in the matter; and I am not reduced to the necessity of exculpating myself at the expense of the deceased, who was distinguished for probity, and amiable simplicity of manners, as much as by profound learning and transcendent ability. I have not at present access to St Justin's Apology; and neither, I suppose, had the Vindicator. I gave his words on the authority of Tillotson, a name well known, and universally esteemed; the Vindicator professes to give them from an anonymous book, and without a reference to any known author who could have vouched for the integrity of the writer, or the accuracy of his work. There is therefore strong reason to suspect that the author, whoever he was, made his quotation from an edition of Justin's work that had been interpolated according to the rules of the Index Expurgatorius. Or, perhaps, he made an addition of his own to the passage, as Mr Andrews himself has done; for Justin is made to say, that the bread and wine being consecrated become the flesh and blood, &c. and Mr Andrews adds, *truly and substantially changed*, not a word of which is in Justin's work as quoted by himself. This is a barefaced interpolation of his own, and it expresses a sentiment not so much as implied in the saint's words. This is a piece of imposition really amounting to a forgery on the part of the Vindicator; and seeing he could, without shame, add the words "truly and substantially changed," we may reasonably presume that the anonymous writer from whom he quotes, also added such words as were agreeable to himself.

Besides, the anonymous author gives us neither the Number, nor the edition, nor the page of the Apology, as Tillotson does, and therefore supposing the words to be fairly given, they may be from another passage of the work; and even supposing they expressed a sentiment somewhat different from the other passage, it need not be thought surprising, seeing the saints are not always consistent with themselves any more than with one another.

But after all, the passages are consistent with each other. Justin does say, in the Vindicator's own quotation, that *this bread and wine nourish our flesh and blood*. This is substantially the same as his doctrine given by Tillotson; and it is in itself a distinct proposition, unaffected by the other words in the sentence; so that by asserting it there is no misrepresentation of the author's meaning, and no foundation whatever for the Vindicator's bluster about garbling, forgery, and so on. Allowing that Justin did say that the bread and wine, being consecrated, became the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus, he must have meant it only figuratively and spiritually, or, if you please, sacramentally, and not naturally, or in the sense of transubstantiation. This is evident from his asserting that the bread and wine nourish our bodies, which supposes them to be in their natural state of nutritious matter, which they cannot be after they are transubstantiated. No Popish writer that I know of ever supposed that our bodies were nourished by the eucharist; and to say that they are so, is to deny transubstantiation. Bellarmine complained of the audacious curiosity of some Protestants, who presumed to ask what became of Christ when the Pope had swallowed him? and then he gives this reply:—"The body of Christ passes through the mouth of the communicant, and yet does not pass off into the draught, but the appearances of bread and wine (speciebus) being corrupted in the stomach, without any injury of itself, it ceases to be there, as, before consecration, without any detriment, it was not there." See *Lib. I. cap. 14. vol. 2d. de sac. Euch.* Antijacobin Rev. for July, 1821, p. 463. If any thing like sense can be made of this, it must be, that in taking the eucharist nothing but an appearance goes into the stomach; it is only an appearance that corrupts there; and when the appearance "ceases to be there," it leaves nothing. Tillotson was therefore perfectly correct in citing St Justin against transubstantiation, and that upon the simple ground of his asserting that our bodies are nourished by the bread and wine in the eucharist.

I next cited Irenæus, who writes as follows:—"When therefore the cup that is mixed and the bread that is broken, receives the word of God, it becomes the eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists." I gave another short extract from the same author, which the Vindicator inserts, together with the above sentence, col. 742; and not being able to find any thing in these two passages, that he could pervert into an example of forgery or garbling on my part, he takes care to make one of his own. Irenæus says, the bread and wine become *the eucharist of* the body and blood of Christ; but Mr Andrews in repeating the passage leaves out the three words which I have given in italics; and represents the "holy father" as saying "the bread and wine BECOME the *body* and *blood* of Christ;" and then he tells us that the words of Irenæus are "as clearly in favour of the *real presence* as any words can possibly be." Col. 743. If he had found any such example of garbling and misrepresenting in my writings, he would have

made a tremendous noise about it, and we should have had it reiterated in every page of his work; from which it would appear that he claims for himself and brethren an exclusive right to garble, and forge, and falsify, without being liable to challenge or censure for so doing. After all, he finds nothing but the *real presence*, even by garbling the words of these fathers, which is not the question in dispute; for as I showed in the last Number but one, Protestants admit the real presence, in the sense understood by themselves; and most Protestants are agreed with Irenæus, that the bread and wine become the eucharist,—that is, the commemoration, or commemorative symbols, of the body and blood of Christ. Irenæus does indeed say, that the bread in the eucharist, receiving the divine invocation, is no longer *common* bread, from which the Vindicator is sure that it must be *transubstantiated* or changed into something extraordinary or uncommon. He does not know, I suppose, that a thing may be changed, or become uncommon, as to its use, while it remains unchanged as to its nature, which is all that the words of this father will bear. The *show bread* in the tabernacle, or bread of proposition, as the Popish translators call it, was not common bread, the use of it being restricted to the priests; but it was bread and nothing else; and it served to allay the hunger of David and his followers, just as other bread would have done.

The next passage which I extracted from Tillotson's discourse is a quotation from Tertullian. The Vindicator boldly represents me as the author of this; and he has no hesitation, he says, in charging me with another *act of forgery*, col. 744; and why? Because in his opinion, Tertullian was too profound a scholar and reasoner to make use of such language; and yet it is language which as great men as he make use of every day; namely, that when Christ said, This is my body, he meant the figure or image of his body. The Vindicator seems never to have seen the passage before. He did not think it worth while to inquire whether it was genuine or not; but simply because it is like the language of Protestants, I must have forged it! It is in this way that he PROVES me guilty of forgery, as he often asserts, in great capitals.

Next comes Origen, whose language is so decidedly against transubstantiation, that the Vindicator can find no way of evading it, but by finding me guilty of another contradiction. I admitted that one expression of this father, (eating the Lord,) was fanciful and incorrect, while it appeared plain from the context that he meant eating in a figurative sense; which was so evident to Cardinal Perron, that he rejected his testimony, because he was accused of heresy, and talked like a heretic in this place; on which Mr Andrews writes:—"Ah! Mr Wm. M'Gavin, why did you not follow Cardinal Perron's example, and reject the testimony of Origen too? If you acted thus wisely you would not have made so gross a contradiction as I shall now point out. You say that this father's words are so *plainly* against any thing but a *figure* of our Lord being in the eucharist, that Cardinal Perron rejected his testimony. But, Mr M'Gavin, if these words are so plainly expressed, how came you to find it necessary to *explain* them, and to declare one expression at least *fanciful* and *incorrect*? Do, sir, explicate this if you can. Pray, sir, clear up this mystery, which is far more incomprehensible to me than transubstantiation. How that can be plain which is incorrect; how words, which expressly say *the Lord is eaten* relate only to a *figure*, is truly puzzling, and reminds me of a similar contradiction in Church of England Protestants, who deny the real presence, yet say, in their catechism, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken in the Lord's supper." Col. 746.

Thus, it seems, a passage cannot be plain and intelligible as to the general scope and meaning of it, if there be a single word introduced that is fanciful and incorrect, and which requires explanation to make it consistent with the context; and that a thing can be both *plain* and incorrect, is a greater mystery to Mr Andrews than transubstantiation. That two and three make six, I take to be an assertion sufficiently plain, and that it is incorrect, I suppose no one will deny; yet this is a greater mystery to him than the conversion of a wafer into the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. Those who can believe that he is speaking truth, may believe it; and if they can do so, they are no doubt prepared to swallow transubstantiation also.

He has nothing more to oppose to the passage adduced from Origen, but another passage which, he says, makes it manifest, "that Origen understood the real presence in the eucharist in a literal and not in a figurative sense." It is this:—"If we do not eat the bread of life, if we do not nourish ourselves with the flesh of Jesus Christ, if we drink not his blood, if we slight our Redeemer's heavenly banquet, we ought to reflect that, though God is all bounteous, he is equally just, and will punish our neglect." Col. 747. These are the strongest words which he can find in the writings of this father, in support of transubstantiation; and they are not stronger than what may be heard on every sacramental occasion, in the Church of Scotland, by pious ministers, who use the figurative language of scripture, under a full conviction that their hearers know the meaning of it, and that by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, no more is understood than believing in him as he is exhibited in the Lord's supper. I am not sure but worthy men on such occasions make too liberal a use of the figurative style, when language free from

metaphor would suit their hearers better; but it would be unjust to accuse them of favouring transubstantiation; and yet upon no stronger ground does the Vindicator claim Origen as a teacher of that monstrous absurdity.

The reader is requested to turn to my 57th Number, in which he will find the words of St Augustine, one of the greatest of the ancient fathers, who speaks more like a Protestant on this subject than Luther himself. I gave several other great names, including a Pope, and even the incomparable Duns Scotus, as witnesses of the fact, that transubstantiation was not always believed in the Church of Rome; to all which the Vindicator opposes nothing but his own word. "I see," says he, "he (The Protestant) has further committed himself with St Augustine, Pope Gelasius, &c. To enter into a refutation of these fabrications is useless; I have clearly convicted him in my last of having recourse to his old tricks of *forgery*, and as he stands a guilty fabricator, no credit can henceforth be given to his assertions." Col. 758. The reader is able to judge what his convictions of fabrication are like; and will no doubt perceive the trick which the Vindicator here plays off; that is, to make it appear that the reader had nothing before him but assertions of mine; whereas I gave the testimony of Augustine and others in their own words. He calls these words fabrications, and he says to enter into a refutation of them is useless; but he takes care not to give the words themselves; for as Augustine's works are well known, he would have been in danger of having his own falsehood detected.

I have given all the particular exceptions which the Vindicator makes against the testimonies which I adduced as to the matter of fact, that the ancient fathers were ignorant of transubstantiation: and it is only as witnesses to a matter of fact that I adduce their testimony. In their opinions the ancient fathers were as liable to err as any modern teacher can be, and they were often mistaken. I would not therefore receive any doctrine that they taught, unless I found it in the word of God, and then I would believe it independently of their teaching or testimony. As transubstantiation is not taught in the bible, I would reject it though it had been taught by all the saints and fathers since the days of the apostles; but it is satisfactory to be able to show that authorities which Papists themselves acknowledge, are against them.

The Vindicator proceeds to give, from a work by one Dr Thomas Bailey, what he calls a chain of evidence, conclusive in favour of transubstantiation. This consists in a great number of scraps of sentences, and parts of sentences, from a host of writers in different ages, most of them nonsensical enough, but whether genuine or not, he does not know; as he takes them on the word of the said Dr Bailey, who, it seems, had been a Protestant, but became a convert to Popery, during the civil wars, in the time of Charles I. By this time, every Popish writer was bound to read and copy the fathers, according to the rules of the Index Expurgatorius, so that there can be no dependence on the genuineness of a single sentence. Though the Vindicator cannot but know this, he does not acknowledge it; and his concealment of it from his readers, most of whom know nothing of the matter, gives us reason to suspect, that he is not very careful whether or not the thing asserted be true, if he can only make it be believed. I pass over all his chain of evidence, as he calls it, as of no value whatever; and thus I get to the conclusion of my answer to the Vindicator, which has been by far the most irksome part of my work, not from any difficulty in it, but from a consciousness of degradation in being obliged to contend with an adversary who despises equally truth in his statements, and decency in his language.

I think I have fully replied to every thing in the Vindicator that relates to Christian doctrine and worship. Of his cavils and calumnies of a private and personal nature, I have given only a few specimens, sufficient, I think, to show the character of his work, and the manner in which Popery is defended; and I do not choose to load my pages with any more of such matter.

No. CLXVIII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 29TH, 1827.

HAVING finished my reply to the Catholic Vindicator, I allude to him now merely for the purpose of introducing another topic. He finds me guilty of asserting that I had not made one real contradiction, or written a sentence which I would wish to alter, were it to be written again; in which, as usual, he misquotes my words, and misrepresents my meaning; for what I said was, that *he had not detected* one real contradiction, or *pointed out* a sentence which I would wish to alter. In order to try whether he knew what a contradiction was, I made one on purpose, and told him the very page on which it stood; but, so far as appears, he was never able to find it out: and I certainly did write some sentences, which I would wish to alter, though he did not point them out. These will be found on page 30; in which I admitted that the civil disabilities, under which Papists lie, are persecution on account of religion. This notion prevails very generally among persons who have not closely studied the subject, as was the case with me when I wrote the above passage; but it was not long till I perceived my mistake; and I know I am not the only individual who, upon a careful

study of the subject, has seen cause to change his mind.

Persecution on account of religion, is to prevent men from worshipping God according to the light of their own consciences, or to punish them for so doing; it being understood that such worship is harmless in the sight of men; for if it were in any manner hurtful to fellow-creatures, the restraining of it would not be persecution, but a lawful exercise of magisterial authority. Now, I do not find that there is any law extant, or practice authorised in this empire, either for preventing Popish worship, or punishing Papists on account of their worship, however absurd and idolatrous it may be. There are, indeed, certain places of power and trust, to which Papists are declared inadmissible; but this is not on account of their religion, or their worship; but solely on account of their sworn subjection to a foreign power, namely, the Pope of Rome, who is the declared enemy of all Protestant churches, and, of course, of all kingdoms in which the Protestant religion is established. His determined hostility against all such as maintain the Protestant religion, has often been published to the world, and has never been disavowed by him; it remains, therefore, to this day in full force; and those in Britain and Ireland who are his subjects, have no more right to complain of exclusion from political power, than the subjects of the Grand Turk have. Nay, supposing a colony of sober Turks to settle among us, I would contemplate less danger from them, than from Papists; I would rather see them admitted into Parliament, than Papists; for their Prophet never claimed sovereignty over this country, which the Pope did claim, and exercise too, in the most rigorous manner. He has never yet relinquished that claim; and his sworn subjects will feel themselves bound to urge it, and to bring the kingdom again under his galling yoke, whenever they are able. The exclusion, therefore, of Papists from political power, is not persecution on account of their religion, but a necessary precaution occasioned by their own obstinate adherence to a foreign and a hostile power.

I grant, that, from the revolution in 1688, down to the reign of King George III. Papists did suffer many privations and hardships, that had very much the appearance of persecution on account of their religion, though really occasioned by their known hostility to the established government. As Papists, I acknowledge, they were proscribed, and many severe laws were made to prevent the growth of Popery; but this was not because Popery, in a religious view, was erroneous; but because it was inseparably connected with hostility to the established government, and because Papists identified themselves with the enemies of the reigning family. At this very day Papists suffer some disqualifications, from which they might be relieved, if they would make the declaration against transubstantiation, and the worship of saints and images; not that saint-worship and transubstantiation are crimes in the eye of the law; they are merely the tests by which the administrators of the law distinguish the subjects of the Pope, from the subjects of King George. It was not because the Ephraimites could not say *Shibboleth*, that the men of Gilead slew them at the fords of Jordan, (Judges xii. 6.) but because their *sibilant* infirmity ascertained them to be the people with whom Gilead was at war: and so it is, that adherence to transubstantiation and saint-worship, ascertains Papists to be the subjects of the Pope, and the enemies of Protestants. Absurd and impious as transubstantiation is, there is no civil penalty attached to the belief of it, nor do I say there ought to be. Idolatrous as is the worship of the Virgin Mary and other saints, there is no civil penalty attached to it; and I do not say there ought to be, unless it occasion a breach of the peace, by setting up images in the streets; but when the believers and practisers of these impieties declare themselves, as they do by the fact, to be under the spiritual dominion of the Pope of Rome, the determined enemy of every Protestant government, it is doing them no injustice to say, "You shall not bear rule in our Protestant state, in which you are more than half alien. You are bound by the most solemn ties, even as you regard the salvation of your souls, to promote the interests of the See of Rome. We know that See to be the enemy of this state. You cannot serve both. You have made your choice of Rome. You must have no power over us."

I know perfectly well that there is no way of evading this argument, but by denying that the Pope has any temporal jurisdiction over Papists in this kingdom. Now, this is what no man has a right to deny; for Papists admit his *spiritual* jurisdiction in all its possible extent; and this necessarily implies the *temporal*, whenever the good of the soul shall demand the submission of the body. Besides, the Pope has, oftener than once, in the face of the whole world, claimed a temporal jurisdiction over this kingdom, and every soul in it. He has never withdrawn this claim; nor was he ever known to relinquish a claim which he had once made. His claim, therefore, of temporal, as well as spiritual jurisdiction, over Britain and Ireland, is not extinct, but merely dormant. It will revive on the first favourable opportunity; and whenever he hears of a few of his dear children being in Parliament, he will bestir himself, and set all his machinery in motion, in order to effect the repeal of every remaining statute that was enacted to maintain the Protestant ascendency; and he will leave no stone unturned, to procure the re-establishment of Popery in all its strength, along with the restoration of the church and abbey lands, and

the estates forfeited in successive Popish rebellions, to the descendants of their former owners. I know this will be scouted at as chimerical. But why so? Every argument that is supposed to prove that a Papist may be safely in Parliament, will equally prove that a Papist may safely be on the throne; and no man can consistently vote for an alteration of the law in the one case, who would not vote for an alteration in the other case; and supposing such a change to happen, all the rest would follow as a thing of course. I have no fear of such a change happening in my time, because the mystery of iniquity, powerful as it is, cannot work upon a great scale, but by slow degrees: but let Papists into Parliament, and the Council, and the Cabinet, and the operation of the system will soon be manifest.

Without further arguing upon the subject, I shall proceed to show what concessions were made to the Papists in Ireland during the late reign; and how such concessions were found not to satisfy or conciliate them, but only to increase their discontent, and make them rise in their demands. For a concise view of this subject, I am indebted to a book printed at Cork, in 1816, entitled, "The true state of the question; Whether admissibility of Romanists to the higher offices of the State, by themselves termed 'Catholic Emancipation,' be compatible with the principles of the British Constitution? By Joseph Spearing, Jun." I would strongly recommend this work to all who wish for information on a subject of vital importance to the whole empire. Mr Spearing is a man of facts, rather than of theory; and I am the more particular in recommending his volume, because it is little known, at least in this part of the empire. It is sold by Archer in Dublin, and in London, by Longman & Co.

In the reign of King William it was found necessary to restrain the Papists by several Acts, which would now be reckoned extremely severe, but which were evidently called for by the exigencies of the times. "All grants of forfeited estates were made subject to the condition, that they should be planted with Protestants; and all those concerned in the rebellion were attainted, except those who were included in any articles of agreement, or had been pardoned. An Act to restrain foreign education was also passed. By a clause in this Act, no Papist was allowed to teach a school publicly, or in private houses, except children of the family. Penalty £20, and three months imprisonment."

"In 1697, the three following Acts were passed: 'An Act to prevent Protestants from intermarrying with Papists:' 'An Act for banishing all Papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all regulars of the Popish clergy out of the kingdom:' And 'An Act for the confirmation of articles made at the surrender of the city of Limerick.'" See True State of the Question, &c. pp. 197, 198. The same year another Act was passed against the authority of the Bishop of Rome, in which it was enacted, That whoever should ascribe any manner of jurisdiction, authority, or pre-eminence, to the See of Rome, within this kingdom, should incur the pains of a *premunire*. "In 1690, an Act was passed to prevent Papists from being solicitors." And in 1703, in the reign of Queen Anne, an Act was passed to prevent the farther growth of Popery, which contained some very severe clauses: for instance, the Papist who should pervert a Protestant, and the Protestant so perverted, both incurred a *premunire*. Papists were disabled from purchasing lands, &c. &c. In short, for more than half a century after the revolution, Papists were held as a sort of outlaws; and their conduct during this period was the very reverse of that of persons wishing to stand upon good terms with their superiors. They were incessantly plotting against the peace of the kingdom, and the authority of the reigning prince; and the Pope, as usual, was blowing the coal, by sending bulls from Rome, promising indulgences, and the pardon of all their sins, to those who should be in any way instrumental in dethroning King George, and bring in the Pretender. Their disaffection for the reigning family was visibly connected with their being Papists; and therefore, it was not surprising that they should have been held as a proscribed race, who would keep no terms with the existing authorities, and who, of course, could not be treated as good subjects.

Some time after the accession of George the Third, it was found that the cause of the Pretender was so extremely low and desperate, that the most sanguine Romanist could have no hope of his being able to supplant the house of Hanover; and as the plotting on his behalf began to cease, the jealousy of men in power against Papists began to decline. In 1778, an Act was passed, by which, on certain conditions, they were empowered to take leases for 999 years, or five lives; and lands were made devisable, transferable, and descendable, to, or from them. The penal Acts were repealed, respecting the hearing and celebrating mass, and several other restrictions removed. In 1782, Romanists were, by another Act, relieved from all restrictions respecting property, and most of the restraints on them were removed. *True State, &c.* pp. 220, 221.

In the year 1792, "An Act was passed granting Romanists, that after the 24th of June, 1792, they may practise as barristers and attorneys; that they and Protestants may intermarry; that Popish schoolmasters need not obtain licenses from the ordinary to keep school, and all restrictions as to foreign education were removed." *Ibid.* 222. It was now that Papists had received in part, and were about to receive more fully, the privileges of

British subjects, that they began to manifest their dissatisfaction with any concession that did not go the length of surrendering the kingdom itself to them. This appears by the speech of their own advocate, in the House of Commons, Sir Hercules Langrishe, who made the following very remarkable disclosure :— "Notwithstanding my prepossessions in favour of the Roman Catholics, I was checked for some time in my ardour to serve them, by reading, of late, a multitude of publications, and paragraphs in the newspapers, and other public prints, circulated gratis, with the utmost industry, purporting to convey the sentiments of the Catholics. What was their import ? They were exhortations to the people never to be satisfied with any concession, until the state itself was conceded !—they were precautions against public tranquillity ;—they were invitations to disorder, and covenants of discontent ; —they were ostentations of strength, rather than solicitations for favour,—rather appeals to the power of the people, than applications to the authority of the state ;—they involved the relief of the Catholic, with the revolution of the government ;—and were dissertations for democracy, rather than arguments for toleration." *Ibid.* 223.

In 1793, the Romanists were granted the elective franchise ; eligibility to be justices of the peace, grand jurors, and officers in the army and navy ; liberty to endow a college and schools; liberty to carry arms, to those possessing a certain degree of property ; and the right of challenge against a Romanist was taken away, in causes where a Protestant and Romanist are the parties. These, with the former grants, leave them now under no exclusions but the following : "the Parliament, the Privy Council, and the Offices of Viceroy, Lord Chancellor, Master of the Rolls, Judges, Judges of the Court of Admiralty, Secretary of State, Lord Privy Seal, Vice Treasurer, Deputy Vice Treasurer, Teller and Cashier of the Exchequer, Auditor General, Lieutenant, or Governor, or Custos Rotulorum of Counties, Secretary to the Viceroy, Sergeants at Law, Attorney General, Solicitor General, King's Council, Masters in Chancery, Provost or Fellow of Trinity College, Postmaster General, Master or Lieutenant General of the Ordnance, Commander in Chief of the Forces, General on the Staff, Sheriff or Sub-Sheriff of any County ; and from holding any office of trust that can be established by the Lord Lieutenant and Council, under the seventeenth and eighteenth of Charles the Second. They are also excluded from the office of Mayors, Sheriffs, Recorders, Aldermen, Common Council Men., &c. in Cities ; and from the office of High and Sub-Sheriffs of Counties." *Ibid.*

Here there seems a vast number of offices from which Papists are excluded ; but so are also dissenters of every name, especially in England, unless they shall qualify themselves according to law ; and they have much more reason to complain than Papists, seeing they are not in subjection to any foreign power, as Papists are ; yet we seldom hear of dissenters complaining of their exclusion ; at least they do not, like Papists, annoy the country, and embarrass the government with their clamour and their threats. We do not hear them magnifying their numbers and importance, and making the peace of the kingdom depend on their being unconditionally admissible to places of power. This is what Papists are always doing ; and yet there are few of the places from which they are excluded, which, as Papists, they could fill in a Protestant country, without annoying Protestants, or violating their allegiance to the Pope. Some of the places are connected with extensive patronage in the Established Church, and the Universities. They will not allow the king a negative in the nomination of their bishops ; and yet they claim a right to such places and offices about the king as would give them the nomination of all the Protestant bishops, and perhaps one-tenth of the inferior clergy in England, and one-fifth of the ministers in the Church of Scotland. The king cannot be personally acquainted with one in a thousand of those whom he appoints to the most important offices in the church ; he must therefore of necessity be guided by the recommendation of his confidential servants ; and as their personal knowledge of individuals must be very limited, within the range of a great empire, they must be guided by the recommendation of inferior functionaries, such as lieutenants, and vice-lieutenants, sheriffs and sub-sheriffs of counties, mayors and magistrates of cities, &c., many of whom are also patrons of parishes, in virtue of their offices. Now, what would a Papist do, if it fell to be his duty to recommend or appoint a successor to Cranmer in the see of Canterbury, or to John Knox in the church of Edinburgh ? He could not recommend a heretic, to teach and defend heresy, for this is absolutely inconsistent with the obligation which he is under, to do every thing in his power to extirpate heresy, and promote the interest of his mother church. What then would he do ? He would consult his confessor, who would have a list of Jesuits duly assorted, and fit for all places in both church and state ; both able and willing to conform to reformed episcopacy, or more heritical presbytery, for the laudable purpose of insinuating doctrines that would gradually overturn both, and establish Popery in their stead.

In short, Popish functionaries in a Protestant country, with church patronage, would incur the damnation of their souls, according to their avowed principles, if they were not to do something like what I have supposed, in order to put down the great schism, which they call

the reformation, and restore the Church of Rome to her former power and glory. Every Papist most firmly believes that the Church of Rome is the only true church; that she is destined to recover her lost dominion, wherever it has been lost; and that she shall stand till the end of time; and, besides the obligation which he feels upon his conscience, he believes that it is so highly meritorious to promote Popery, and suppress heresy, that he will receive an eternal reward for what he may be able to do in so good a cause. These things are undeniable; and to admit persons professing such principles, and actuated by such motives, into places of power in a Protestant kingdom, with an established Protestant religion, would indicate such a degree of infatuation, that I should think it could not be seriously proposed by any man who had been at due pains to make himself acquainted with the system.

But I shall be told, that it is unjust to deprive men of their natural rights; and that they ought to enjoy these, whatever may be the consequence. But what are our natural rights? Liberty of worshipping God in such a way as we conscientiously believe to be pleasing to him, is a natural right, of which no power on earth can justly deprive us, while we do not injure, or disturb the peace of our neighbours: but nothing can be the *natural* right of one man, which is not as much the natural right of every man. Now it is not the natural right of every man to be a member of parliament, or a minister of state; and therefore it is not the natural right of any man. Neither is it the natural right of every man, or of any man to be eligible to such places, for that must depend upon certain qualifications which every man does not possess, and of which, men who do possess them, may deprive themselves, as every Papist does by his acknowledged allegiance to a foreign, and, to Protestants, a hostile power. Rights of this kind are entirely *conventional*. They are to be enjoyed and exercised for the good of the community; and every community has a *right* to exclude from places of power those who are incapable, either from want of talents, or from holding principles incompatible with the public good.

The privileges which the Act of 1793 extended to Papists, seem to have been all which they themselves, at that time, contemplated; and while they were yet the subject of petition and expectation, it was confidently maintained, that if these things were conceded, the concession would be considered as complete emancipation; it would produce perfect contentment, and ensure the most flourishing state of peace, happiness, and prosperity in Ireland. Father O'Leary, their most popular writer at that time, thus expresses himself:—"This happy system of toleration could be introduced, by excluding in this kingdom, the Catholics *from any high offices* under the crown; secondly, *from the privilege of sitting in the senate;* thirdly, if the use of arms gives any umbrage, *from the privilege of carrying them*, except to such as have a mind to serve their country in the army, or such persons as are possessed of real or personal estate, amounting to whatever value the legislature may think fit; all other laws heretofore enacted to be null and void. The kingdom would soon flourish; and the brilliant example set to such princes as have not yet thrown open the gates of toleration, would rescue mankind from the heavy yoke which misconstrued religion has laid on their necks." "Thus," says Mr Spearing, "one of their own priests, previous to the grant of these privileges, held them out as the most desirable boon, and viewed them as complete emancipation," p. 224.

Yes: but after these privileges were granted to them, and after they had the most complete toleration, they found out, and they complained to their holy father the Pope, that they were still suffering the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people. See PROT. page 352. This they declare to be their present condition; which verifies what Mr Leslie Foster said in the House of Commons, when the question was discussed in 1811: "Hardly were the political concessions granted, until Ireland was in a flame from end to end, and one continued month of peace and security it has never known from that hour to the present." And those of Lord Redesdale in the House of Lords the same year: "The tone of the Catholics now was very different from what it had been at the commencement of the concessions to them, which were received in the spirit of amity and good will; but the moment they gained a standing place, they assumed the language of menace and intimidation." *Ibid.* pp. 292, 297.

CLXIX.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6TH, 1821.

IN my last Number, I gave an account of the relief granted at different times, during the late reign, to the Papists in Ireland, and of the disabilities to which they are still subject. I showed that the privileges which they obtained by the Act of 1793, were considered by themselves at the time as complete emancipation, seeing that, by that and former Acts, every restriction with regard to liberty of worship, and the education of their children, was removed; and that their present disability is only exclusion from certain offices of power and trust, which they could not possibly hold consistently with their allegiance to the Pope, without doing every thing in their power to subvert our Protestant establishment. Nay, by the Act of 1793, political power was actually conferred upon them; for it gave them the

right of voting for members of parliament; and, to use the language of Lord Redesdale, "the moment they gained this standing place, they assumed the language of menace and intimidation." Having obtained from a Protestant legislature more than they at first expected, they began to aspire to still greater things; and now they regard all that has been conceded to them as nothing; they are still demanding "emancipation," which implies that they are still in bondage; and nothing less will satisfy them now, than the surrender of the kingdom to them. According to their known principles, they must be in bondage while heretics, or a single heretic, shall bear rule over them; and they will never consider themselves "emancipated," till they get the government into their own hands, and till they have accomplished the reconciliation of the kingdom to the See of Rome. This is their object; and I challenge them to deny it, if they can.

And upon the supposition that they really believe their own doctrine, it must appear to them a very proper and laudable object. I suppose if I were a Papist, I would think it so; and all Papists must think it so, else their minds are differently constituted from those of other men. They believe that Jesus Christ gave to St Peter, and through him, to his successor the Pope of Rome, sovereignty over the whole Christian world, including Great Britain and Ireland; and that for supporting Romish Christianity with becoming splendour, their pious ancestors appropriated immense wealth, including thousands of acres of the best land in the kingdom: and built a great number of magnificent edifices, which remain to this day in the hands of heretics. They believe that by an act, or series of acts, of unparalleled wickedness, the king of England threw off his allegiance to the Pope, abandoned the true church, and drew away most of the people with him, as Satan in his apostacy drew away many of the angels from heaven; that, in the most sacrilegious manner, he plundered the holy church of all her wealth, which he bestowed, partly on his courtiers, and partly on a church of his own creation, of which he declared himself the head. I do not say that this is in all respects a correct view of the matter, but it is the view which Papists have of it. A Papist plumes himself on his having remained unshaken in his allegiance to the holy See. On this account he feels himself superior to Protestants, whom he looks upon as heretics and schismatics, and, what is perhaps worst of all, vicious intromitters with the property of his church; in short, as unjustly holding possession of that which belongs not to them, but to his holy mother. He naturally, and, according to his own principles, justly desires the restoration of this property to the right owner, which implies the restoration of the Church of Rome to all her former splendour and power: and he feels himself imperiously called upon to use every means to bring about this happy restoration.

Besides, there was a great deal of property forfeited by Papists in successive rebellions, especially in Ireland, from the time of Queen Elizabeth, down to that of King William. These rebellions were encouraged by the Pope, with a view to the restoration of Popery; and property that was forfeited in consequence of obedience to the Pope, in defence of the true religion, must be considered by Papists as having been unjustly wrested out of the hands of the lawful proprietors. I suppose one-half of the land in Ireland is in this predicament. The present possessors hold it in virtue of purchase, or of inheritance from those to whom Queen Elizabeth, and subsequent sovereigns, gave it, on the attainder of the ancient proprietors; but upon the principles which every Papist holds to be infallible, all these forfeitures were unjust. The property belongs to the lawful heirs and lineal descendants of the ancient proprietors. When Popery shall be re-established, every man will get his own; and it is as a step towards this, that Papists are so anxious to get into Parliament, where they will occupy a higher standing ground; and where, by combination and perseverance, they will ultimately carry their point. There are many poor persons in Ireland, who have the record of their lineage distinctly preserved, who publicly claim to be the heirs of certain estates, who have never relinquished the hope that the property will be restored to them or to their descendants. In order to preserve the knowledge of it, it has been the practice of fathers from age to age, as I have been informed, to lead their children round the boundaries of the lands which they claim as theirs. All this is done in the hope, that one day these lands will revert to the right owners.

Nay, Lord Viscount Carleton, in a speech quoted by Mr Spearing, page 265, tells us, that, "Not many years ago, maps of the Irish forfeited estates were industriously circulated on the continent, an indication that some important object was looked at for attainment; and that it was desirable to conciliate foreign Catholic potentates, with a view to the success of that project. Since the Union, it has been openly avowed, that the Revolution was an usurpation; the exclusion of Roman Catholics from seats in Parliament, an excess of the power of the legislature; that the old Roman Catholic proprietors had never offended; that the confiscations were unjust; and that the present possessors hold by usurpation, and ought to be dispossessed."

What is thus distinctly avowed, is no more than what is naturally to be expected. Papists must desire the restoration of the ancient order and state of things; believing as they do in the divinity of their religion, they confidently ex-

pect such restoration; and what men desire and expect, they will most certainly endeavour to accomplish. Give them the power of doing it, and it shall be done. I say, Papists would do this, because it is natural and reasonable; it is what every man feels he would do, if he were in their circumstances, and believing as they believe.

Nothing can be more natural than that Papists should desire the re-establishment of their religion, and the restoration of what they consider their property; and that they should aspire to places of power, in order to enable them to effect these objects; but that Protestants should labour to help them to it, is beyond measure astonishing. But such is the fact. There is scarcely a company of half a dozen individuals, into which one can enter, in which advocates of what is called "Catholic emancipation," will not be found. Nay, there are Protestants, and Presbyterians too, who go the length of maintaining, that if it be proper to have an established religion, that of Ireland ought to be Popery, seeing Papists are the majority. Upon the same principle it is proper that Mahometanism should be the established religion in Turkey, Arabia, and Persia. And, by all means, be it so, if the government and people in those countries choose to have it so. The powers of Christendom have no right to hinder them, or to force Christianity upon them: but for *Christians* to argue that it is proper and right to establish error, delusion, and idolatry, because the majority of the people are deluded idolaters, would be somewhat strange. Not more strange, however, than for *Protestants* to argue for the establishment of Popery, where the subjects of that delusion happen to be the majority. Putting the question in the above hypothetic form, I would say, if it be proper to have an established religion in any country, it ought to be the *true* religion; in which, I am sure, all Papists will agree with me, whether all Protestants will or not. As Christians and Protestants, we have nothing to do with Popery, or any other false religion, but to endeavour to win men from it by instruction and persuasion. To establish error of any kind, is to throw an obstruction in the way of those who would perform this Christian duty. It is to put a weapon into the hands of the enemies of the truth, with which they will destroy its friends; and to establish Popery in Ireland, would be at once to extinguish the light that has begun to rise upon it; for it is a fact, confirmed by the experience of ages, that where Papists have power, they will persecute to death those who presume to teach genuine Christianity.

There are, however, few Protestants who contemplate the possibility of Popery becoming again the established religion in any part of the British Isles; and, perhaps, fewer who think it ought to be so. Most of the advocates of "emancipation" mean by the term, no more than admissibility into places of power; and judging from their own indifference about the ascendancy of one church more than another, or their consciousness that they would not make use of power, if they had it, to enforce conformity to the principles of their own sect, they charitably conclude that Papists would be equally indulgent to those who did not choose to conform to Popery, and equally indifferent about the re-establishment of it. But all this is contradicted by the avowed principles of Papists, and by every historical fact, for a thousand years, that bears any relation to the subject. Suppose a Papist in Parliament, or in the Privy Council, and disposed to act as liberally as a Protestant, and to refuse to lend himself to promote the designs of his sect, his priest would soon teach him better manners. The salvation of his soul depends upon his keeping on good terms with his confessor, who has power, as he believes, to absolve, or not absolve him, from his sins; and this absolution is usually granted upon condition that the penitent shall undergo some penance, or perform some good work; and of all the good works that can be thought of by a Papist, there is none more meritorious than the extirpation of heresy, that is, the Protestant religion, and the establishment of Popery in its place. If a Papist has really imbibed the spirit of his religion, the work will appear to himself in this meritorious light, and he will feel it to be his most imperious duty; and if he has not this as the result of his own conviction, his confessor will soon make him both feel and act as he ought to do for the sake of his holy church. No wise man would take into his confidential service, or intrust the charge of his affairs with a known dependent, and sworn vassal of an enemy and a rival; but every Papist, living in a Protestant state, is a vassal and a dependent of a rival and a hostile master, and of course cannot be safely intrusted with power over Protestants, or with the confidential management of their affairs.

I have laid it down as a thing most certain, that by "emancipation," which Papists demand with so much clamour, they mean, ultimately, nothing less than the restoration of the church, and other forfeited property, as well as the establishment of their religion. Well, I suppose there are Protestants so remarkably, and so romantically generous, that they would concede even this to them. I do not recollect having ever heard, or read of this being proposed in so many words; but I have heard doctrines advanced that would naturally lead to it. It is admitted that the tithes and church lands did once belong to Papists; and that many great estates, now in the hands of Protestants, were transferred from Papists, in consequence of what we call their rebellion, but what they call their loyalty and their re-

ligion : and if the Church of Rome, and her adherents, were unjustly deprived of this property, why ought it not to be restored ? Is not restitution a Christian duty ? Yes ; but there is an *if* in the matter ; and *if* they were *not* unjustly deprived of that property, it would be great *injustice* now to take it from those whose ancestors paid a price for it, or who received it as the reward of meritorious services.

I am not going to enter upon the subject of forfeitures and attainders, which are matters merely civil and political. My business is with Popery as a system of false religion, which incapacitates those who believe it from holding places of power and trust, among those who believe and profess the true religion, because it imperiously binds them to use whatever power they may possess to extirpate this. But I suppose all civilians are agreed, that rebellion against the sovereign power, as established by law, infers the forfeiture of the property, and even the life of the rebel. The property reverts to the sovereign, who may give it away, or sell it, as he pleases. There is no injustice in this ; for no subject ever held his property upon any other condition ; and the man who holds property without the condition of allegiance, is not a subject, but a sovereign. But I shall be told, perhaps, that Papists do not admit that the conduct of their ancestors was rebellion ; and I reply by asking, what rebel ever made such an admission ? If the opinion of rebels themselves, and of their approvers, be the rule by which we are to judge, there never was rebellion in the world, and never will be. If modern Papists shall seriously maintain that the conduct of their ancestors, by which they forfeited their estates, was not rebellion ; I shall think it fair to retort, that they hold it lawful to do as their ancestors did ; and that, if Protestants be wise, they will beware of them.

What was called church property, was equally subject to civil allegiance ; for those who gave it to the church, could not convey it more unconditionally than they themselves received it. The Church of Rome, as such, never owned allegiance to the Protestant sovereign of Britain ; and, of course, cannot lawfully hold property ; and if she had done so, it would long ago have been forfeited by the rebellions excited by her head, which must be understood to have had the consent of the members. In point of fact, however, the church property was not in general confiscated, except in Scotland, where, perhaps, *plundered* would be the better word. In England and Ireland it was appropriated for the support of the purer system of the Reformation, and so it continues to this day. I have made these few remarks, in order to show, that in a religious and moral point of view, there is no injustice done to Papists by their exclusion from places of power, or in refusing to restore to them the property which their ancestors forfeited ; for if it could be shown that there was *injustice* in the case, I would abandon the defence of it, being convinced that what is morally wrong, cannot be politically right.

It will perhaps be said that I have assumed a great deal about the devotion of Papists to the See of Rome, and their hostility to our Protestant government. I have done so, because evidence upon the point is so abundant and so accessible, that any man who chooses may satisfy himself on the subject. Till of late, indeed, this evidence had to be sought for in books which were not in every library ; but the Reverend Mr Graham in his Annals of Ireland, commencing in 1535, and coming down to the period of the Revolution, and Mr Spearing in his Work, which comes down to the present day, furnish such a compendium, with reference to such unquestionable authorities, that any man may, in a few hours, obtain such a view of the subject, as will make him dread the admission into places of power over him, persons who really are not their own masters, but the bond slaves of a spiritual power that is bent on the overthrow of the Protestant religion, and the destruction of its active defenders.

With a few extracts from the last mentioned work, I shall conclude the present Number. I have selected a few facts of recent occurrence, not of ancient date, in order to show that the hostility of Papists against Protestants is as determined and bloody as ever it was. The following are given on the authority of Sir Richard Musgrave, who wrote a history of the last Irish rebellion :—

" James Beagham, executed on Vinegar Hill, the 24th of June, 1799, for various murders, which, he said, he was instigated by Popish priests to commit, confessed, that every man that was a Protestant was called an Orangeman, and every one was to be killed, from the poorest man in the country. They thought it no more sin to kill a Protestant than a dog." " It appears, on the evidence of different persons, that one hundred and eighty-four Protestants were burnt in the barn of Scullabogne, where they had been collected for the purpose, and that thirty-seven were shot at the front of it." " Ninety-seven Protestants were put to death on the bridge of Wexford in the following manner :—Two rebels pushed their pikes into the breast of the victim, and two into his back ; and, in that state, writhing with torture, they held him suspended, until dead, and then threw him over the bridge into the water." " One of the favourite toasts at the convivial meetings of the rebels, was, 'A total extirpation of the Protestants.' " " It was often asserted in the committees, that a person would ensure salvation by killing a certain number of Protestants :"—" That a Roman Catholic would

certainly go to heaven, if he killed three Protestants." p. 238, 239.

I expect to be censured by some of our very liberal Protestants for bringing these horrible facts to their view; and yet they are only a specimen of what Sir Richard Musgrave has given upon authority, to which it is impossible to refuse to give credence, and which, so far as I know, has never been contradicted. The following is from Jackson's narrative:—

"The extinction of the Protestant religion was the favourite idea of the great mass of the rebels, and their strongest motive to action. In the town of Wexford, Protestant men and women were obliged to recant; and, with their children, were required to be baptized in the Catholic chapel, after the Roman Catholic manner, and to attend mass. Even the protection granted by the priests to the Protestant men and women, after they had been thus baptized, was, 'Protect, in the name of Jesus Christ, A. B. he or she having been made a Christian, and a member of the Catholic church.' (Signed by the priest.)"

At the battle of Three Rocks, before the town of Wexford was taken by the rebels, a priest, of the name of Murphy, marched at their head, telling them to follow him, and not to fear; for if they took up the dust from the roads, and threw it at the king's troops, they would fall dead before them. The rebel camps were constantly attended by numbers of priests, saying mass every day, and pretending to give charms which would prevent the balls of the soldiers from injuring them." "That no compunction might arise in their breasts, on account of the murders they were daily committing, their priests assured them it was ordained by God, and that it had been prophesied there should be but one religion, and that was to be the Roman Catholic; so that in destroying the Protestants, they were performing a duty to heaven." p. 240.

In the Report of the Secret Committee of the House of Lords, we have the following singular disclosure:—From the information, on oath before four magistrates, of Richard Granby, farmer, 23d of June, 1798, who had escaped from the rebels;—"Saith, that he attended mass, celebrated by Edward Murphy, parish priest of Bannow; that, after mass, he heard said Murphy preach a sermon, in which he said, 'Brethren, you see you are victorious every where,—that the balls of the heretics fly about you, without hurting you,—that few of you have fallen, whilst thousands of the heretics are dead; and that the few who have fallen, was from deviating from our cause, and from want of faith; that this visibly is the work of God, who is now determined, that the heretics, who have reigned upwards of a hundred years, should be now extirpated, and the true Catholic religion established.' And deponent saith, that this sermon was preached after the battle of Ross; and saith, that he has heard several sermons preached by the priest to the same effect; and farther saith, that he has heard several of the rebels, who had been at the battle of Enniscorthy, and elsewhere, declare, that Edward Roche, the priest, did constantly catch the bullets that came from his Majesty's army in his hand, and give them to the rebels to load their guns with. Deponent farther saith, that any Protestant who was admitted into the rebel army, was first baptized by a Roman Catholic priest: and that every Protestant who refused to be baptized, was put to death; and that many, to save their lives, suffered themselves to be baptized." p. 249.

The reader is requested to remember, that this is not a narrative of what took place hundreds of years since. It happened little more than twenty years ago, soon after Papists had obtained what they had formerly considered complete emancipation; and, if I am not misinformed, there are Papists at this day in Glasgow, who know the truth of these things, not from mere report, but from their own personal acquaintance with them. Surely these facts ought to convince every one of the bloody hostility which still exists with Papists, not only against the Protestant religion, but also against the persons of Protestants; and they assure us of what we may expect, whenever such enemies shall obtain power over us.

No. CLXX.

SATURDAY, October 13th, 1821.

A few days ago I had a call from a venerable old man, who addressed me to the following effect:—"You ought to tell the Papists, that, seeing they are the only Christians, and are sure of going to heaven; and that, as we are heretics and must go to hell, they ought to be content with the kingdom of heaven; and leave us unmolested to manage the affairs of this world, which, they say, is all *our* portion." Having "dropt this word," my visitor immediately took leave, and left me to ruminate on what I had heard. His words have often recurred to my mind, and the more I think of them, the more force I perceive in the sentiment which they express.

Papists are incessantly boasting that they hold the very religion which the apostles taught; that their doctrines are in *every iota* the very same that were held by the Christians in Rome, when Paul wrote to them, that he thanked God on their behalf, and that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. I have just been reading Bishop Milner's great work, "The End of Religious Controversy;" the Alpha and Omega of which seems to be what I have here stated; namely, that the Church of Rome is in every respect such a

church as the apostles planted; that Papists are just such Christians as were addressed by Paul in Rome, Ephesus, and Corinth; and that this would have been the case though the apostles and evangelists had not taken the trouble of writing a word about a Christian church, or Christianity itself. I must, however, do the Bishop the justice to say, that he does not in so many words deny the truth of what the apostles wrote, though he adduces many things from what he calls the "unwritten word of God," (tradition) not very consistent with that which has been written. But, in reference to the point in hand, I have not found, even in his work, a scripture, or even a traditionary example, of the primitive Christians demanding to be admitted into high offices in the state. We do not hear a clamour, or even a whisper of discontent among them because they were excluded from such offices; or because the heathen Romans kept the good things of this world to themselves, and managed the business of this world without calling Christians into their council. The fact is, the primitive Christians *were* satisfied with their heavenly inheritance, as my visitor says Papists ought to be, and which they would be, if they were like them. They were not desirous of great things in this world. If the civil government afforded them protection, and freedom of worship, it was all they desired; and whether they were favoured with these or not, they were taught to pray for kings and all in authority over them, that they might live quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty.

We know that there were Christians even in the court of Nero, when Paul was a prisoner in Rome; (Phil. i. 13.) and seeing the providence of God had brought them there, or his grace had found them there, they would no doubt study to behave in every respect as became Christians; but we hear nothing of Christians aspiring to places at court, or in the senate, or clamouring about exclusion from the senate, being an infringement of their natural rights. If they had, we may be sure Paul would have addressed them in some such language as Jeremiah did his companion, Baruch, "Seekest thou great things for thyself? seek them not." After all, we have no evidence that Nero's Christian courtiers were men in power, like modern ministers of state, else they would surely have found means to release Paul from bondage, which would have been a very laudable "emancipation." I believe these courtiers were slaves themselves—men and women whose personal emancipation would have been a desirable boon; yet Christians, even in these circumstances, were instructed by this apostle so to prize and rejoice in their heavenly inheritance, as to make little account of their personal slavery. "Art thou called, being a servant, (the word is *a slave*,) care not for it; but if thou *mayest* be free, choose it rather."

The question is not about the lawfulness of masters having slaves; but since the state of society was such that servants were generally in that condition, it was the duty of Christian servants or slaves, to serve their masters faithfully and without repining. In like manner, the question is not, whether the Roman emperors acted wisely or lawfully in not taking Christians into the senate but seeing they were not admitted, at least for many ages, it was their duty as Christians to be content without civil power; and to be in subjection to lawful authority as much as if they had held places of authority themselves. And such was the case in point of fact. The inspired apostles enjoined subjection in the strongest manner; and it does not appear that they were disobeyed. Seditions were classed with other immoralities which rendered those who did them unfit for the kingdom of heaven; and had Paul heard of a seditious person in any church, or of one who disturbed the public peace by claiming to have a share in the government of the empire, he would have reproved that church as severely as he did that in Corinth for suffering an incestuous person among them.

Now, if our modern Papists were precisely of the same faith and character as the primitive Christians were, they would be equally peaceable, and contented with their religious privileges, especially as they enjoy protection and toleration, which the primitive Christians did not, and as they have the happiness of living under a government a thousand times more worthy of respect and obedience than was that of Rome in the time of Nero. If it shall be replied that the Romans were heathens, and that Christians could have little comfort in being associated with them in the government of the empire, I shall admit that it is true; though this is not the reason given for the duty of obedience; nor does it appear that it would have been the duty of Christians to decline being associated with heathens when they were lawfully called to serve their country along with them, though, having their inheritance and their hearts in heaven, they would not be desirous of honour or power in this world, much less would they be clamorous for it, or disposed to disturb the public peace if they did not obtain it.

But if the Romans were heathens, Protestants are heretics, which in the view of a Papist is much worse. The Pope does not excommunicate heathens, but heretics he does excommunicate every year, on holy Thursday. It must, therefore, not only be very uncomfortable for Papists to be associated with them in Parliament, or in the government of the kingdom, but it must be absolutely unlawful; for to have any voluntary, unnecessary communication with heretics, is to partake of their heresy. It is known, and ought not to be forgotten, that a dreadful sentence of excommunication and

damnation lies particularly upon the throne of Britain, and upon all the states of Parliament. It was first pronounced against the throne in the person of Henry VIII. and repeated in those of Elizabeth and James I. As this sentence was never revoked, it remains to this day in as much force as ever. Now, I ask Papists, how could they hold places in a government that lies under such a curse? It is possible to be associated with heathens in any sort of public business, especially such liberal and tolerant heathens as most of the Romans were, without suffering inconvenience, or being conscious of contamination; but with heretics, who lie under the solemn curse of the most holy head of the Catholic Church, it is impossible to be so associated, without danger of incurring a part at least of the dreadful malediction; and, therefore, to return to the point from which I set out, Papists ought to be content with the kingdom of heaven, which, they say, is exclusively theirs, and leave the government of this worldly kingdom to those who have no portion or part in their inheritance. If they cannot be persuaded to act thus from choice, as the primitive Christians did, they should feel themselves compelled from necessity to do it. And, indeed, I am persuaded this would be their feeling on the subject, were it not that they expect, by getting into power, to supplant the heretics altogether; and they know well how to submit to a little inconvenience, or even do a little evil, for the sake of effecting a great good.

This, I know, is the very point they would be at; and they are not now at much pains to conceal it. They have now got such a broad "standing ground" in their legal privileges, and in the favour of nominal Protestants, that they can venture to speak plainly out, and tell what they want. Thus, on a late occasion, when it was proposed to lay open Parliament to them, and all places of power, with two or three exceptions, the proposers of the measure, in the childlike simplicity of their hearts, proposed something that they called securities; and they had not a doubt but that Papists would become bound not to do any thing that should tend, directly or indirectly, to injure, or affect the interests of the established church. Some leading laymen among them were, I believe, willing to come under this obligation; but the clergy instantly took the alarm. Meetings were held both in England and Ireland, and resolutions were published, in which it was explicitly declared that the securities were inadmissible; and one document in particular, which was signed by Vicar Apostolic Milner, plainly stated, that they could not become bound not to do any thing that should tend to the overthrow of the established religion, seeing that was the very end and tendency of all their preaching and writing. This was honest and honourable. It contained nothing new; for every person acquainted with Papists and their system, knew it before. But persons ignorant of these, did not know it, and would not believe it, till they had it from such high and unexceptionable authority; and there are some on whom my writing could make no impression, who were convinced in a moment, when they saw it under the hand of JOHN MILNER, D. D. F. A. S. V. A. M. D.

That Doctor Milner speaks the sentiments of Papists in general, is very evident, from the applause with which a speech by Dr Dromgoole was received by a great public meeting in Dublin, which speech the doctor afterwards published and defended. Speaking of the "oath for Catholic members of Parliament," he says, "it is nearly similar to the ordinary oath of allegiance; it is drawn up in the same cautious and suspicious manner—the clauses and observations are of the same insulting and calumnious kind. But both go to a solemn pledge to support, not the succession, but the PROTESTANT succession of the crown." This is what Papists cannot swear to; and it is considered "insulting" to propose it to them. "How gross," says he, "the ignorance that would propose such an oath unless it was meant to insult! and how absurd and persumptuous to suppose that it would be accepted! Are these the securities that are sought for the protection of the Protestant Church? If so, she cannot obtain them. She might, according to the penalties of that bill, see, indeed, the Catholic pastors driven from their flocks—she might see them subjected to obloquy, privation, and insult—she might see them transported as felons, and suffering as murderers;—but she would never see them so lost, so abandoned, as to take the oath which was proposed—an oath not to seek, *directly* or *indirectly*, the subversion of the Protestant church! Why, this would be to abuse the divine command, which says, 'Go, teach all nations.'" After describing what he considers the danger of the established church from dissenters, he adds, "the columns of catholicity are collecting, WHO CHALLENGE THE POSSESSION OF THE ARK, and unfurling the *oriflamme*, display its glorious motto—Εν τουτῳ νικα."

Yes: the possession of the ark is what they challenge;—that is, the established church and its immense property; for this purpose "the columns of catholicity are collecting;" that is, Papists are collecting their strength, and preparing to take by storm what they are not yet sure of getting by capitulation. This is pretty plainly intimated by the allusion to the fiery cross with its Greek motto. In his published defence of the speech, the orator tells us how much it was applauded by the meeting:—"It met," he says, "with the most complete concurrence. The speaker was frequently interrupted by applause; and the resolution was passed with marks of enthusiastic appro-

bation. The whole assembly, the galleries and all the members of the board, with the exception of two or three individuals, rose up together; and with clapping of hands, waving of hats, and long continued cheering, gave the most unequivocal proofs of their entire satisfaction."

In another speech, the same orator addressed the board as follows: "My opinions, as I have given them, I would declare before the privy council or the bench of bishops. I desire no man to adopt them; and, in their rejection, for myself I shall feel nothing, but I shall feel a great deal for the character of the board. Recollect, gentlemen, that those are the opinions of a Catholic—that they are yours, if you be Catholic—and that they are notoriously the opinions of every well-informed Catholic on the face of the earth. I have ventured, in order to prevent an oath from being enacted, which could not, in its present form, be taken, to state one of the religious objections which we have to the Protestant Church. And because a few hired paupers have made a noise in the city, and a few ragged Orangemen, in Derry or Belfast, have come together in consequence, if such be the case, are you to make a solemn disavowal of your principles? And if you do, will you be believed? Is there a Protestant of any description, in any of these kingdoms, that does not know that you have objections to the religion of the state? And if you say the contrary, how can they believe you? Are you prepared, like slaves before their offended masters, to get upon your knees, and say, that indeed you meant no offence—*that the Protestant Church is not in danger*—that you have no objections to the tenets it holds—that you, for your part, do not think that it is *novel*, or that it will have an end? If you do this, you will be disgraced and laughed at—your fellow-catholics will be ashamed of you, and Protestants will hold you in contempt."

The doctor, in his vindication, says, "Let no man deceive himself. As long as the Catholic is oppressed, and conceives that his political degradation is to be referred to the Church of England—that it must co-exist with the duration of that church—so long he can have no alternative—he must unavoidably, and in spite of himself, desire to see that system changed or destroyed." Again—"This is not the only crime of which the writer has been guilty. He has dared to say, with an appearance of satisfaction, that the Church of England will fall; and that nothing but the memory of the mischiefs she has created will survive. *Well, this is his belief, and the belief of every Catholic in the world.*" See Mr Spearing's work, pp. 383—388, where will be found much more to the same purpose.

In my last Number, I endeavoured to show, that in the very nature of the thing, it was to be supposed that Papists would desire the overthrow of the established religion. This is fully confirmed by the publications and the speeches of their leading men, as I think will appear from the preceding extracts. Surely our ultra liberal Protestants will believe them, if they should not believe The Protestant, who is supposed to be prejudiced on this subject. Dr Milner tells us, that all the preaching and writing of himself and brethren, tend to this very object,—the overthrow of the established church; and Dr Dromgoole, and the "Catholic board" that applauded his speech, tell us as plainly, that they intend to establish Popery in its stead. This is what is meant by chal lenging possession of the ark, for taking which the columns of catholicity are collecting. Their bishops are looking at the cathedrals as theirs in point of right, as they hope they shall soon be in reality; and all the inferior stalls have their anxious expectants. They demand political power for the very purpose of bringing this about. Along with this, as a thing of course, the kingdom will be reconciled to the holy See, that is, brought under the dominion of the Pope; and Protestants of every name will be extirpated. I must do the Papists the justice to say, that they have honestly and plainly given us warning; and if Protestants will be so silly as put it in their power to subvert the Protestant religion, and establish Popery, they deserve to suffer the consequence of their own folly; but for the sake of their innocent children, on whom chiefly the evil would fall, I hope they will pause, and see it to be their duty to transmit to posterity those privileges which our fathers procured for us at the expense of their blood.

I quoted parts of Dr Dromgoole's speech, not for the purpose of replying to it, but to show how boldly he proclaims the views of his party. There is one thing, however, which I must not pass without notice. He represents the "Catholic" as "oppressed," and conceiving "that his political degradation is to be referred to the Church of England." And certain public meetings, held by Papists in Ireland, in 1813, published the following, among other resolutions:—"*That if there be a God in heaven*, our cause cannot be indifferent to his providence! and if there be justice on earth, our slavery must be near its termination." *Spearing's True State, &c.* p. 380. What the one calls *slavery*, and the other *oppression* and *political degradation*, is nothing more than exclusion from certain offices of power and trust, which their allegiance to a foreign power renders them incapable of holding, as I showed at length in the Number before last. Nothing, therefore, but the spirit of falsehood that prevails in the Church of Rome, would represent their condition as that of slavery, oppression, and degradation; and even if it were so, it is sufficiently absurd to ascribe it to the Church of England, seeing the law as it stands was the act of King, Lords, and Commons; and, I sup-

pose, the church was never consulted in the matter. It is a political arrangement intended to maintain the security of the established government in church and state; and the same restrictions would attach to members of the Church of England itself, if they held principles which prevented them from maintaining undivided allegiance to king George. I can prove this by a historical fact, known to all the world. There are thousands of Episcopalians in Scotland who are in full communion with the Church of England. These lay for a whole century under similar restrictions with those which still attach to Papists, and for the same reason,—they held principles (conscientiously I believe) which did not admit of undivided allegiance to the reigning family. It was impossible, in the very nature of the thing, consistently with public security, that they should have been eligible to seats in Parliament, while the obstacle continued; and so far as appears, they did not expect or desire it. They were exposed to the penalty of some very severe laws, in which they were designated simply, "those of the Episcopal communion in Scotland." Certainly it was not meant by these laws to persecute episcopacy, or to enslave, oppress, and persecute Episcopalians on account of their religion, for those who made the laws were Episcopalians. Unfortunately, those of that religion in Scotland, were known to be attached to King James; and it was on this account, not because they were Episcopalians, that they suffered such disabilities. When prince Charles died, the obstacle was removed. They were then willing to take the oaths to king George; in 1792, an act was passed for their relief; and they are now under less restriction than the members of the Church of Scotland, seeing they are not required, in order to admission to places, to take the sacrament in a communion different from their own.

In one sense, the obstacle was a religious one. It regarded the obligation of an oath, which is undoubtedly a religious matter. The Scotch bishops had, in their official capacity, sworn allegiance to king James and *his heirs;* and this was considered as not only binding them personally to James, but also as binding their successors in office to his natural heirs, as his successors. The question is not, whether, by fair construction, the oath of allegiance did so bind them; or whether they were not relieved from the obligation of their oath by the king's breach of his? But seeing, in point of fact, that body did consider themselves bound by oath to James and his heirs, they were necessarily incapable of holding places under king George. This incapacity arose from a conscientious, *religious,* though, I think, mistaken principle; but it would be absurd to call it persecution on account of religion; for they are still of the same religion in every point, and hold the same opinion, with regard to the obligation of the oath, which, since the death of the Pretender, is merely a matter of speculation, and does not interfere with practical subjection to the house of Hanover.

Let Papists "emancipate" themselves from a foreign yoke, and place themselves in circumstances capable of maintaining undivided allegiance to their lawful sovereign; in other words, let them renounce the Pope, and the arbitrary and slavish principles connected with their owning him, and they will then be prepared for the same privileges which the Scotch Episcopalians have enjoyed for thirty years.

CLXXI.

SATURDAY, October 20th, 1821.

My object, in some of my late Numbers, was to show, that the exclusion of Papists from places of power in a Protestant government is a necessary measure of self-defence, occasioned by their well-known principles of attachment to a foreign power, and hostility to the Protestant religion; that such exclusion is not unjust in a moral point of view; and that it is not persecution on account of religion. This last article was illustrated, at the conclusion of my last Number, by an allusion to the well-known fact, that persons in Scotland, of the very same religion with the King and Parliament of Great Britain, suffered the same disabilities as Papists do, for a whole century after the revolution; and they would have been suffering them still, had the cause of them not ceased to exist, on the extinction of the Stuart line, when the adherents of that family conformed in every respect to the established order in church and state, by subscribing the thirty-nine Articles, and taking the oaths which recognised the title of the house of Hanover.

If the Pope of Rome, and Rome itself, with the whole conclave, were as extinct as the race of king James; and if it were as impossible to raise up successors to the Pope and Cardinals, as it is to create heirs of that king's body; I would not see so much danger in conceding the "Catholic claims." Indeed there would be no occasion to concede them, for then there would be no political barrier to divide the allegiance of Papists, or to prevent them from taking the oaths to king George. There would be nothing then to unite them in one body, as a kingdom within the kingdom, threatening the overthrow of the established government. In order to the enjoyment of constitutional rights, it would not be asked what nonsense they believed, or did not believe. Their entire political conformity would throw their religious errors as much into the shade as those of other sects, or of individuals who have no fixed principles of religion at all. It is most desirable that all men in power were free from religious

errors; that they held the Christian doctrine pure and entire as it is taught in the bible; and that they lived and acted under its influence; but as the kingdoms of this world are constituted, that is not to be expected. There may be men in power, and high power too, whose religious principles are as inimical to the salvation of their own souls as the most impious dogmas of Popery, without being disqualified for managing the affairs of the nation, or unworthy of our confidence with regard to loyalty and patriotism. Indeed some of the fundamental errors of Popery are entertained by every man who does not cordially embrace the Christianity of the Bible. They are the errors of our fallen nature; such as inadequate views of the holiness and justice of God, of the evil of sin, and of our own estrangement from God on account of it. Right apprehensions of these things are necessary to the salvation of a man's soul; but they are not necessary to his being a politician and a statesman; and therefore I would not insist on entire orthodoxy of religious belief as a qualification for places of power.

Yet there are things of a religious nature, which ought not to be forgotten, in reference to political matters. An atheist, for instance, could not safely be intrusted with power over the persons and property of others, because there is no moral tie by which he can be bound to do justly. The same remark will apply to some of the errors of Popery, such as transubstantiation, and that it is lawful to put heretics to death; and therefore it is that I said merely that I would not see *so much* danger in conceding the "Catholic claims," if the Pope were disowned and his power destroyed; for there would still be danger to the peace and happiness of the community, if men were raised to power over us, who thought it right to punish men with death for their religious opinions; and men who did not believe their own senses of seeing, feeling, tasting, and smelling; for persons who will not receive the testimony of these in evidence of a fact, would be very incompetent to judge of any other evidence, and, therefore, incapable of presiding in courts of justice.

It is needless, however, to speak of Popery as separated from the Pope. We must take it as it is and has been for ages; and, in order to show farther the danger that is to be apprehended from admitting Papists to places of power, I shall proceed to give a summary of the statutes by which Papists are bound to extirpate heresy and heretics, and a recent example of the manner in which power is exercised by them among themselves, even by priests over men of their own order, from which we may guess how rigorously they would deal with heretics, if they had but their faces at the grindstone. I allude to the case of a Popish priest in Ireland, who, a few months ago, published a statement under the following title: "A Developement of the Cruel and Dangerous Inquisitorial System of the Church of Rome in Ireland, and of its particular operations in the case of the Author, the Rev. L. Morrissy, Parish Priest of Oning and Templeorum, in the Diocese of Ossory and County of Kilkenny, and Roman Catholic Chaplain to his Majesty's Prisons in Dublin"—1821. I received a copy, at the time of its publication, from a clergyman of the established church, who is intimately acquainted with the author, of whose character he speaks in terms of high commendation. The following is extracted from his Preliminary Observations:—

"When I attempt to treat of the detestable tribunal of the Inquisition, which, at different times, overwhelmed the Catholic countries of Europe with distress and dismay, and corrupted the principles of morality and the integrity of the human mind, wherever its progress was permitted and its direful effects felt with impunity; my principal object is to discover how far this diabolical system extends its baneful influence over the minds, the morals, and the inclinations of the inhabitants of poor distracted Ireland; and also how far a revolutionary spirit of disloyalty and subversion of what is deemed heretical monarchy is engendered and hatched among a certain portion of his Majesty's subjects, for the horrid purposes prescribed by the legislators of this holy tribunal, yet undiscovered and uncontrolled in our native soil to the present time. For the better understanding of the mortal hatred entertained by Roman Catholics against all other sects, I shall make use of the same appellations given them by their declared enemies and sworn opponents."

"I had always a natural repugnancy to all revolutionary systems and disloyal principles. These, my opinions, provoked the obloquy and indignation of my spiritual superiors and clerical brethren, and brought on me such a flood of persecutions, as induced me to make diligent search into the different modes of ecclesiastical government at different periods, and I found, by woful experience, that the inquisitorial system entirely differs from the true discipline practised in the early ages of the church. From the practical knowledge I have acquired for the long period of upwards of twenty years on the Irish mission, and intimate information I have received for a considerable time in Rome, both by theory and practice, in the inquisitorial courts of that capital, wherein my case was in agitation for the space of four years, I consider myself bound in conscience, for the sake of religion, the good of my country, and preservation of the state, to disclose and make public those detestable measures and treasonable plots, (now in contemplation,) that will ultimately terminate in the destruction of——, if not timely prevented by *legal interference*

and necessary precaution. For this laudable purpose I brought with me from Rome the best and most recent documents, which I can produce on proper application being made."

Before giving a statement of his own case, he gives a summary of the law, as it stands in the Church of Rome, with regard to heretics, which is as follows:—

"The first constitution of Pope Innocent IV. beginning *Cum adversus.* This constitution was enacted the 31st October, 1242, which contains the following laws:—

"1. *Ut Heretici*—That heretics, condemned by the Roman Catholic Church, &c. are to be handed over to the secular power for punishment, (*where the secular power supports this tribunal.*)

"2. That heretics, although penitent, are to be perpetually imprisoned.

"3. That heretics are to be taken up every where, and consigned to the Inquisitors.

"4. That the favourers and abettors of heretics are to be punished, as well as heretics themselves, &c.

"5. That they are, by virtue of the same law, to be punished in like manner, even in case they would make their escape and fly to another country.

"6. That the repentance of heretics, who relapse, is not to be received.

"7. That their appeals are not to be listened to, or received.

"8. That their descendants, to the second generation, are to be deprived of their temporal benefices and public offices.

"9. That the Inquisitors are to be favoured every where.

"10. That heretics are to be carefully kept in custody until they are condemned.

"11. That heresy is to be accounted among public crimes, and adjudged greater than the crime of high treason.

"12. That impenitent heretics are to be burned alive.

"13. That the favourers of heretics are to be perpetually banished, and their properties confiscated.

"14. That the children of the favourers and abettors of heretics, are deprived and expelled from all dignities and honours, except they would discover of some heretic.

"15. That heretics are to be always looked upon and considered as infamous people, and not to be confided in; that their goods are to be confiscated, and that their children cannot inherit their property.

"16. That those who are suspected of heresy, unless they satisfactorily clear themselves from that suspicion, are considered as *infamous people,* and as *banditti;* and if they persevere for twelve months under this suspicion, they are to be condemned as heretics, &c.

"17. That those invested with the civil power, and rectors in their respective places, are to be bound down by an oath to prosecute heretics publicly.

"18. That many more punishments, to be mentioned hereafter, are to be inflicted on those who favour heretics, and also on those who believe them.

"19. That these laws are universal, and are to be observed and put in execution every where, &c.

"20. That heresy is never to be tolerated; but, on the contrary, is always to be punished. (HERESIS NUNQUAM TOLERANDA, SED SEMPER PUNIENDA.)

"Pope Boniface VIII. afterwards confirmed the above laws in the year 1294.

"Pope Clement V. (A. D. 1305) made a similar constitution against repealing the punishments prescribed by his predecessors against heretics.

"The first constitution of Pope John XXII. Incipiens, (*ex parte*) 1410. This Pope described heretics and their crimes in the following manner:—

"1. The crime of heresy, by its own impiety, exceeds all other impiety; it is more execrable than all other crimes, and therefore calls aloud for more severe punishments than all other crimes do.

"2. Heretics are the receptacles of all wickedness, as they are described in the 23d chapter of St Matthew, Duces Cæci, &c. viz. the leaders of the blind, serpents, the generation of vipers, full of rapine and impurity, of baseness, hypocrisy, and iniquity. Therefore, the Son of the Most High wished to have his immaculate and spotless church armed with a two-edged sword, in order to bring these nefarious and wicked sects to the paths of truth, or inflict *perpetual punishments.*

"3. It is forbidden to receive heretics, though allied by affinity and consanguinity.

"4. Heresy, though ever so trivial, entirely subverts faith.

"5. The Popes never repealed or abrogated the constitutions established by their predecessors against heretical pravity, but, on the contrary, generally confirmed, and renewed them occasionally, viz. Paul IV. in const. 19. an. 1555, and Pius V. in const. 22. an. 1566, beginning *Inter Multiplices.*

"In his 4th const. Pope John XXII. did not monopolize what did not belong to himself, alluding to this country, whereas it is clearly evident, that the kingdom of Ireland was not only tributary, but also feudal to the holy See. To prove that Ireland belongs to St Peter, it suffices to adduce the authority of Adrian IV. When Henry II. desired the possession of this kingdom, he obtained the investiture of it from the same Pope in this manner: "Truly, Ireland, and all other islands which the Son of Justice, Jesus Christ, enlightened, and which received the doctrine of Christianity, are the undoubted right of St Peter, and the holy Roman church,

(as your own majesty hath recognised :) for you have, my dear child, signified to us, that you wish to enter the kingdom of Ireland for the sake of civilizing the people by wholesome laws, and to extirpate the reigning vices practised among them ; and also to pay the tribute of one piece of silver out of every house to St Peter, and to preserve the ecclesiastical rights and jurisdictions inviolate. We, therefore, highly approve of your laudable desire, and give our full assent to your benevolent petition, &c. You may enter that island, and may the inhabitants receive you with due honour, and venerate you as their lord ! The authority of the church is always to be free and kept inviolate, and the tribute of one piece of silver, as aforesaid, to be annually paid to St Peter and to the holy Roman Church." This also the people of Ireland testified, says Polydorus, lib. 13. Histor. Anglic. ibi. de Hen. II. Angliæ rege, qui Hiberniam occuparat. The king went to Dublin, and there convened the bishops and regulars, and treated with them concerning the realm, which he obtained for himself and his posterity : that measure the Irish opposed, and denied him to be their king, unless by the authority of the Pope, because from the time that Christianity was received in the island they gave themselves and their all up to him ; and they constantly affirmed (as they do now assert) that they will have no other lord or king but the Pope. The king having heard these declarations, shortly after implored, by legates, Alex. III. Adrian's successor, to join Ireland, which he lately civilized, to the kingdom of England, by his authority, and the same Pope, by the apostolic authority, confirmed to him and his heirs the aforesaid kingdom of Ireland.

" Constitution 9. John XXII. beginning *Exigit*, &c. The Popes allow the Inquisitors to have armed people about them, for the suppression of heretical pravity, and self-defence, &c.

" Const. 12. of Pope John also, (*Cum nonnulli.*) Roman Catholics are forbidden to associate with heretics, &c. ; if they do, they are liable to be suspected of heresy, and to be punished by the Inquisitors, &c.

" Const. 10. of Pope Martin V. (A. D. 1428.)

" 1. In this constitution he enacted many punishments both against laics and clergymen who would indite an ecclesiastic before a civil tribunal, and commence an action either real, personal, mixed, civil, or criminal. The punishments fulminated against them are, 1st, An excommunication with respect to all opponents. 2nd, An interdict with respect to the community ; and 3dly, A clergyman concerned in citing another clergyman, loses his cause, *ipso jure*, without any privilege of evading such censures or punishments.

" A lay judge incurs the same punishments by bringing clergymen to an account, or to trial before his own tribunal.

A. D. 1555, Pope Paul IV. said, that the benefices of heretics become vacant the very instant they fall into heresy, *ipso jure*.

" Pope Pius IV. also declared the same, A. D. 1559, and several others.

" 19th March, 1587, Sixtus V. decreed, that letters should be sent free to the general Inquisitors all over the world.

" Pope Paul V. A. D. 1605, declared it a violation of faith to abjure the deposing and absolving powers in cases of heresy, viz. Powers to depose heretical kings, and in their realms to create Catholic kings—Powers to absolve subjects from their oaths of allegiance to heretical monarchs.

" A. D. 1642, Urban VIII. and after him, in the year 1663, Alexander VII. granted the same privileges—and *Pius V. on all occasions to Ireland.*

" Benedict XIV. in the last century, made several constitutions against heretics, at the head of his cardinals, in his palace at *Monte Cavallo.* In one of these he says, that a man who incurs a censure on account of heresy, cannot be absolved by an ordinary confessor, but by a clergyman who hath an express faculty for that purpose ; therefore I recollect my bishop, Dr Marum of Kilkenny, wanted me some time back to go to his Diocesan Penitentiary for absolution ; I refused to comply with such an absurdity ; this, of course, increased his indignation. I could mention several other decrees and bulls of this same century.

" There are many other constitutions and decretals made and established for the horrid purposes of murdering heretics, confiscating their properties, and disinheriting their children ; for degrading, dispossessing, and burning clergymen who would befriend, receive, abet, or defend heretics ; also for the sacrilegious purposes of *remitting the sins—granting indulgences—and imposing sacramental penances* productive of *grace* and *remission of crimes* to those who should *imbrue their hands in the blood of heretics, particularly proscribed heretics, excommunicated* (*ipso jure*) *by the holy Apostolic See,* as the Protestants of these countries are, &c. &c.

" I shall not at present enter into a full discussion and minute detail of the laws affecting the lives, properties, and vital happiness of my countrymen, as I intend, without much delay, and as soon as time will permit, to develope the intrigues of foreign power and ecclesiastical influence, and expose the projects of domestic enemies, in their full extent, for the good of my country.

" After quoting (to the present age, from century to century) so many indisputable authorities to prove the real existence of the above laws, can any intelligent and rational man say, or even insinuate, that they are

antiquated and now repealed? However, if any should entertain a doubt, or maintain the contrary, I shall remove all ambiguity and imprint a thorough conviction on the minds of all liberal and well disposed men, by adducing *a living example.* Behold our present Pope Pius VII. together with the congregation of the Universal Inquisition, announcing themselves by insertion in the Rom. Register of 1819, as the authors and abettors of the inquisitorial system!"

In my next Number I shall introduce Mr Morrissy to the more intimate acquaintance of my readers, by inserting part of his personal history, as related by himself. His case is not unlike that of Mr Bourke, which had a conspicuous place in former Numbers. The persecutions which he suffered show, in the most striking manner, that every tender and humane feeling is banished from the minds of persons who administer the law in the Church of Rome; and that nothing whatever can influence them to depart from the course of establishing their own absolute power over those who choose to submit to their ghostly authority. The summary, which is given above, of the existing law with regard to heretics, which Mr Morrissy brought from Rome, will be found to confirm what I have written about the danger to be apprehended from the admission of Papists to places of power in a Protestant kingdom; for heresy, that is, the gospel as believed and professed by Protestants, is declared to be worse than high treason. Every Papist, therefore, who shall possess political power, will feel it to be his indispensable duty to persecute and extirpate heretics to the uttermost; and let them talk as they will about charity and liberality, while they have not the power of the state in their hands, these will be found to be mere empty sounds, when the existing statutes of the holy and infallible church demand their prompt obedience.

My readers are very naturally inquiring, what has become of the Jury Trial, which I promised them long ago?—and the only answer which I can make, is, that there are above a hundred closely printed pages of it lying with my printers, and that I am waiting for more copy from the shorthand writer, who either cannot or will not be induced, by any consideration that I can think of, to make more haste than is agreeable to himself. Nearly four months have elapsed, and he has not yet been prevailed upon to execute what ought to have been done in four days, which has been a grievous disappointment to me and to many others.

No. CLXXII.

SATURDAY, October 27th, 1821.

My last Number contained a summary of the existing laws in the Church of Rome, making it the imperious duty of every Romanist to persecute heretics to the uttermost, even to their complete extirpation. These are given on the authority of a priest of that Church, a man of good moral character, who publishes his statement to the world, and promises to publish more to the same purpose. This is a fair challenge to his brethren of that communion, to defend their church, and refute his statements, if they can; but though six months have elapsed, I have heard of no attempt to answer him, and have seen no advertisement of any such attempt. The silence of the bishop, and of the inferior clergy who are implicated, amounts to an admission that the principles and the facts which Mr Morrissy has brought to view, are incontrovertible; and I do hope that this exposure will tend to open the eyes of some, to the danger of admitting men who hold such principles, and are capable of such practices, into places of power and authority over Protestants—the very persons whom they engage by oath to persecute and destroy. I proceed with my extracts from Mr Morrissy:—

"All Catholics are bound, especially if required, to bring and accuse all heretics, and those suspected of heresy, before the tribunal of the Inquisition. There is a living example of this requisition and immediate compliance in real existence:—when, in the year 1815, the prelate of the diocese of Ossory ordered the clergy and laity to collect and bring their accusations to the inquisitorial tribunal, held in Kilkenny that year in the bishop's house against me."

"Our Irish prelates, Roman Catholic bishops, on the day of their consecration take an oath of allegiance to the reigning Pope and his successors: let not the substance be mutilated or the form deranged, for the original can be produced. I have been lately present at a consecration where such an oath was solemnly taken. The following extracts are selected from it.

"'Ego, electus ecclesiæ N. ab hac hora in antea, fidelis et obediens ero beato,' &c. 'I, N. elect of such a church, from henceforth will be faithful and obedient to St Peter the apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our lord Pope N. and to his successors. I shall never, to their prejudice or detriment, reveal to any man the council they shall intrust me with, either by themselves, their nuncios, or letters. The Roman Papacy, and the regalities of St Peter, I will help them to keep and maintain against all men. I shall take care to conserve, defend, increase, and promote the rights, honours, privileges, and authorities of the holy

Roman Church, for our lord the Pope and his successors. I will observe, with all my power, and shall make others do the same, the rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic (Papal) decrees, ordinations, dispositions, reservations, provisions, and mandates. *I will persecute and fight against all heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our lord the Pope and his successors.* I shall visit personally the shrine of the apostles every third year, and render an account of all my pastoral office to the Pope and his successors, and of all the affairs of my church, and discipline of my clergy and people; and will receive the apostolical or Papal mandates, and shall put them most diligently into execution; and, if justly prevented, I shall make the necessary communication through some other proper clergyman," &c. &c.

"Abbots take the same oath of allegiance and fidelity in their benedictions.

"'Ego, electus monasterii N. ab hac hora in antea, fidelis et obediens ero beato.' &c. 'I, N. elect of such a monastery, from henceforth will be faithful,' &c.

"The Council of Trent decreed that canons, dignitaries, parish priests, and all ecclesiastics who would have the care of souls, and direction of the people, should make a public profession of faith, and take an oath of obedience and fidelity to the Pope and his successors. Sess. xxiv. cap. 12. (tantamount to the above, &c.)

"Pope Pius IV. made a similar decree, and issued a Bull in confirmation of these oaths in the year 1564. 'Pius Episcopus servus servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Nos volentes,' &c. 'We also wishing that, besides the above specified dignitaries and those who preside over the flock, the superiors of monasteries, convents, and all other religious houses of every religious order, should be uniformly bound by the same ties of public obedience to the Roman Church, and solemn oath to the existing Pope and his successors, do order and decree that the following form of the profession of faith and oath of fidelity must be publicly and every where taken, (*ubique gentium,*) received, and observed, by virtue of these presents, and our apostolic authority, under the same punishments prescribed by the Council of Trent.'

"I shall quote a few passages contained in this form of profession of faith, and oath of allegiance, and liege fidelity, &c.

"'Ego, N. firma fide credo et profiteor omnia et singula, &c. 'I, N. with a firm faith believe and profess all and each, &c. I most firmly admit and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all the other observations and constitutions of the same church. I without doubt or hesitation receive and profess all other things defined and declared by the sacred, canonical, and ecumenical councils, especially by the Council of Trent. And, at the same time, I do in like manner condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies of all kind condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Roman Catholic Church. And truly this catholic faith and profession I, at this moment, spontaneously profess and sincerely hold, and the same I shall hold and acknowledge entire and inviolate to the end of my life; *and the same I will, to the utmost of my power, make my subjects and those committed to my charge hold, teach, and preach.* I promise, vow, and swear: so help me God, and these holy gospels of God. We ordain that no person shall infringe or contradict this declaration of our will and mandate: if any will presume to do so, he shall incur the indignation of the Almighty God, and of the holy apostles St Peter and St Paul. Given in Rome, at St Peter's in the year of the incarnation of our Lord 1564, the ides of November, and fifth year of our pontificate.

"'FREDERIC CARD. CESSIUS,
"'*Cæsar Glorierius.*'

"The court of Rome is now appointing and creating notary apostolics more than ever.—These jurisdictionary powers were not before conferred on any besides the clergy, but this time back the same privileges and authority are extended to some of the laity, who are, as well as the clergy, bound by an oath of fidelity and obedience to the holy see.

"Form—'Ego, N. post hanc horam fidelis et obediens ero B. Petro Apos. et Papæ septimo,' &c. as before. 'I, N. shall be faithful to,' &c. 'Papatum Romanum, et regalia S. Petri ac jura Ecclesiæ Romanæ, &c. Jurabo et defendam,' &c. &c. This oath is taken in Ireland before the bishops or their vicars.

"Alexander IV. in his 15th constitution bound the laity to assist bishops and inquisitors to take, &c. heretics; and said that they are bound, especially if asked, to take an oath to that purpose, viz. to assist, counsel, and favour them in their proceedings against heretical pravity, &c.; and in case of their refusal or hindering them, they incur an excommunication, and are to be deprived of their honour and office, and are incapable of holding any office for the future. Innocent IV. and Urban IV. declare the same.

"After advancing so many authentic documents, and quoting so many indisputable authorities, can any rational, intelligent, and impartial man deny that there is a coalition of foreign influence, ecclesiastical overtures, and domestic acquiescence, maintained by mutual engagements and solemn oaths for the execrable purposes already described, by Papal constitutions, decretals of general councils, and ecclesiastical laws of episcopal synods? The long, complicated, and preconcerted measure cannot any longer be hid in the shades of obscurity. Behold the regular concatenation of sanguinary pursuits and sinister views, from the chief pontiff down to the most obscure

plebeian and abandoned character! A solemn attestation of the Divine Being for the confirmation of truth and justice, is now become a bond of iniquity between pontiffs, cardinals, prelates, dignitaries, pastors, clergy, religious and laity, few, comparatively, excepted, for the horrid purposes of exterminating heretics, confiscating their properties, and disinheriting their children—of preventing every resource of redress and vindication, by inflicting similar punishments on their abettors, defenders, and associates! May I presume to ask my learned and conscientious bishops, What are the necessary conditions of a lawful oath? They will, I am confident, reply and say, *truth, justice,* and *judgment.* I shall then take the liberty of asking their lordships, Are all these conditions, or even any of them, to be found in the oath above alluded to, which they take privately in their rooms, or sacristies, in the presence of the consecrating bishop, and the rest of the prelates and clergy, before their public consecration in the chapel? If not, I will again ask, Is an oath given without these conditions, perjury or not? If it is, I shall beg pardon for asking the third time, Is the word, oath, or evidence of a perjurer to be either believed or received? If such an oath is no perjury, the good divines and practical civilians, and all men of sound judgment, are wrong, and deceive others in teaching and inculcating the contrary doctrine. May I here insert the Roman adage—*Semel mendax, semper mendax,—semel perjurus, semper perjurus,*—once a liar always a liar,—once a perjurer, always a perjurer. I may be told by an inquisitor, or even an honest man and good Christian, that, though the holy inquisition, and its binding laws and inquisitorial intrigues, are theoretically planted in Irish hearts, still no presages of its direful operations can be traced, or even allowed by our glorious constitution. I allow in the first instance, that the inquisitorial system cannot be put in force by murdering, burning, imprisoning, &c. but I assert that it is scrupulously and tyrannically put in force, as far as the inquisitors and judges can, without infringing on the restraining laws, or exposing their private views; although their extraordinary zeal and mortal hatred against all other sects and their suspected friends, make them sometimes outstep the legal mark, and inflict intolerant pains and unjust privations, as I shall now disclose by a living example.

"As the foundation of my misfortunes is now laid, I shall briefly begin to relate the painful history.

"In the year 1797, I began my mission in the town of Ballyragget, within three miles of Castlecomer and eight of Kilkenny. In 1798, I had an occasion to show and prove my loyalty in preaching against the rebellion, which at that time threatened destruction in that country. The active part I took in keeping down a revolutionary spirit, and the unfeigned loyalty I showed on all occasions, made inquisitors believe that I was true to my king and country. One day I dined with a Roman Catholic bishop, in company with some of his clergymen. In conversation, they reprobated the conduct of General Johnson for killing the rebels at the battle of Ross, county Wexford. I remarked, that they deserved the punishment for rebelling against their king and constitution;—I was immediately checked by the bishop and clergymen. Here the inquisition began to flash in the face of a suspected abettor of heretical pravity its bitter invectives. (*Si non Verberibus Verbis.* See Constit. Inn. IV.) The sworn bishop and his faithful inquisitors expressed their liege fidelity to a foreign power. In the time of the rebellion, the bishop of the diocese wherein I lived told me, that some of his clergy were encouraging the subversion of the constitution—I expressed no desire of imitation, nor showed any marks of approbation; I never after saw or heard that these suffered any censure. I was always considered, both by clergy and laity, a declared enemy to all inquisitorial laws and rebellious systems.

"In the year 1801, I was sent to the united parishes of Oning and Templeorum, as a *quasi parochus* to the Rev. Mr Lalor, then a superannuated P. P. of said parish, by my bishop, Dr Lanigan, with a promise of succession. The following year, 1802, Mr Lalor resigned these parishes formally and canonically into the hands of his bishop, Dr Lanigan, who immediately appointed me as P. P. to the same living, and left me in the full enjoyment and peaceable possession of it to the hour of his death, which, alas! happened the 11th of February, 1812.

"In the year 1810, the infatuated people called Caravats, &c. were forcibly taking firearms from the gentlemen of that country, and shooting some of them; holding nocturnal meetings, and disturbing the happiness of the peaceable inhabitants. I spoke from my altars against such illegal proceedings and rebellious dispositions, and exhorted my flock to keep and preserve the peace and tranquillity of the country, and to guard against the intrusion of strangers, who might endeavour to contaminate their principles, and inflame their minds with chimerical ideas of subverting the constitution for the purpose of ameliorating their condition and establishing religious liberties.

"My loyalty on this occasion was construed into a great crime. My admonition to my flock on this subject was a principal charge—an unpardonable offence, for which, in a few years after, my new bishop told me I should be tried, and punished according to the decision of his inquisitorial clergymen.

"In the year 1812, immediately after Dr Lanigan's death, Doctor Mansfield, P. P. of Kilmaganny, was appointed vicar capitular by the diocesan chapter with full powers to go-

vern the diocese until a bishop would be appointed; he also made the present Doctor Marum, who was then P. P. only, his vicar general, to assist him in the discharge of his new administration, and execution, of heretical pravity. *The choice was ominous, for he studied in Spain!!!* Now, according to the Council of Trent, these clergymen, on becoming members of the holy inquisition, should take an oath of perpetual obedience and liege fidelity to persecute heretics, and fight against them; but the question was, how could this strayed sheep, this heretical priest, be separated and banished from the sound, the inquisitorial tribe of the diocese of Ossory; as no other canonical crime could be fully established, and as the civil power did not recognise the holy tribunal? Therefore it was necessary and incumbent on these faithful officers to devise some plan to cover the scheme, and punish the heretic.

"*Ad rem.*—In 1812, I was determined to build a parish chapel, or repair the old one, in the parish of Templeorum. I gave my parishioners the plan and size of a good chapel, built and just finished in a neighbouring parish for £600, with which they were in general well pleased. This chapel would be full large and sufficiently commodious, as there was another in the same parish, to which nearly half the congregation went to mass on Sundays and holidays. The vicar capitular, Dr Mansfield, contrary to custom, and the law of the church, took the building and management of it out of the hands of the lawful pastor, and gave it to his curate and a few of his parishioners. This was the policy of the inquisitorial court of Ossory, as a pretext to disgrace the heretic, and despoil him of his ecclesiastical preferment and benefice. Behold the scheme! "We will first give this building to these people under the pretence that their parish priest would not build it for them; secondly, we will build it on so large a scale as they cannot finish; and thirdly, when it will be impossible to accomplish it, we shall then insist on the pastor to undertake the work, and in case of refusal, will declare him utterly unworthy of being a parish priest and presiding over a flock, who would not build a house of worship for the honour of God, and the good of the people.' The laity were instruments in the hands of the sacerdotal inquisitors and presiding judges, in order to accomplish the destruction of the favourer and abettor of proscribed heretics. In my presence the vicar capitular desired them to adopt any plan they would think well of, and applot any taxes they should deem proportionable, and that he would insist on the payment; and at the same time told me, if I would oppose these measures he would proceed against me, insinuating that he would deprive me of my benefice. Conformable to his instructions, and private understanding with some of the parishioners, and without consulting the parish at large, the foundation of a chapel was laid which would amount to £3000, according to the estimate of the best architects in that country, and applotted the extraordinary tax of 6*s.* per acre, (many acres in said parish were not worth that sum.) The people murmured at the assumption of this arbitrary power, and the injustice of his illegal taxation; therefore, some would not pay, several had not the necessary means; others were reduced to mendicity, and under the necessity of running away from their landlords without paying their rents and lawful debts. Notwithstanding this great distress and visible poverty, the vicar capitular, in his elevated capacity, begins now to scatter his inquisitorial censures from the lofty tops of the Welch mountains (so called) to the level banks of the river Suir, as the following letter will show:

"'*Kilmaganny, 13th Dec.* 1812.

"'Rev. Sir—As I find that only few people at your side of the parish paid their subscriptions towards the building of their parish chapel, I now give them this notice, that unless the entire of their subscriptions shall be paid up before new year's day, I shall prohibit mass, under pain of suspension, to be given in the chapel of Pilltown, in the aforesaid parish, and every other part of the parish, except the two parish chapels on new year's day, and every subsequent Sunday and holyday, until the whole be paid. You will, I hope, earnestly urge them to it. There is a strong insinuation that they are countenanced by you. I remain your humble servant,

"'RICHARD MANSFIELD.

"'*To the Rev. Mr Morrissy, Bessborough.*'

"This enjoined order, implying a matter of extreme distress and spiritual dereliction, was complied with; therefore every opportunity of fulfilling the ecclesiastical precept of hearing mass and adoring God by prayer, &c. was taken away from the innocent, indigent, and those who paid in said district, as well as from the supposed guilty, for about twelve months. This prohibition and censure was illegal, unjust, and irreligious, and not binding either on the people or pastor.

"1st.—It was illegal, because the law of God, the true law of the church, and the law of the land, did not sanction such contributions as could not be reasonably and possibly complied with; besides, it was against the law of the realm to impose such taxes by private authority on his majesty's subjects, against their free will and mutual concurrence.

"2d.—It was unjust, because it was an unnecessary and oppressive imposition; whereas £600 would build a chapel sufficiently large and commodious for the circumstances of the people and population of the parish: it must be universally acknowledged that the enormous sum of £2,400 applotted on a poor country parish must be altogether unjust, and

must unequivocally call aloud for restitution under the pain of eternal woe. 'No man can enter the kingdom of heaven until he shall pay the last farthing.' £2,400 is the extra sum after the subtraction of £600 from £3000, whereas £600 was sufficient.

"3d.—It was irreligious.—It is the firm belief of the Roman Catholic Church that every Roman Catholic is bound under the penalty of a grievous sin, to attend their respective places of worship on Sundays and holydays, unless prevented by a special case of necessity; and, that any person who is accessary to the prevention of another from the discharge of this obligation, incurs the same guilt, and of course is guilty of as many sins as he shall deprive others of the opportunity."

The author argues at greater length than is necessary, under a fourth head, to show the impropriety of such rigorous measures being resorted to, in order to raise money, for the chapel; and he draws a melancholy picture of a pastor being thus obliged "to desert his flock, leaving them weeping and sighing in their solitary abodes, panting after the sacrifice of the altar, the exhortation of their spiritual father, and the graces conferred by the sacraments through his administration." But his spiritual superior was not moved by these considerations, for he proceeded to still more rigorous measures, as we shall see in next Number.

No. CLXXIII.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 3D, 1821.

I DOUBT not some of my readers will be greatly surprised by the disclosures which are made in my last Number. I have introduced a living, officiating priest of the Romish Church in Ireland, who informs us that the Popish bishops in that kingdom solemnly swear at their consecration:—"*I will persecute and fight against all heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our lord the Pope and his successors.*" This is not given by Mr Morrissy on hearsay; for he was "lately present at a consecration, where such an oath was solemnly taken;" which is, to all intents and purposes, an oath to fight against the reigning sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland, and against all his Protestant loyal subjects. From the same authority it appears, that the oath is so understood by those that take it; and that the principle of it is reduced to practice, by their encouragement of rebellion, and their persecution of those of their own religion who maintain their loyalty to the king. If any other class of His Majesty's subjects were known to take such an oath, they would be strictly looked after, and, perhaps, suffer some abridgment of their personal liberty; but because they are Papists we must conciliate them, and take care not to offend them, and repeal every statute that prevents them from having power over us! That so many Protestants should plead for the repeal of these statutes, reminds me of the saying, *Quem Deus vult perdere*, &c.—"Those whom God intends to destroy he leaves to be infatuated."

Mr Morrissy quotes for us another oath, which is ordained to be taken by persons in authority, in which they swear as follows:—"And truly this Catholic faith and profession I, at this moment, spontaneously profess and sincerely hold, and the same I shall hold and acknowledge entire and inviolate *to the end of my life;* and the same I will, to the utmost of my power, *make my subjects, and those committed to my charge, hold, teach, and preach.* I promise, vow, and swear, so help me God, and these holy gospels of God." If there be such a thing as a man's literally selling himself to the devil, it must be by taking this oath; for it binds every Papist who takes it, to resist the truth *to his life's end;* and to cause all under his charge or power to do the same. It effectually obstructs every approach of divine truth to the mind; for the fear of being sent to hell for perjury, is like a pledge lodged with the devil for his appearance there. Dispensations and absolutions may be had for other oaths; but the Pope himself never pretended to absolve a man from an oath concerning the faith: and should a conscientious person, in confessing to his priest, hint a doubt with regard to any article of belief, he would instantly be reminded of his oath, and threatened with certain damnation if he did not abide by what he had sworn to. A man is not lawfully bound by an unlawful oath to maintain falsehood, and resist the truth; but it serves the purpose of the priests to make their dupes believe what they please on this and every other subject.

The intelligent reader will consider what would be the consequence of admitting to places of power and authority, persons who had sworn this oath. They solemnly swear that to *the utmost of their power,* they will MAKE their subjects, and those committed to their charge, hold, teach, and preach the doctrines of Popery. This is Popish tolerance with a witness! The last king of the Stuart line had probably sworn this oath; at least he acted as if he had; and thereby lost the kingdom for himself and his heirs for ever. The oath, however, is not for sovereigns only, or those who have subjects. It seems intended for every functionary who may have persons committed to his charge;—in short, for every person who holds an office of authority or oversight in church or state; and it binds them to be persecutors, or be guilty of perjury; and yet there are Protestants who labour with all their might to get Papists made admissible to places of power and authority over themselves—to have men set over them, who take an oath to *make* them become Papists whether they will or not! They would act more

wisely to become Papists of their own accord beforehand; for then they would have a chance to partake of the good things that Papists expect from emancipation; whereas if they shall wait till the strong arm of arbitrary power MAKE them Papists, they will never enjoy the favour or confidence of their *makers;* for even Papists know the value of conversions made by force.

The unpardonable sin of Mr Morrissy was his good character, especially for loyalty, and opposition to all seditious practices, which many of his brethren have been known to countenance and encourage. It has always given me pleasure to admit, that amidst the general profligacy of the Church of Rome, especially of the clergy, there are honourable exceptions, even among that corrupt body. That Mr Morrissy holds the doctrines of the Church of Rome is evident from the manner in which he writes of the sacraments; but he seems to be fully convinced that that church, at least in Ireland, has become deplorably corrupt in discipline. Now, purity of discipline is as essential to the church of Christ in this world as purity of doctrine; and if the Church of Rome has failed in this respect, she is not the church of Christ, else, according to her own mode of arguing, Christ's promise has failed. It is well known that she rests her pretension to infallibility upon Christ's promise to be with his church, Mat. xviii. 15—20, "If he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." And "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." From this passage all Popish writers argue, that if it were possible for the church to fail, Christ's promises must have failed. It is impious and blasphemous to suppose the latter; therefore they consider it a necessary and unavoidable conclusion that the church cannot fail. Now, that, in the above passage, Christ is speaking, not of doctrine, but of discipline, must be evident to every one who reads it, for it prescribes the mode of dealing with an offending brother. Mr Morrissy clearly convicts his church of the grossest and most cruel depravity in discipline; therefore, unless he adopt the impious tenet, that Christ's promise has failed, he must allow that his church has failed, and that therefore she is not the church of Christ.

I recommend this subject to his most serious consideration, as I hope he is a reader of my papers; and I request particularly, that he will read with attention Mr Bradley's letter, in Nos. lxxxix. xc. This gentleman, like himself, was educated in the Church of Rome; and when his eyes began to open to her fearful departure from the Christianity of the New Testament, he found the word *church* a grevious stumblingblock to him. By attention to the scriptures, however, he got over it; and so I hope Mr Morrissy will do, if he will seriously apply his mind to it.

A man of Mr Morrissy's character and political principles, must have been disliked by those with whom he was associated, and who were set over him. His general good conduct was a standing testimony against their vices; and from his loyalty they would dread him as a spy upon their conduct. It is not necessary to suppose that he was so; for there is always a jealousy in guilty minds that makes them dread the oversight of honest men; and, as was quite natural, they devised means to get him out of the way. But like the great enemy of the Jews, in Esther's time, they scorned the paltry sacrifice of an individual; and, therefore, they determined to make his whole parish suffer with him. The plan they adopted was truly worthy of the inquisition. They ordered a new chapel to be built, upon a scale five times more expensive than was necessary; they tax the parishioners with a sum greater than the yearly rent of their lands; then they set their loyal brother to enforce the payment of this grievous and illegal exaction, for we must not call it extortion on this side of the channel, though Mr Morrissy seems to entertain no dread of calling things by their own names, in Ireland, which it is fashionable to call an enslaved country, though it appears they have more freedom of pen and press, at least, than we have in highly favoured Scotland. As must have been anticipated, the poor people were utterly unable to pay the expense of so fine a chapel; it is left unfinished; Mr Morrissy gets the blame; he is prohibited from giving the sacraments to those who do not, and cannot pay the uttermost farthing of the chapel tax; and so, according to their own tenets, these priests allow men, women, and children to perish for want of the necessary means of salvation, solely because they cannot pay a sufficient sum towards a splendid chapel.

It is firmly believed by every Papist, that a child dying unbaptized must perish. This is believed by Mr Morrissy; and it is according to the authoritative canon of the Council of Trent. DE BAPTISMO. *Can. V. Si quis dixerit baptismum liberum esse, hoc est, non necessarium ad salutem; anathema sit.* "If any man shall say that baptism is indifferent, that is, not necessary to salvation; let him be accursed." But we shall see that even baptism was prohibited to the innocent children of parents who could not pay the tax which the ghostly father was pleased to impose.

We shall now proceed with the narrative:—"The reverend doctor, wishing still to extend his prohibitions a little farther, and deprive the poor parishioners of more spiritual advantages, sends me the following letter:

"'*Kilmaganny, 6th June,* 1813.

"'Rev. Sir—As I find that you are to have a station of confession next Wednesday in the chapel of Piltown, hereby I not only prohibit mass to be given in the chapel of Piltown on Sundays and holydays as before, but I also prohibit, under pain of suspension, mass to be given, or any assembly or congregation for spiritual purposes to be held there, even on week days.

"'RICHARD MANSFIELD.

"'*To Rev. L. Morrissy, Bessborough.*'

"Here the pious doctor prohibits, by severe censures, any good works to be performed, or sacraments to be administered in the chapel of this district, to the indigent, innocent, and pennyless. Are there any similar prohibitions to be found in the written word of God, or traditions of the church? Did the learned doctor consider the decision of the holy fathers —'Baptism and penance can be given in chapels and places interdicted?' *St Augustine,* &c.

"The vicar capitular is not yet satisfied with the inflictions already described for the punishment of heretical pravity, so he sends the following:—

"'*Kilmaganny, 9th Oct.* 1813.

"'Rev. Sir—I do hereby order and enjoin you, under pain of suspension, by the fact, not to admit to sacraments those refractory individuals, *nor any of their family,* until they shall have paid their equitable proportion towards advancing their parish chapel. I remain, your humble servant,

"'RICHARD MANSFIELD.

"'*To Rev. L. Morrissy, Bessborough.*'

"Here the sacraments of salvation are become the instruments of temporal oppression and spiritual injustice in the hands of the doctor. 1st. By withdrawing the sacraments from the people, several of them would, in a great measure, starve themselves—would refuse the payment of lawful debts and legal taxes, imposed for the support of the king and constitution, in order to pay illegal and oppressive taxations, imposed by spiritual superiors for sinister motives and vindictive objects, sooner than suffer the privation of divine and ecclesiastical rites and pastoral consolation. I was an ocular witness on different occasions to the veracity of these assertions; I know some who paid for said chapel *out of subscriptions made for buying a coffin,* &c. 2dly. The people have an undoubted right to receive the rites and sacraments of their church, whilst they do not render themselves unworthy of them by personal guilt. Now, with respect to the case in question, did the wife, the child, and the servant of the recusants and indigents deserve to be deprived of the sacraments, &c.? Certainly every good and respectable divine, true Christian, and rational man, will coincide with me in the negative, and conclude that the prohibitions and suspensions of the above letters contain nothing solid, spiritual, or exemplary; but, on the contrary, are replete with temporal oppression and spiritual injustice, with respect to the pastor and his flock.

"Now the renowned doctor begins to manifest his unlimited and uncontrolled authority, and redoubles his censures as well as his taxes.

"'*Kilmaganny, 14th Oct.* 1813.

"'Rev. Sir—I find you begin now to be sincere, but regret that in throwing off every disguise you not only justify the opinion heretofore entertained of you, but seem also to give manifest proofs that your religion is as false as your promises. From your conduct, as I am informed, you must have misinterpreted some words of my letter to you some days back, which were, 'You will not administer, &c. until they shall have paid an *equitable proportion* of the chapel tax.' Now, Sir, the meaning of the last underlined words must obviously be, until they should have paid such a proportion of the tax as had been paid by people in equal or similar circumstances with them; yet you have given the words a construction of your own, and acted upon it at no small risk to your conscience. But to remove all ground for error or misapprehension, I do hereby order you, under pain of suspension, by the fact, to administer no sacraments or rites to your parishioners, except the last sacraments to persons in imminent danger of death, and baptism to children, until they shall have paid not only the full amount of the first tax, according as it was settled and applotted, but also a second tax to the same amount with the first. In this prohibition the families of the recusants are included. But as nothing short of a double tax (12s. per acre) would be sufficient to finish the shell of the chapel, it cannot be avoided. If a spark of religion existed in the heart of the pastor, he could easily persuade them that this tax, let it be what it may, would be but a small token of gratitude to God. Your's, &c.

"'RICHARD MANSFIELD.

"'*To Rev. Mr Morrissy, Bessborough.*'

"I suppose the vicar capitular in the first part of his letter alludes to the opinion entertained of me as a heretic, or a friend to heretics. He pretends I made him promises; which I never did, or could do in conscience—promises to oppress the people, and require impossibilities, for the hidden purposes of preventing disclosures and revealing perfidy; non-compliance betrayed false religion in the estimation of an inquisitorial member. The vicar sanctioned and desired other priests to give sacraments to some friends and accomplices who did not pay the tax but in part; from this example I considered that I was at liberty to do the same, yet he threatens and reprimands me for administering sacraments, &c to any, without paying the entire tax; and he calls

this error and misapprehension, &c.—he punishes me for doing what he allows others to do—he suspends me from the discharge of my duty, and commands others to intrude on my pastoral rights.

"By this letter the difficulties, impositions and taxations are redoubled: the poor people are taxed 12s. per acre before half the work is done. But with respect to sacramental privations I must do him this common justice, that he is like the relapsing sinner, rising and falling, for in his former letter he prohibited all the sacraments to be administered to the recusants and their families: but in this letter, he permits almost the one-half of them to be given to the recusants, &c. I could ardently wish that this reformation might prove effectual, but, alas! I dread the next fall will be a woeful one. I am sorry the noble doctor did not permit his clergy to administer the last sacraments to those in danger of death, as the great divines and holy fathers did. No! for he binds them here not to administer them except in case of imminent danger of death, perhaps at a time when the patient could not receive them, or reap but little or no benefit from them.

"As I have predicted, the vicar fell again into his old mode of issuing censures and committing errors, as appears by the following:—

"'*Kilmaganny*, 12*th March*, 1814.

"'Rev. Sir—I enjoin you again to administer no sacraments whatsoever publicly or privately to any person, or any one of his family, who shall not have previously paid the full amount of both taxes, nor any of the rites of churching women, blessing clay, or celebrating mass for them, under pain of suspension, to be incurred by the fact; and any violation of this injunction you may rely shall be rigorously punished. I also require that Mr Henebry shall say the parish mass in Templeorum, without any obstruction whatever. You married two couple who paid no tax; one in Tobernabroon, and one in Dowling, if so, I beg you look to———'

"I confess I am at a loss to know what to say—what strictures to make, or ideas to form of these melancholy prohibitions, irreligious injunctions, and general exclusion of men, women, and children, born and unborn, guilty or not guilty, from all the sacraments, sacrifices, rites, privileges, &c. of the Catholic Church. My heart feels more than my tongue can express. No man can sufficiently lament this irreparable calamity, but he who contemplates it in mournful silence. I ask you Roman Catholics, Can a child be saved without baptism, according to the divine oracles and the doctrine of our church? 'unless a man is born of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven,'—Can the sinner in leaving this world be saved without repentance? You will say 'the one cannot without baptism, or the other without real contrition, or at least attrition, with the help of the sacrament of penance.' What opinion then will you form of the man who will not allow either the sacraments necessary for salvation, or the auxiliary means to obtain it, and sacred rites of the church to be administered either in case of absolute or ordinary necessity? I venture to anticipate that you will say nothing less than that 'no heretic, whom the church ever condemned, gave orders more destructive of the very essence of religion!' You will also confess that Luther and Calvin, against whom, together with their followers, the Roman Church pronounced so many woes and anathemas, never made such an attempt to destroy the divine institution of all the sacraments, sacrifices, rites, &c. by issuing orders in positive terms, under severe censures, not to administer to the innocent and pennyless, what Jesus Christ instituted and ordained for their salvation:—no payment, no sacrament! The doctor of censures must acknowledge that there is virtue or no virtue in the sacraments and rites of the church.—If there is any virtue—how could he withdraw them from the well-disposed subject?—If there is no virtue—how can he impose on thousands to receive and pay divine homage to what he believes there is no virtue or efficacy in, and of course be guilty of idolatry? I am sorry that he has given sufficient reasons and convincing proofs to the public at large to believe that he is possessed of the deistical idea, that there is no virtue, &c. Candid reader, you will tell me that his superiors, on intimation and conviction, must condemn and punish this ecclesiastic for his heretical and erroneous principles, or otherwise must participate in his crime—that nothing will palliate but the profession of an inquisitorial member of the holy office. More of this hereafter.

"The vicar also in this letter foisted another priest, Mr Henebry, into my parish, contrary to the ecclesiastical law, to act in direct opposition to my parochial administration and temporal interest in said benefice; in like manner he hindered me from preaching and teaching my flock, by giving up my parish chapel and parish mass to said Mr Henebry, and excluding me, not without reason indeed, for by this prohibition and exclusion, I should not have the power or liberty of preaching loyalty, and preventing the inquisitorial systems, &c.

"By virtue of these vicarial censures, the children and servants of the poor recusants could not be married, let what would depend on chances, or appointments, or melancholy results. To harass and persecute me more and more, the vicar capitular sent the Rev. Mr Forestall, P. P. of Callom, a very active inquisitor, into my parish, as an equestrian suspender, who galloped in full speed through the country, until he met me on the highway in company with several of my parishioners

and there suspended me without assigning any reason, if he knew any. I laughed at the madness and inconsistency of his conduct, but at the same time had compassion on the petulant hireling, who incurred a greater censure, *ipso jure*, than he thought to inflict."

No. CLXXIV.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 10TH, 1821

MY readers, by this time, have become pretty well acquainted with Mr Morrissy, and his controversy with his ecclesiastical superior. It would fill some Numbers more to give his case at length, in his own words; but I do not think this necessary. Suffice it to say, that he was pursued with unrelenting rigour; that he was thrust out of his parish, without reason being assigned; that he appealed to his metropolitan, Dr Troy, without obtaining redress; that he consulted a lawyer, in his extreme difficulties, who was decidedly of opinion, that he could maintain an action of damages against Dr Mansfield; and that the simple fact of his having consulted a Protestant lawyer, in a question between him and his spiritual superior, subjected him to excommunication, though it does not appear that his enemies pronounced the sentence.

Dr Marum was advanced to be bishop, and then poor Morrissy found himself under the fangs of the inquisitor, "who had been educated in Spain!" On the 19th of June, 1815, the new bishop made a visitation of his parish; and after mass, &c. the bishop declared to the congregation, that he had several sheets in folio, full of charges against Mr Morrissy, from his parishioners; but he had not communicated these to the accused person, who was quite ignorant of the existence of such charges. Mr Morrissy had the fortitude to declare before the congregation, that he was quite innocent, which enraged the bishop, who told him, that he would make his protestation of innocence an additional charge. The accused applied to have a copy of the charges which were alleged against him, but was refused. A court of inquisition was appointed to be held, to which he had received no summons, though he was the party chiefly interested. Here I shall give his own words:—

"The appointed day of trial was rapidly approaching; I was in a complete dilemma how to act, without the knowledge of the charges, the advantage of witnesses, or any other auxiliary means, allowed the greatest culprit on the day appointed for the investigation of his conduct, and decision of his fate. At length, I formed a resolution of going to this partial trial, listening to the charges preferred, and calling for an adjournment, and a legal and canonical mode of proceeding. This favour was denied. At my arrival at Kilkenny, Dr Marum asked me abruptly, where I was going? I made reply, and said, 'My lord, I come to my trial;' the bishop exclaimed, '*Sir, you are not to be at your trial, or any person for you, or bearing evidence in your favour, on this day, or any other day you will be tried; you may go home, we will do the business ourselves without you,*' &c. I was obliged to withdraw. He summoned to this holy tribunal, erected in his own house, the principal inquisitors in his chapter, and the principal enemies I had among the clergy, to bear testimony, and decide my case."

Next follow the names of those who sat in judgment. One of them, the Rev. John Fitzpatrick, had the courage to speak a good word for the accused,—to declare that he considered Mr Morrissy an injured man; that the expensive chapel was undertaken quite against his will; and he, being his next door neighbour, could bear witness to the general good character of Mr Morrissy. "This honest and candid priest was immediately expelled the inquisitorial court;" and no one dared to follow his example. As a thing of course, the accused person was found guilty, without a hearing, and without witnesses; condemned to a perpetual privation of ecclesiastical living, and clerical functions, and another was appointed in his place. Had he not lived under the protection of Protestant laws, he would have been burned to ashes; and thus the Church of Rome would have saved herself from the exposure which he lives to make; and as he is now employed in His Majesty's service as chaplain in the prisons in Dublin, for the instruction of persons of his own communion, I hope he is beyond the reach of such of his brethren, who would take his life with as little scruple as they would shoot a sparrow.

I proceed now to relate a similar instance of arbitrary clerical power in the United States of America, that "land of freedom." Mr Morrissy tells us of an acquaintance of his having been lately sent from Cork, to establish the inquisition in America, and who has been appointed by the Pope to a bishopric in that quarter. This refers, I suppose, to Dr England, lately consecrated at Cork, bishop of Charleston. I have been informed of his arrival in that city. I have received from a correspondent a copy of his first pastoral letter, in which he informs the people of the great kindness of the Pope, in erecting a new diocese, suffragan to Baltimore, and appointing him bishop thereof. He has commenced hostilities against his Protestant neighbours; and a Charleston merchant, under the signature of "A PROTESTANT," has entered the lists with him, finding, I suppose, the clergy as indifferent to the question of Popery there, as most of them are here; and this merchant, if I may judge from his first publication, which is in my possession,

though his beginning be but small, may come in good time to be as formidable to the bishop of Charleston, as a Glasgow merchant has been to the Scottish conclave. The arrival of Dr England in America is hailed by one of his clerical brethren, in a pamphlet, lately published in Philadelphia, in the following style, which will justly be considered as bordering on blasphemy :—

"The Right Rev. Dr England, lately of Cork, and now bishop of Charleston, will, I trust, change the face of things. The profound theologian, the pious prelate, the eloquent preacher, the disinterested cleric, and the accomplished gentleman, will not be an unobservant spectator of these proceedings ; no, his soul is too noble, and his heart too pure; well, indeed, may the people of Charleston say, in the inspired language of the Psalmist, *it is the day-star from on high that has come to visit us ; it is the morning spread upon the mountains.* With such a prelate in this country, it is fondly to be hoped our religion will flourish; with such a parent to advise them, its children will not disobey ! with such an orb to light them, its prelates cannot stray."—*Address to the Congregation of St Mary's Church, Philadelphia, by the Rev. Wm. Hogan, Pastor of St Mary's, Feb. 2d,* 1821, pp. 26, 27.

This pamphlet, by the Rev. Wm. Hogan, which the reader will see, refers to something, under the expression, "these proceedings," is a complaint against his bishop, not unlike that of Mr Morrissy against his. Mr Hogan appears, by the testimony of a number of his congregation, to be a man of good character, a popular preacher, and a diligent instructor of the young in the faith of the church. His zeal and good conduct were felt by his ghostly brethren as a reproach to them; the bishop became jealous of his popularity, and accordingly deposed, and deprived him of his living, without assigning any reason. But the congregation took their pastor's part, and would know why they were deprived of his acceptable and useful labours ; for even Papists in America will insist upon a why and a wherefore, with regard to things in which they are interested. The bishop was obliged to comply : he gave his reasons, and published them. I insert them here entire, as a literary curiosity, and as furnishing a fair specimen of the literature and taste of the Popish hierarchy in the most enlightened country in the world except our own :—

A Pastoral Charge, delivered by the Right Rev. Henry, Bishop of Philadelphia, February 11th, 1821.

My Beloved Children,

I thought this business was over, but I am sorry it is not, for indeed a very disagreeable business it is. In all the countries I travelled I never saw any business like it, but one, and that was in Ireland, in the place I myself came from; it happened in a town they call Drogheda, which I knew very well ; and indeed a very pious town it was, for religion was carried on there as devoutly as it was in any town I ever was in, even as devoutly as in Dublin itself. The business happened in the diocess of the primate of all Ireland, to whom I was vicar general for 24 years, and under whom I learned. The case was this. An unfortunate man like the present of the name of Brannegan, after being suspended, continued to discharge his duties, and the primate to save his flock from the jaws of the lion was put to the disagreeable necessity, (for of all the necessities in this world, that is the most disagreeable necessity of all,) well, the primate of all Ireland, as I said before, was put to this painful necessity of separating that unfortunate man from his flock.

I did not think I would be put to this disagreeable necessity with regard to this person, I thought he would leave this place and go elsewhere to follow the discharge of his duty. For when I suspended him, that is, when I withdrew his faculties, I did not mean a heavy punishment, for suspension is a light punishment, for it is medicinal, and I only meant to withdraw his faculties in my diocess of Philadelphia, and to let him go any where else, and that I would recommend him, though I could not nor ought not DOWNRIGHTLY recommend him. Well now, my children, when I, for reasons which I know myself from my conscience, was put to the very disagreeable necessity, (for indeed very disagreeable it is, as I said before,) I sent for this person, and in the presence of the Rev. Mr Kenny, Mr Hurly, and Mr Roloff, I ordered this person not to discharge any sacerdotal duty in my diocess of Philadelphia, and to go immediately and not to disturb my flock : I did not mean this, as I said before, to be a suspension, for he had full liberty to go any where else ; but he asked me was this a suspension, I desired him again to leave the city, but he forced me at last to tell him it was suspension, though as I said before, I only meant to withdraw his faculties in my diocess, and let him go any where else. Well, my children, this person then asked me what cause I had for suspending him : but I did not then like to give him the reasons, for they were only in my own conscience, and I thought to recommend him elsewhere as well as my conscience would allow me, for I could not downrightly recommend him, and did not wish for his sake to let the things be known that were in my conscience ; nor indeed, my children, I can't now without the most disagreeable feelings, for they are such shocking things, that I am ashamed to mention them, but as I perceive that this person is holding out and I am sure and I know he has bad advisers, I am, as I said before, put to the disagreeable necessity of letting you know some of my reasons, though it is a thing I never meant to do, for they can't

be mentioned without a great deal of scandal. Well my children, when I came here first to take charge of this respectable flock, (and indeed respectable it is,) that is, when I was sent here by the Pope, this congregation, as you all know was under the care of a man, who had a truly *ecclesiastical* heart, the Rev. Mr de Bart, now, I was told from undoubted authority indeed, that this person did not only not obey, this pious superior, but always looked upon him as his inferior; now my children the doctrine of every theologian, which cannot be denied, is that every inferior should be subject to every superior. Well, that now is my first charge. Now my next is that this person never read his office. I was told so indeed by undoubted authority; and my conscience told me that I as being the *church*, that is being the *head* of the church, I mean the *representative* of the church in this diocess, could not in conscience allow him to go to the altar: for there is seven parts in the office that every priest is bound to say every day, under pain of mortal sin. That is, mattins and lauds, one, prime, two, terce, three, sext, four, none, five, vespers, six, and complin seven. Now my children every priest, as I said before, is bound to read them seven hours under pain of mortal sin, and my conscience could not allow me to let him offer up the mass in a state of mortal sin: for any priest that would do it, is not worthy of being a priest. Now that is my second charge. There is a great deal more charges that I have against this person, but they are so scandalous that I am delicate and ashamed to mention them; but as I am brought to it I must tell you, though as I said before, I am ashamed to mention it, the charges are so shocking that I would not think it safe for me in my conscience, to allow any of my females, I mean any of my young girls into the same room with this person. Now my children, when I had all these in my conscience, and many others that I am ashamed to mention, why do you continue to persecute me by asking me to restore this person, but I must tell you and I am bound to do so, that there is no use in endeavouring to force me to do so, for I am bishop and I must act as my conscience bids me; that I never will restore faculties to this person in my diocess; and again I tell you I will not be forced to it, for I am bishop; for if this house was full of dollars, as much as it could hold, (for I don't care for money, nor never did,) and there were twenty cannons placed before this church, I would not for all them dollars, and if I were to be *shot afterwards* by these twenty cannons, give that person faculties in my diocess. So let me beg of you my children no longer to ask me. In a pamphlet that lately came out, he says I deprived him of his living, and he styles himself pastor of St Mary's Church. No, I deny it, I never deprived him of a living, for he had no living in this diocess, because any act of the vicar general was not binding unless confirmed by the church, that is by the bishop. Now I did not confirm his being in St Mary's and he could not then call it his living. Moreover he was no pastor, he could not be pastor, for what is a pastor, the word pastor comes from the Latin word *pasco* to feed, now it only belongs to the church to feed the flock. And *I as being the church*, that is the representative of the church, am and can be the only pastor in this diocess: he therefore never was, nor never will be pastor in this diocess. In his late pamphlet he has endeavoured to blindfold a part of the congregation and set them astray, throwing dust in their eyes, but I shall soon satisfy you my children on that head, Oh! them canons he quoted, are long ago obsolete and are no more binding than a law passed in the reigns of queen Anne or Richard III. or William the Conqueror are at present binding in England: Oh! them laws were done away in the Council of Trent and new ones made, which are to be interpreted by the church of God. Now my children *I am the church, for I am the bishop I mean I am the representative of the church*, and my children I will give you full satisfaction about them before a few days. I came over here from Ireland; I was sent here by the Pope with extraordinary powers to act in a Papal way, as my conscience directed me. I therefore request of you my flock, not to trouble me any more, for I am resolved not to be forced against my conscience. I have been told that there is a few individuals of the congregation holding meetings and making resolutions to frighten me. Oh it will not do, there was a meeting at Mr Bazely's the other night, I was told there was some people, who think they are very clever in making speeches, and going about speaking those speeches publicly and privately, to make converts, those persons may be looked upon by this person to be his friends but they are his greatest enemies. I see by some papers that are pasted upon the walls that there is to be another meeting at Mr Bazely's on Wednesday next in order to force this person into this church; Oh, but it is all of no use, these persons as I said before are the greatest enemies to this person. Now my children as I see by these meetings and also from a pamphlet lately published that this person contrary to all church authority intends to again discharge the priestly functions. I feel myself bound as your pastor, to save you my flock from the jaws of the wolf which would disperse them, to let you know that if any such step be taken by this person, I shall without delay proceed to the most disagreeable necessity in the world, which is that of separating this person from the flock entrusted to my charge, and not only him, but any person that shall hold any communion with him afterwards.

I beg you then my flock to think with yourselves and not put me to this painful necessity, and I hope this person will think with himself upon his state and no longer listen to these bad advisers, and not put me to this necessity, I hope he will think with himself upon his poor soul, and perhaps I may do something for him yet. The person I mean is now listening to me, may God grant, he will hear this advice, and I beg of you all my dear children to pray for his poor soul. The next pastoral address will not be kept so long from the public."

This is a true copy of the pastoral charge of the Right Reverend the bishop of Philadelphia; and I shall take care to preserve the original American impression, to satisfy the curious, some of whom may suspect that it is a piece of home manufacture, intended to burlesque Popish learning.

It is right that Mr Hogan should be heard a few words in his own defence. Every reasonable man will allow that he has met with hard measures. He came to Philadelphia with a fair character, and a very ample certificate to that effect by TUOHY, bishop of Limerick. He acquired the good opinion of the congregation of St Mary's, by great diligence in the discharge of his official duties; and by condescending even to become a sabbath school teacher, for the sake of the young of his flock. His Address to his congregation commences in the following manner; and I think it looks very like the appeal of an honest man:—

"I should be truly ungrateful and undeserving the attentions that have been shown me since my arrival in this city, did I not endeavour to rescue my character from the imputations which the base machinations and unmanly envy of a few individuals would fain throw upon it. It is with reluctance, I would upon any occasion, presume to intrude on the public attention; but it is with heartfelt pain I do it on the present, knowing how fatal to religion the exposing of perfidy and unmasking of clerical hypocrisy must necessarily be. I have done all in my power, to bring those who have endeavoured to injure me, to a sense of the impropriety of their conduct, and effect a reconciliation between us. For any supposed offence that I might have given them, I offered to make an adequate apology, but no apology would be listened to from me, no apology would be made for the injury done me. It is well known that I have been deprived of my living in St Mary's Church, by the Right Rev. Dr Conwell: this step he has taken without giving me any previous notice or admonition, and without assigning any cause for so doing. In vain have I asked why I have been deprived of my living, in vain have the congregation asked why they have been deprived of my services, in vain have I appealed to the Metropolitan, the Archbishop of Baltimore, in vain have I protested against the precipitancy and injustice of such proceedings against me, no appeal from me will be listened to, and no reason will be assigned for thus injuring me, by depriving me of my living. This is cruel treatment, and unparalleled in the annals of ecclesiastical despotism. Were I so fortunate to live in those happy times, "*when kings could do no wrong, or bishops in their individual capacities err,*" then I should tamely submit; if I had been in a catholic country where the civil authorities would interfere, if I had been in a country where I could appeal to an unprejudiced tribunal, I should quietly await its decision, and cheerfully submit to it; but circumstanced as I am, having no one to appeal to, except a professed enemy, I am reluctantly obliged to have recourse to this mode of vindicating my character."

In the sequel it appears, that the Popish priests who were settled in Philadelphia before him, were persons of character so contemptible, that Mr Hogan could not, without sacrificing his own character, associate with them; and this seems to have been one of the secret reasons why he incurred the displeasure of his bishop, and suffered so much persecution. Truly that must be a holy church that nourishes and brings up such sons!

No. CLXXV.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 17TH, 1821.

IN my last Number I introduced an American Popish bishop to the reader's acquaintance; and I gave an example of arbitrary government on his part, which shows that the system receives no amelioration even in that land of freedom. Some of the republican congregation did indeed venture to remonstrate with their bishop; but they could not move him to depart from his purpose of removing the obnoxious priest, whose presence he said was dangerous to the morals of his diocess, particularly of his young girls; but he would give him a recommendation to another diocess; and, in language as dignified as that of his printed address, he told the gentleman who took the priest's part, "He has a light pair of heels, and a clean pair of breeches, and the world is wide for him." *Hogan's Address*, p. 12.

Speaking of the United States of America, I am reminded of the only thing that remains to be mentioned on the subject of making Papists eligible to places of power in a Protestant country. It is argued, that there are no political distinctions on account of religion in that country; that a Papist or a Deist is as eligible to the highest office in the state as a Protestant, and that no evil whatever has resulted from this arrangement. I admit the

fact, that such is the law in the United States; but then I maintain, that that is not a Protestant country, in any proper sense of the words. The majority of the people in some of the States are, indeed, Protestants; and in others, at least in Maryland, a vast proportion, if not the majority, are Papists; and the greatest man in that part of the world is the archbishop of Baltimore, who formerly claimed jurisdiction over that, and all the territory southward to the Floridas; but the Pope has lately given the Carolinas and Georgia to the newly created bishop of Charleston, as mentioned in my last. Be the majority in any, or in all the States, what it may, it is certain that the United States, as such, is not a Protestant country. The Protestant religion is not acknowledged by its government any more than the Romish, though, in the establishment of all their institutions, they had the advantage of Protestant experience and example. Politically considered, the United States form no part of what is called Christendom. I am not going to inquire into the disadvantages, or the advantages of this state; my business is merely with the fact: and such being the fact, it must be very evident that the admission of Papists to places of power and authority in these States, is not attended by the same danger, as in Protestant Britain and Ireland, where every established institution would become their prey.

Papists have no motive to overturn the American government, for they would gain nothing by it. There are no church lands there, no tythes, and no estates forfeited by the treasons of their ancestors. In short, there are none of those retrospections which exist in a country where Popery was once established,* and which, in the very nature of the thing, make Papists desire the overthrow of the present, and the re-establishment of the ancient order.

If it be admitted that no evil has arisen from the admission of Papists to places of power, it ought also to be admitted, that the Americans have not yet had time for a fair trial. It was many centuries before Rome was able to enslave England and Scotland, especially the latter; and she may at this moment be working her way to dominion in the continent of America, without the enlightened citizens of those States being able to perceive it; though very probably, their children shall see it, and feel it too.

Hitherto there have been what our old divines called *lets*, in the way. The American government was scarcely settled when the French revolution took place, which unhinged the whole European system; and none were more affected by it than the Pope and his clergy. Holding their power, and even their lives, at the will of the French emperor, they could do little in the way of propagating the faith in foreign countries. Most of the Papists who had settled in America, were poor emigrants from Ireland, or French refugees from St Domingo, and other colonies, who had fled for their lives at the time of the massacre by the negroes. With little property and less learning, they could make little way among their more intelligent neighbours. We may judge of the state of literature among them from the composition of HIS ILLUSTRIOUS LORDSHIP, THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA,† which I gave in my last Number. A flock that requires, and can be profited by the instruction of such a pastor, will not speedily find way to high offices in the state, and, therefore, they can do no evil in that way.

But the Pope was not restored to the posses-

* I recollect having seen this subject set in a clear light by PHILOPATRIS, in one of his letters in the Morning Post. I cannot refer to the date; but it was while the subject of "emancipation" was last pending in Parliament.

† Nothing can be more absurd and riduculous than the high sounding titles which these eleemosynary bishops take to themselves, and give to one another. Those of the Church of England are peers of the realm, in virtue of the baronies attached to their sees; and are therefore styled their Lordships: but for the Popish bishops, who subsist upon what they can collect from the inferior clergy, and poor laity, to assume such a style, is more ridiculous than the mock royalty of King Crispin. The following certificate, prefixed to the bishop of Charleston's "Pastoral Letter" is a fine specimen of such Popish puff:—

"Note.—The bull of his holiness Pope Pius VII. for separating the States of North-Carolina and South-Carolina and Georgia from the diocess of Baltimore, and for erecting for their government a new episcopal see, in the city of Charleston, (S. C.) suffragan to Baltimore, and appointing the right reverend Doctor John England, bishop thereof, was published in the Roman Catholic Church of Charleston, on Sunday the 31st of December, 1820.

The certificate of consecration, of which the following is a correct translation, was also then read:

"We, John Murphy, by the grace of God and of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Cork, in Ireland, certify to all whom it does or may concern, that on the twenty-first day of September, to wit, on the festival day of St Matthew the apostle in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and twenty; by virtue of the annexed apostolic letters having first received from him the profession of Catholic faith, and the oath of fealty to our Lord Pope Pius VII. and the holy Roman Church; we, celebrating mass in pontifical robes, in the church of Saint Finbar, patron of our diocess, have bestowed the grace of consecration on John England, a priest of Cork, chosen for a new bishop of the church of Charleston; being assisted therein by the right reverend and most illustrious Lords, Kieran Marum, Bishop of Ossory, and Patrick Kelly, Bishop of Richmond; there being also present the most reverend and most illustrious Lord Patrick Everard, Archbishop of Mitylene, and coadjutor to the Archbishop of Cashel, the right reverend and most illustrious Lords, William Coppinger, Bishop of Cloyne and Ross, Charles Sughrue, Bishop of Ardfert and Aghadoe, and Charles Tuohy, Bishop of Limerick. In testimony whereof we have written these presents with our hand, and affixed to them our episcopal seal.

Given from our residence in Cork the day and year above.

[L. S.] JOHN MURPHY, Bishop of Cork."

sion of sovereign power twelve months, till he took measures for extending his dominion. The first step of any consequence was the restoration of the order of the Jesuits, which took place, I think, in 1815. These are the sworn propagators of the faith of Rome, and of the authority of the Pope, in all parts of the world; and about two years ago, I observed in the Orthodox Journal, a work avowedly in the interest of the Jesuits, that the society either had made, or were about to make a settlement in the United States of America. Add to this the information of Mr Morrissy, contained in my last Number, that the Pope had lately sent an acquaintance of his, from Ireland, to establish the Inquisition in the United States; referring, I have no doubt, to the new bishop of Charleston, who was consecrated at Cork about a year ago.

Now, the Jesuits are men of talents, learning, and intrigue. They know how to make their religion appear respectable in the eyes of worldly men. They will soon throw into the shade such dignitaries as his lordship of Philadelphia, or get them promoted to other sees, where their ignorance will not be so manifest; for as the Pope has men for all sorts of places, so he has places for all sorts of men. Upon the whole, there is reason to expect, that the Church of Rome will soon appear in great splendour in the western world. The bishop of Charleston has made his *debut* as a preacher with great eclat; and his church is well attended, even by Protestants, who are attracted by the pomp of the service and the brilliancy of his eloquence.

If it be true, as I fear it is, that infidelity is very prevalent in the American States, there is the more reason to apprehend the increase of Popery. Infidelity is a heartless, comfortless system: it will never do to die with. There are certain fearful forebodings of a judgment to come, from which the most hardened infidel is not altogether exempted. While he rejects the sovereign, certain remedy, which the gospel reveals, he will readily take up with such a counterfeit of it, as will afford him peace of mind without requiring him to relinquish any of his evil propensities. Popery is such a counterfeit of Christianity, as it has been my design to show throughout my work. The state into which it puts a man, in reference to the future judgment, is not a whit better than that in which infidelity leaves him; but he has present peace of mind in believing a lie; and this is inducement enough for multitudes to become Papists. It is most undoubtedly a lie which the priest tells the miserable sinner, when he assures him, that by baptism he can regenerate him, or that by penance he can absolve him from his sins, or that by any means a sinner can be saved without faith in Christ, and the actual, not the mere proposed forsaking of his sins; for without holiness no man shall see the Lord; but those who will not forsake their sins in this world, yet wish to escape hell in the next, are, in righteous judgment, abandoned to believe this lie as a truth, and are deceived to their eternal ruin.

The prevalence of ignorance over very extensive districts of the western continent also gives reason to expect the increase of Popery there. This remark does not apply to the eastern, or New England States; but chiefly to the immense territory of Virginia and southwards. In the interior of these States, there are few places for Christian worship, and few to dispense Christian ordinances; and there can be nothing more true than what Dr Chalmers has been labouring to inculcate, that Christian instruction is not one of those things for which there is a natural demand. A knowledge of Christianity is essentially necessary to the desire of enjoying any of its ministrations, or partaking of any of its benefits. *Those who possess the gospel* ought therefore to carry it to those who have it not, without waiting for a demand; but this has not been done to any great extent, nor is there any appearance of its being done, in the interior of the above territory. The people, therefore, will fall an easy prey to swarms of artful priests, who will soon be sent among them, now since the Jesuits have taken the work in hand. We know what has taken place in this respect, in some of the large Highland parishes, where there has always been some sort of Protestant ministry. How much more may it not be expected in those districts of America, where thousands and tens of thousands are growing up to manhood, without ever having heard a gospel sermon, or witnessed a Christian baptism? In short, unless the real Protestants of America bestir themselves, and undertake the work of evangelizing their countrymen, with the zeal and fidelity of apostles and evangelists, the Pope will get the better of them; and a thick darkness will settle down upon their country, like that which enveloped Europe for a thousand years.

It is not necessary to suppose Popery to have arrived at this state of advancement, in order to perceive its probable influence upon the political institutions of America. When the Jesuits have got the education of youth, were it only the youth of their own communion, into their hands, they will soon make learned and accomplished politicians and statesmen. The road to honour and power lies open before them. They will soon get into both branches of the legislature; and there is nothing to prevent a Papist from being President; and it is possible that persons lately come into the world may live to see this. Popery is essentially and incurably an arbitrary, slavish, and intolerant system; and where it possesses power, it will establish itself to the exclusion of every other. The Americans will find it so, when they have

a sufficient number of Papists in Congress, or in the executive of their government; and then they will be able to judge whether or not their fathers acted wisely in leaving the door open to them.

I know that by making this suggestion, I shall incur the charge of intolerance, and what not—but this gives me no concern, seeing the accusation proceeds from a mistake. I do not think the Americans were called upon, when framing their constitution, to ordain any restrictions with regard to liberty of worship; but I think they might have ordained that no man should hold an office of power and authority in their republic, who owed spiritual or temporal allegiance to a foreign power. This would have shut out Papists, without so much as naming Popery; and it would have been doing no more than what every state has a right to do, and ought to do, if it pays any regard to its own preservation.

I take it for granted that spiritual subjection to a fellow-creature necessarily implies temporal subjection; and I defy all the world to show the contrary. Now the Pope has actually begun to exercise spiritual supremacy in the United States. By his own sole authority, he detaches the two Carolinas and Georgia from the see of Baltimore, and he gives these States to Dr England, late of Cork, to be subject to him in all things spiritual, as he is subject to the Pope himself. It is certified that this Dr England has taken the oath of fealty to the Pope, which, as I showed in a late Number, is also an oath to persecute and fight against all heretics:—and does any man imagine, that when the question shall come to be, whether he, or such as he, shall be loyal to the Pope or to the President, the latter will have any chance of such a one standing by him, or by the free constitution of the United States? If the Americans were wise, they would keep a watchful eye over those divisions of their territory, for the purpose of spiritual jurisdiction; for they may depend upon it, that temporal jurisdiction is intended to follow, and will follow by degrees; for no Papist will refuse to apply all the strength of his body to effect what his priest tells him is for the good of his soul.

I have mentioned, on the authority of Mr Morrissy, that a priest has lately gone from Ireland to establish the inquisition in the United States; and this will no doubt be scouted at as the most chimerical thing in the world. What! the inquisition! the Americans will never submit to that! Nay, but they have submitted to it already; and they will do so again. The inquisition consists of a thousand degrees of atrocity, from the *pious* confessional, to the rack, and the "dry pan," in which the bodies of heretics are burnt over a slow fire. In auricular confession, every priest is an inquisitor. He inquires into the most secret thoughts of those who acknowledge his ghostly authority. He becomes acquainted with all their faults and with all their crimes, if they have been so unhappy as to make themselves criminal even in thought. Then he obtains absolute authority over them, and makes them do whatever he pleases; and they dare not disobey him, for he knows their crimes, and may divulge them. An engine is thus put into the hand of every priest, which, with a little address, he may make use of to subvert the best civil government in the world, if those who submit their consciences to him have any place in such government. And therefore it is that I maintain, that a Papist cannot be safely intrusted with power, over any but persons of his own communion; and even over them he must be an arbitrary governor if it be the will of his priest that he should be so.

The following is not very intimately connected with the subject of my late Numbers; but it has been lying some time by me, and I do not know when I may have a better opportunity of bringing it in. It is part of a serious religious letter, from a Papist, in a remote part of the Highlands, to his son in Glasgow. I have the names of both father and son, as well as the place of residence of the former, in the Highlands, and of the latter, in Glasgow; but I shall suppress these, as it is not my intention to expose private family matters, but merely to exhibit the character of Popery, and the spirit of its adherents. The letter is dated 16th July, 1819; and the following is the extract:—

"As you apprehend the danger you are in among heretics, desiring me to pray for you, I always remember you in my prayer. Heretics and wicked men are permitted by God to live on in their wicked ways, for some time, as he sees proper; but the justice of God will overtake them at last, so that I would not choose to live amongst them. It is for the things of this world, and the body, you stay among them; as the gospel says, 'what will it avail a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' Many kingdoms and states rose up and stood against the Catholic Church, since the time of the apostles; but none of them had the promise of Jesus Christ to last long, but his Catholic Church. There was never an empire, kingdom, or commonwealth, that stood for eighteen hundred and nineteen years, but her; and we are sure of that government to remain to the end of the world. All the rest had their period; and their particular judgment came upon them in their places, one by one as church history informs me. This poor kingdom has been corrupted by heresy for the space of near three hundred years, especially the low country; and that period will be *at an end within two years after this*; and whatever judgment as God sees proper may happen, every pious Catholic ought to

choose for himself the place where the Catholic faith ever stood, and is still, rather than be among them; that is my advice to you; and keep this letter to yourself."

It is very evident that this letter proceeds from the mind of a man who is seriously religious in his own way, and anxious about the spiritual welfare of his son, which he considers to be exposed to as much danger among heretics in Glasgow, as that of Lot was among the men of Sodom. This ought to let us, Protestants, know in what light we are regarded by our Popish neighbours. Those from the Highlands, as well as those from Ireland, come and settle among us, with the design of earning their bread by the employment which we furnish them; but all the while they look upon us as a proscribed race, and doomed to destruction, because we are heretics; and they think, with complacency, of the near approach of that destruction, which they consider the same thing as their own emancipation.

This remark is suggested by the prophecy contained in the above extract. The letter was written in July, 1819, and it is predicted, that in two years from that date the Protestant religion in this country will be overthrown. It is well known that in 1819, the system of radicalism came to its height, or perfection of organization; and that travelling chapmen, and all sorts of low itinerants, carried the report through the remotest parts of the country, that there was to be a *radical* change in the government of the kingdom; and that Glasgow was to be the centre of the enterprise; and by such simpletons as the writer of this letter, the subversion of the established government was considered the same thing as the restoration of the true religion, which had been suppressed for three hundred years. The father did not wish his son to have any hand in the intended rebellion, as is evident from the mysterious manner in which he advises him to leave Glasgow, lest he should be involved in it; but it is equally evident that any thing that would bring about a restoration of Popery, in two years, would be hailed by the writer as a joyful event; and I put it to every Papist in the kingdom to say, if he would not think it so. And though they are not aware of it, and will not believe it, our Papists, by desiring such a change, are desiring their own destruction; for as matters are at present, they enjoy the privileges of British subjects, and may resist even the impositions of their priests if they please; but supposing them to have obtained the desired revolution, and the establishment of their own religion, they would loose the benefit of that protection which the law as it stands affords them; they would fall under the arbitrary dominion of their priests, and become as great slaves in Britain as Christians are in Algiers.

No. CLXXVI.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 24TH, 1821.

I have finished what I had to say on the subject of admitting Papists to places of power in this Protestant kingdom, and should now proceed to what I formerly promised, namely, a reply to Dr Milner's "End of Religious Controversy." But a subject of more immediate interest to myself, and the work in which I am engaged, will demand my attention for a week or two. My reply to Dr Milner is, indeed, a matter of less importance, seeing he has lately received a very able answer, by the Rev. Richard Grier, a clergyman of the established church in Ireland. This work is yet little known; none of the Reviews having noticed it, so far as I have seen; but, when it shall become known, I have no doubt of its obtaining very extensive circulation. Mr Grier is a thousand times better acquainted with the ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, as well as with the fathers of the Reformation, than I can pretend to be; and, therefore, far more able to detect the impositions of the vicar apostolic of the midland district; and many a barefaced imposition he has detected. When I come to grapple with the said apostolic vicar, I shall keep on the ground of scripture and common sense, and refer him to Mr Grier for tradition and the fathers; and I suspect it will be a long time before his right reverence will venture to meet Mr Grier on the one ground, or The Protestant on the other. I must not be understood to insinuate that Mr Grier does not occupy the former ground as well as The Protestant; but merely that it is chiefly on the latter that he has the advantage of him.

The thing which demands my more immediate attention is, the Report of the Jury Trial of the cause between Mr Scott and THE PROTESTANT, which is just published,—nearly five months after the trial took place; and now it appears under this great disadvantage, that the public have forgotten the question, to which they were most feelingly alive at the time. While thus expressing the great disappointment, and the loss occasioned by the unreasonable delay of my reporter, justice requires me to say, that the Report itself is given with great accuracy, so far as my own recollection enables me to judge; and I appeal to the recollection of others who were present at the trial, whether it be not so. For the reason given in a former Number, (161,) the reporter was not able to finish it, or to give any part of the evidence in defence; but it is presumed, that there is enough given from other sources to enable the intelligent and impartial reader to form his own judgment as to the merits of the question.

The Issues and preliminary matter occupy the first eleven pages of the publication. In the twelfth page, Mr Cockburn begins to open the case for the pursuer; and a very strong and plain case he seems to make of it; namely, that Mr Scott is a very meritorious individual, who comes into court with clean hands; and that Mr M'Gavin is one of the greatest libellers on the face of the earth. Many bad things he lays to the charge of Mr M'Gavin, which he does not even attempt to prove; and which it is not necessary, perhaps, that he himself should believe. A thing may be true in fact, yet it will be held false in law, if not proved in court; so there are many things at least doubtful, which an advocate may argue upon for hours, as if they were true, without transgressing the law. I do not wish to be understood as intending the least reflection against Mr Cockburn. He had a duty to perform to his client, which he did with great ability and fidelity; and in the severest passages, his language is such as became a gentleman to speak, and as was fit for gentlemen to hear, which I mention merely for the sake of a subsequent contrast. After all, it is not properly with Mr Cockburn that I have to do, in reviewing this Report of the Trial. He was merely the official organ of Mr Scott, from whom he must have received those things which he gave as facts, and some of the things which he meant to pass for arguments. I mean, therefore, no reflection against the bar, much less against the court or the jury, in any thing that I am going to write; but I consider a published account of a public trial, as fair a subject of review as any other publication; and though the issue of this trial was against me, and though the damages found had been ten times more than they were, I would not think it right or lawful to say a word in disparagement of the civil institutions of my country, or that had the least tendency to bring the law into contempt.

But with the most cordial respect for our civil institutions, and a conscientious subjection to the law, I hope I shall not be found a transgressor by exposing some of the sophistry and misrepresentation that my pursuer appears to have put into the mouth of his counsel. Some of the things are most powerfully exposed by Mr Moncreiff, in his speech in the defence: but that speech being necessarily extempore, so far as regarded replies, it was not possible to attend to every minute particular that is asserted on the other side; and some things are slightly touched, which admit of a more detailed discussion.

The reader of the Report will see that in strong language, Mr M'Gavin is accused of *malignity* towards the pursuer, to whom his writings have been so extremely injurious, that "it would be very odd, indeed, that, after such writing, Mr Scott's character should be as it was," and that "every farthing given of the damages asked, could not restore Mr Scott to the respectability and comfort he enjoyed before," p. 44. Again, "The work itself, by Mr M'Gavin, was hung up on the statue of King William, for the sake of being read by the mob in the street; and the effect of all this was, that Mr Scott was, in many cases, made the victim of popular commotion," p. 42. Not a word of this is proved, or attempted to be proved. I suppose it is usual in actions of damages, for the pursuer to prove that he has sustained injury of some kind or other: but here there is nothing of the kind, as the reader may see by reading over the depositions of Mr Scott's witnesses; and surely had Mr Scott been the victim of popular commotion—had he received a single public insult, nothing could be easier than to prove the fact. But not a word is said by any of his witnesses on that point. Neither is it proved, or attempted to be proved, that Mr Scott's character is not what it was; or that he does not now enjoy the respectability and comfort which he enjoyed before. These also are things capable of proof, and no doubt would have been proved had the allegation been true, which it is not. The statements of The Protestant could not affect his respectability among his own people, if they knew them to be false; and if he knew of any other persons who had conceived a bad opinion of him from these statements, he might have brought such persons to prove the fact. One respectable witness deponing to this would have had more weight with the jury than all Mr Cockburn's unsupported assertions; and would have procured him more ample damages. And I agree with the learned gentleman in his conclusion, had he proved his premises; that is, had he proved that Mr Scott had sustained such injury, as he says he did, in consequence of false and malignant statements in The Protestant, the whole £3000 of damages would not have been too much.

I said, Mr Scott did not even attempt to prove that he had sustained injury of any kind; but I must give this with some explanation; for there was something like an attempt, in one or two instances; but such attempts, and such a sort of proof, were never heard of before in any court in the world. Mr Gordon, the Popish priest in Greenock, was brought to prove that he had been insulted in Greenock, from the impression which the Protestant had made upon the good people of that town; and the jury were asked to consider this as evidence of what Mr Scott must have suffered in Glasgow! I question if Mr Cockburn will be able to keep his gravity when he reads the account of the hand he had in leading this sort of evidence. For the reader's satisfaction, I shall quote the passage in connection with part of Mr Cockburn's speech:—

"In the town of Greenock," said Mr C. "there was a dissenter, who, instead of making

the scriptures the subject of his sermon, actually gave his hearers a lecture from The Protestant, insomuch that the Catholic clergyman there was obliged to apply to the magistrates for assistance," p. 42. Then turn to the examination of the Rev. Mr Gordon, p. 74.

"Q. Had this work (The Protestant) a considerable circulation about Greenock? Was it publicly commented on?—A. I understood it was, in a meeting-house.

"Q. Whose meeting-house?—A. The Rev. Mr Wilson's.

"Q. Were ever any particular words put upon your own chapel?—A. Yes.

"What were they?—A. 'Down with Popery' or 'Black Popery'—I do not remember which.

"Q. Was that during the time The Protestant was going on?—A. It was.

"Q. And was there ever any thing done to put down black Popery—or did the populace ever give any insults to you about that time?—A. They called after me 'Roman Catholic priest,'—I do not know if that is an insult or not.

"The Lord Chief Commissioner—Q. What is the meaning of all this?

"Mr Cockburn—*We leave the jury to infer what effect this Protestant would have upon Mr Scott.*"

Now this is what I called something like an attempt to prove that Mr Scott had suffered injury from The Protestant; and I ask all the lawyers in the world, if ever they witnessed any thing like it? It is in fact a proof that Mr Scott never suffered insult or inconvenience from the cause assigned, else he would have got some direct proof of the fact, and would never have had recourse to such a desperate shift as to try to prove his sufferings from those of another man, in another town. In his cross-examination, Mr Gordon admitted that he had been called Roman priest before The Protestant began; and that this work only revived what had been done before: and why should he consider it an insult to be called by his real designation? He was called so, he says, at the time of building his own chapel; but I suppose he never thought of raising an action of damages against the builders on that account.

To that part of the question, whether any thing had been done in Greenock to put down black Popery, he gave no answer, from which we may infer that nothing was done; but Mr Cockburn tells us, that something was done to put down free discussion:—that this said priest applied to the magistrates of Greenock for assistance; that is, to compel the people who met in Mr Wilson's meeting-house to forbear reading the Protestant. This is a fact which I had heard before; but I did not expect that it would have been so explicitly avowed. This was a direct attempt by the Papists to commence persecution in a Protestant town. It is not true that The Protestant was made to supersede the bible, and preaching from it. The matter was simply this:—a number of Protestants, of various denominations, met once a week, on Thursday evening, to hear one of their number read The Protestant; and I have been told that great numbers attended, and that the interest excited was very great. Certainly there was nothing illegal in this—nothing that required magisterial interference; and the magistrates had too much good sense, and knew their duty too well, to become the executioners of the holy inquisition, which thus appeared to be erected within their jurisdiction. Had any of the ministers of Greenock applied to the magistrates to prohibit Mr Gordon from preaching against the established religion, all the world would have heard of Protestant intolerance and persecution; but when a Popish priest does virtually the same thing, it is considered so much a thing of course, that no person wonders at it, or at all thinks about it. No doubt Mr Gordon was grieved by the exposure of the superstitons and idolatries of his church, which was made every week almost within his hearing; but he ought to have replied in the way of fair argument, and not by force, as is evident he would have done, had he had Popish magistrates who would have executed his mandate.

That some person did hang up some Numbers of my work on the railing of King William's statue, to be read by the public, is true; but I had no more hand in it than Mr Scott; nor do I know who did it; and that it was done by me, is one of those random assertions, which the learned gentleman chose to make, to serve the cause of his client; no matter how improbable, if it was likely to make an impression on the jury. But whoever was guilty of giving my work such publicity, it is very certain that it did Mr Scott no injury,—it excited no commotion, else we should have heard of it, and Mr Scott would have proved it.

Another circumstance is brought into view, as an attempt to prove the injury which The Protestant has done to Mr Scott; that is, the great diminution of the number of his members. This was not pleaded by his counsel; and none of his witnesses were examined as to the number of conversions from Popery by means of my writings; but some papers were given in, and sworn to by the witness Bowman, which are printed, pp. 60, 61. of the Trial, by which it appears, that the number is very much diminished indeed; and I cannot comprehend why these papers were given in, but to support the claim of heavy damages for the injury done by The Protestant in causing such diminution. In March, 1817, the year before my work commenced, the total number on the books was 4517
Total number in December, 1820 . 3957

Decrease of members . . . 560

At the first mentioned period, the number of subscribers to the chapel was .	4037
At the second period, the number was	2696
Decrease of subscribers . . .	1341

Allowing these to be facts, and I have no means of disproving them, it was not an injury done to Mr Scott by illegal means, and therefore not such as to found a claim for damages. It is the result of argument on the one hand, and conviction on the other. If an action of damages can be maintained on this ground, Mr Scott ought to be libelled for every convert he has made from the established church, if he ever made such a thing, which I much doubt.

He will argue that I made his people disaffected by means of false statements, and that therefore they left him; but if the people knew my statements to be false, and none could know the state of facts so well as they, that would have endeared them to their pastor the more. If they left him in consequence of my statements, it must have been because they knew them to be true; for it would be almost as absurd as transubstantiation, to say, that they disbelieved my statements, or knew them to be false, and yet were influenced by the belief of them to forsake their priest, and abandon their religion.

But admitting the facts in all their extent, Mr Scott is no way injured by them. If his flock is less numerous, his work is less arduous; and bishop Cameron proved it to be a very arduous work indeed,—a work for which no other priest within his jurisdiction was competent. If the subscriptions be also diminished, that is no pecuniary loss to Mr Scott; for bishop Cameron proved likewise, that he had no patrimonial interest whatever in the property, and his stipend remains undiminished.

Of the 560 members whom he has lost, he has not said how many were lost by reading The Protestant, and how many by leaving the place from want of employment, during the stagnation of trade, in 1819-20. Much as it would gratify me to have the former proved to be the chief cause, a regard to truth compels me to say, that I believe, at least in the proportion of ten to one, the defection was owing to the latter cause. With regard to them, therefore, the falling off was owing to no fault of mine, and it could not be for that that damages were awarded. Nay, I have in my possession the names of upwards of fifty Popish families,* making about 250 individuals, whom I assisted to feed and clothe, by means of a public subscription, during the above period of stagnation, and thus kept them in the place, when, otherwise, they must have left it, or died of want. I hope Mr Scott will not say I must pay damages for this.

Of the 1341 who have ceased to subscribe for paying the debt upon the chapel, or the manse, or both, he does not say how many were influenced to withdraw their names by reading The Protestant. From any thing that appears, the defalcation may be entirely owing to their not being so strictly looked after, or so strongly urged to subscribe, as they were before The Protestant took up the subject. The time of subscribing according to the statements above referred to, divides itself into two periods of about $3\frac{1}{2}$ years each. During the first period, the sum raised, among the labouring classes, in sixpences, shillings &c. was £5487 9*s.* 9*d.*, and in the latter period, only £687 18*s.* 3*d.* Report, pp. 60, 61. Was this defalcation owing to The Protestant? If not, I ask, why was such a statement given in evidence against him; and if it was owing to his writings, the people must have known there was truth in his statements.

Here is a case of Mr Scott's own showing, and I ask him to explain it. From August, 1813, to March, 1817, that is, 43 months, the poor and labouring part of his congregation contributed for the chapel £5487 9*s.* 9*d.* This is exclusive of large sums from the rich, which are stated separately at £426 3*s.* which includes Mr Finlay's 50 guineas, and sums from several other of my Protestant acquaintances, whom I need not name, as Mr Cockburn boasts of none of them by name but Mr Finlay. Well, in the first period, or 43 months, the poor labouring people contribute £5487 9*s.* 9*d.*, and in the second period, from March, 1817, to December, 1820, that is, 45 months, the very same class of people contribute only £687 18*s.* 3*d.*

This, I say, is according to Mr Scott's own showing; and I call upon him to account for the difference of his levies in these two periods. That I may not assert what may be called libellous, I shall merely ask him a pair of questions, on which I really wish to obtain information. First; Was not the sum levied in the

* One of these was that of the celebrated John Drain, who makes a conspicuous figure in the trial. The following is the statement given by himself, when he applied for relief at Hutcheson's Hospital. "Name, John Drain—place of abode, M'Kinlay's land, east end of Duke Street—residence, within the royalty, five years—age, 27,—wife's, 23—children under 10 years, 2—occupation, weaver—earnings, himself 4*s.* his wife, 9*d.* per week;"—and the following is a certificate by the gentleman appointed by the committee to visit him in his own house, which was usually done to applicants before relief was granted. "This statement (the above) is correct. This is a case of great poverty, arising from his bad state of health, and the lowness of his wages for a long time past. They are destitute of bed-clothing, and almost so of body clothes. These articles they are in real want of; and the prospect of an addition to his family very soon, would render them doubly acceptable. He bears an honest and industrious character. 6th Jany. 1820." Relief granted, a pair and a half of blankets, and a supply of meal weekly, till the month of May, 15 pecks in all. It is to be regretted his character did not stand so fair, when he appeared as a witness in my cause, to prove that Mr Scott, eighteen months before, had refused to baptize his apparently dying child, unless he would pay 10*s.* to the chapel. The character must however have been given according to the knowledge of his neighbours at the time.

first period, done by means of that influence by which a Popish priest can make his people do whatever he pleases, that is, not without the range of physical impossibility? And, secondly; Was not the small sum collected during the second period, just that which the people chose to give of their own free will, without recourse being had to that influence which is mentioned in the other question? An answer to these two questions will enable us to judge how far the first contributions were really voluntary; and as the latter period was distinguished by the lucubrations of The Protestant, we shall, perhaps, be enabled to determine, whether there has been any connection between these lucubrations, and the falling off of the subscriptions. I maintain that though the one were proved to have been occasioned by the other, there could be no fault found, seeing no means but argument were used, to convince poor persons, that it was better to study the health and comfort of their families, than to give their money for raising a great heap of stones cut into fantastic figures, "whose likeness is not seen in heaven, or earth, or sea."

If it shall be alleged that the small sum collected during the second period was owing to the stagnation of trade, on account of which Mr Scott did not urge his people to contribute; I shall answer, that the greatest stagnation and distress known in the present age was during the first period, when the large sum was collected, to wit, 1816, and the beginning of 1817; for then there was a dearth of provisions as well as want of employment for the poor. I am in possession of the committee's books for both periods, and I speak what I know; and what is known to all who took charge of supplying the wants of the poor in these seasons of great distress.

No. CLXXVII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1ST 1821.

THE reader will see by my last Number, that Mr Scott did not prove that he had suffered any injury from the statements in The Protestant. For the truth of this I appealed to the testimony of his own witnesses, in the Report of the Trial, not one of whom speaks of injury having been done to the character or interest of the pursuer. Some statements, in their opinion, may have been injurious; but they do not prove the fact that they were so, in any respect whatever. From certain productions, it was proved indeed, that the number of his congregation was greatly reduced of late, that the number of subscribers for his house and chapel was still more reduced; and that those who continued to subscribe were not so liberal as before, seeing that in a recent period of 45 months they had contributed only £687 18*s.* 3*d.*, whereas in an immediately preceding period of 43 months they had contributed the large sum of £5487 9*s.* 9*d.*, exclusive of certain subscriptions from wealthy Protestants and others. I have called upon Mr Scott to account for the astonishing difference between the sums collected in these two periods; and, I am sure, account for it as he will, he cannot ascribe it to any thing very culpable on my part, seeing if the people withheld their money in consequence of my arguments, it must have been from a conviction in their own minds that they could apply it to a better purpose; and every one has a right to do what he will with his own. It could not be for this, or for injury done in any way to Mr Scott, that damages were awarded. I admit, that where malice and falsehood appear, they ought to be punished whether they have been injurious or not; but I was not proved guilty of these, else doubtless the damages would have been much greater.

I shall now proceed with my review of the Report of the Trial, and I shall dispose of the calculation part of it before I attend to any other. By a certain arithmetical process, (I shall not call it deception) Mr Cockburn finds that the total amount levied by Mr Scott from all his people, was, upon an average, only a penny three farthings a week; and by deducting the subscriptions above £10, the remainder was scarcely a penny a week; then, on the suggestion of Lord Gillies, this is reduced to a half-penny a week, which suggestion was perhaps correct, according to the data laid down, for which Mr Scott and his counsel alone were accountable. There was however a fundamental error in the data, which could not easily be detected, without a process of calculation which it was impossible to work and at the same time attend to the business of the court. So, taking his data as undisputed, Mr Cockburn goes on to say:—"Observe that plain and glaring fact. Allowing Mr Scott to have run riot in Glasgow, like a lion seeking whom he might devour, and devouring all who came in his way,—of great influence over his flock,—the calumny amounts to this, that for building a chapel necessary for his flock, the amount of the extortion was a half-penny a week." p. 34. The reply of the defender's counsel to this statement was necessarily general, (see p. 128.) for there was no time to go into the minute calculation which the subject required; and I have no doubt this confident statement of Mr Cockburn, suggested by one of the judges, and apparently resting upon an arithmetical fact, had more weight with the jury than any thing else that was said or proved.

It is admitted by Mr Cockburn, in his speech, that the expense of the chapel and manse was from fifteen to twenty thousand pounds, which agrees with the statement in The Protestant, where it is said to be nearly twenty thousand. Take it at the medium between fifteen and

twenty, and we have £17,500; but the learned counsel makes his calculations upon only £5487. There is the sum of £12,000 altogether unaccounted for. There is not so much as an attempt to account for it, either by word or writing. Speaking of the large sum from £15,000 to 20,000, Mr Cockburn says, "that was not all from Glasgow," leaving it to be inferred that it was got somewhere. For the satisfaction of the court and jury they should have shown where they got so large a sum; or if it remains a debt on the property they should have said so. It is, however, not credible that so large a debt should lie upon it, or that any person would accept the security for so much. The necessary inference is, that by fees of confession, and other means, the poor people had to pay a great deal more than what appears in the subscription books.

But it is from these books that we must make our calculations, for we have no other data. Mr Cockburn states the number of Papists in and about Glasgow to have been, at the time of the subscription, meaning I suppose the first period, at 8245, which is the number according to Mr Cleland's tables. Then he tells us, they are now between nine and ten thousand, which is not very consistent with the statement of their decrease, as deponed by one of the witnesses. Whether he divides the product by one or other of the numbers to make out the half-penny a-week, it is needless to inquire, seeing the lowest number contains all the souls of that communion, men, women, and children, in the city and neighbourhood, according to a very accurate survey. Of these not above one fourth could be subscribers at any one time, according to the average of poor Irish families, in which there are usually a great many children. This plain fact raises Mr Cockburn's half-penny to twopence a-week, to every head of a family without exception; and though this will appear a small matter to learned gentlemen who are making their thousands a year, it must have been a very great matter to a poor labourer, and to his hungry children, at a time when provisions were nearly double the price that they are at present, and when he could not find employment for half his time.

But Mr Scott himself, by the hands of Mr Jeffrey, produces a statement to the accuracy of which Mr Bowman depones, by which it appears that during the 43 months, from August, 1813, to March, 1817, the total number of subscribers was only 4037. Observe, these were not all subscribers at any one time. They are all who gave any thing *during the whole* 43 *months*. A stranger, staying only a week in the place, and giving a sixpence, or other small sum, is marked down as a subscriber; and his name counts as well as that of the man who paid sixpence a-week during the whole period. The number 4037 is made up by reckoning many such. These, and their small sums, ought to be deducted, and then, by dividing the sum that remains among the remaining persons, we shall see what the regular subscribers paid upon an average.

The paper referred to states, that 1049 persons gave under five shillings; and that 597 gave under ten shillings but above five. These must all have been persons who staid only a short time in the place, or persons who had died, or had recently come to reside among us. Be what they may, they cannot be called regular subscribers. They must therefore be deducted from the 4037, and the average of their payments from the aggregate amount. Thus, take 1049 at 2*s*. 6*d*. which is the medium between 5*s*. and nothing, and we

have	£131	2	6
597 at 7*s*. 6*d*. the medium between 10*s*. and 5*s*. . .	223	17	6
	£355	0	0

This sum, therefore, falls to be deducted from the £5487, which leaves, nett, £5132. Mr Cockburn consented to deduct those who paid above £10; but I will concede to him all above £7, considering these above the rank of poor persons. These are 72, (see p. 60,) and this will exhaust a little more than the £426 3*s*., which is given as the amount of the large sums. Then deduct 1049 + 597 + 72 = 1718, from 4037, and we have 2319 persons. Among them divide £5132, and we have exactly £2 4*s*. 3*d*., from each individual for 43 months, being a fraction more than a shilling a month or sixpence a fortnight. This result corresponds with the real fact of the case, for which I appeal to Mr Scott's own books, in the columns of which 6*d*. a fortnight will be found the prevailing rate of contribution. There are of course some more and some less; but the thousands of sixpences in the books of his inventory, No. I. prove the correctness of my calculation.

Thus the court and the jury were led by Mr Scott and his counsel, by a calculation proceeding upon a false datum, to believe that the sum exacted from poor people was only a sixth part of what it really was. Had the books themselves been submitted to the inspection of the jury when they retired, they would have seen the real state of the matter. They would have seen lists of names such as they never saw before,—M'Gurks, and M'Guires, and M'Deads and M'Deaths, and O'Rourks, and O'Flannahans, O'Regans, Gallochars, and such like, mostly poor Irish labourers, with lines of sixpences opposite their names, like the notes in a music book; and they would at once have detected the halfpenny a week sophistry; but somehow the jury were not directed to take the books with them when they retired; and they saw them merely as a heap, lying on a table at a distance.

By Mr Scott's own productions, and the de-

position of one of his witnesses, it is thus proved, that 2319 Papists in Glasgow and the neighbourhood, during a period of 43 months, were contributing towards the building of the chapel, threepence a week, upon an average, that is, a halfpenny a day; and it is well known that during at least a part of that period few labourers of any description, with the exception of cotton-spinners, were able to procure food for their families, or clothes to cover them. I appeal for the truth of this, to all the elders, and others, who have paid any attention to the state of the poor in this city, and in the Barony parish of late years; and I ask such persons to say, whether, in their opinion, it was possible, that such a number of labourers, in such a season of distress, could pay a halfpenny a day, without denying their children or themselves some of the necessaries of life, or being indebted for them to the bounty of others?

The commissioners of police, and the managers of the water companies, know how difficult it is, nay that it is impossible, in hundreds of instances, to obtain payment of their assessments and rates, though as low as twentypence a year, even from persons not as poor as Irish labourers, but from persons whose yearly rent amounts to £5, and who are therefore in a more respectable situation than those who cannot afford to have houses of their own, but are huddled together in crowds, in hired apartments, as is the case with multitudes of Irish labourers. To such persons a halfpenny a day or thirteen shillings a year, must have been a grievous burden. Persons wallowing in wealth will not understand this; but the poor themselves, and those who have had the charge of supplying the poor, will understand it.

Mr Jeffrey, it will be seen, in the short sketch of his speech that is given at the end of the Report, enlarged on the monstrous statement of The Protestant, of nearly £20,000 having been levied from the poor people, when it turned out in evidence that the sum so levied was under £6000. So far as recollection serves, this was the most argumentative part of his speech, and he made as much, I believe, as human ingenuity could make of the discrepancy between the statement, and the arithmetical fact, as it appeared in the evidence. I shall reply to this when he, or Mr Scott, shall have accounted for the £12,000 that remains unaccounted for, according to Mr Scott's own showing, by the mouth of Mr Cockburn. The remarks of The Protestant in his seventy-second Number, proceeded upon the general report and belief, that two such buildings as the chapel and the manse must have cost nearly £20,000, and that they were built chiefly at the expense of the labouring poor of his congregation. Mr Scott, by his counsel, admits the fact, that the buildings cost as much as The Protestant said, but he accounts for only one-third of the money raised for these buildings. His subscription books, therefore, do not give a full statement of the sums levied for the chapel. There must have been other sources of supply which are kept out of view, else there remains a debt upon the property of more than it is worth, which was not pleaded or pretended in the process.

I am willing, however, to admit the existence of some debt upon the property, because bishop Cameron speaks of Mr Scott's having proposed to let his fine house, and go to a smaller one, that the rent of the large one might go towards the payment of the debt. But this would be a most absurd idea, if the debt were £12,000; for the rent of the house, together with the total contributions of all the people, since March, 1817, would not pay the interest of the debt; so they would find themselves like a lame man pursuing a hare, the longer he ran he would be the farther from his object. If the debt in March, 1817, was £12,000, it must have been at the end of 1820 at least £14,000, and all the money collected for the liquidation of it, down to that period, was only £687 18*s.* 3*d.*, acording to Mr Scott's own productions. Now, I say, this is altogether incredible. It is improbable, I may say impossible, that the property can bear such a burden; and, therefore, there is every reason to believe he must have raised among his people much more money than that which appears in his subscription books; and whatever was so raised, ought to be added to the sixpence a fortnight already proved to have been the average rate of contribution from his subscribers.

Here I am arguing from a public statement made by Mr Scott's counsel, and public documents exhibited by himself in open court. The sum of the matter is this:—his chapel and manse cost £17,500; all that he collected for it from his people and others was about £6000, leaving about £12,000 unaccounted for. He ought to have accounted for this one way or other; and if he had received large subscriptions from his brethren at a distance, he would have had no reasonable objection to show them, because they could have shown the interest which these brethren took in his great undertaking; but as nothing of the kind was shown, it is reasonable to presume nothing of the kind could be shown.

We must have a more particular inquiry into this £687 18*s.* 3*d*, which has come so often in our way. This was all that Mr Scott was able to collect from his people from March, 1817, to December, 1820, that is, 45 months. The contributors were, as is stated, p. 61. of the Report, 2696. Of these 1625 paid under 5*s.* which, taken at half-a-crown as formerly, would make £203 2*s.* 6*d.*; 608 were above 5*s.* but under 10*s.* and taken as formerly at 7*s.* 6*d.* the sum is £228. These two sums = £431 2*s.* 6*d.*, taken from £687: 18*s.* 3*d.*, leave £256: 15*s.* 9*d.* Deduct 1625 + 608 = 2233, from

2696, and we have 463 persons who paid £256 15*s.* 9*d.*, in 45 months, making eleven shillings and one penny each, for the whole period; that is, about threepence a month. This comes nearer Mr Cockburn's halfpenny a week result; and it appears to have been the amount of the voluntary contribution, not of the thousands of poor, but of the four hundred and sixty-three rich, after The Protestant had opened their eyes, and shut their purses. The reader is again requested to observe, that I am arguing from Mr Scott's own statements; and if I am wrong in any of my inferences, he may set me right if he pleases.

Thus, though Mr Scott failed to prove that he had sustained any injury in his person or property, he does show that this Protestant has done immense mischief to the cause of Popery in this city and neighbourhood. But surely this will never be considered a crime by Protestants. It could not be for this that a Protestant jury ordained me to pay a hundred pounds of damages. The thing has been the effect of a fair literary warfare. Popery has ever been considered an enemy by consistent Protestants; and it has always been reckoned fair to cut off the supplies of an enemy when it can be done. I never intended injury to the person or property of Mr Scott or any other Papist; and it is gratifying to know that no such injury has been sustained by any man by what I have written; for it is doing Papists themselves no injury, but rather a benefit, to check the progress of their superstition, and to prevent their extending the reign of idolatry among us. That such a check has been given to Popery here, is fully proved by these statements of Mr Scott, especially when taken in connection with the deposition of bishop Cameron, who says, p. 46, that the house was built for the accommodation of two priests *at least*, because two are *absolutely necessary*, if they could be supported there; and in the same page, he says, that Mr Scott had applied to be removed to a smaller house, and to have the large one let, that the rent might go towards the payment of the debt. Thus what I stated more than three years ago, is proved to be true, by the bishop upon oath, that it was intended to have a college of priests in Glasgow, for whom this house was then building, and now it is further proved that the congregation cannot afford to support even one priest in the great house, with becoming splendour, but that he wishes to go to a small one. The design of having two priests at least, though declared *absolutely necessary*, has been abandoned in consequence of the drying up of their resources. Thus Popery has got a check here; and I would never have suspected that it was so much owing to my writings, if Mr Scott had not shown it.—When the design was formed the congregation were contributing in small sums, at the rate of £5487 in 43 months, or £127 a month; but lately they have contributed only £687 18*s.* 3*d.*, in 45 months, or £15 a month. Seeing they have been so powerfully affected by my writings in one way, I most earnestly entreat them to be affected in another way:—let them embrace the truth, renounce their errors, and abandon the Pope and Popery for ever. This will be infinitely more beneficial to them than the mere saving of their money, and I shall esteem it a much more glorious victory.

The achievement, such as it is, has been highly appreciated in the south, as appears by a late letter in the True Briton, London newspaper, signed ICONO-CLASTES, that is, image-breaker, of which the following is an extract:—"It will scarcely be credited that the inhabitants of Glasgow had so much forgotten the principles of their forefathers, that they flocked in crowds to this temple of the Christian Diana, and contributed liberally to the practice and encouragement of idolatry amongst them. Such latitudinarian indifference excited much regret among the sound part of the city, and at last, a respectable merchant, named M'Gavin, inserted a few letters in one of the Glasgow papers, under the signature of THE PROTESTANT. (It was A Protestant.) These were answered by Amicus Veritatis, Pax, &c. and the controversy continuing, Mr M'Gavin was induced to publish a weekly Number of eight pages, on the errors and absurdities of Popery. The effect has been beneficial beyond all hope. This recall to reflection has awakened in the inhabitants of that city a proper sense of their vacillating conduct on so important a subject; and their desertion of the Clyde Street Chapel has had a similar effect to that of the preaching of the apostle at Ephesus:—one of the priests, giving up all attempts of vindicating the worship of his imagery by the pen, determined to try what assistance the quirks and quibbles of the law would lend him." Then follow some remarks which must not appear in my pages.

People dwelling upon the spot will probably be of opinion that this writer overrates the good which my labours have done. I would think so myself, if Mr Scott had not shown that his supplics are so completely cut off, that instead of enlarging the establishment, and increasing the number of priests in order to propagate Popery among us, he is obliged to reduce the establishment,—to propose letting his dwelling-house, and going to a smaller one. Mr Jeffrey drew a most melancholy picture of a highly meritorious individual, living alone, in the corner of a great house, upon fifty pounds a year, which if it did not draw tears from the eyes of the judges and jury, was meant to draw money from my pocket. Though it had been for the sake of this passage alone, I wish the speech had been preserved; not merely because it was a piece of most pathetic eloquence; but because it showed how deeply

he was affected by the magnitude of the mischief which I had done; which mischief, after all, is only the triumph of truth over error,—of common sense over absurdity and imposition.

No. CLXXVIII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8TH, 1821.

IT is a general belief among Protestants that miracles ceased with the apostolic age, or soon after it. Papists, on the other hand, maintain, that the church has had the power of working miracles in all ages; and Dr Milner, in his "End of Religious Controversy," relates several that have lately been performed at the holy well of St Wenefride, and one by the application of the hand of a dead saint to a diseased person in Lancashire. I was by no means convinced by the doctor's statements; and I might have continued all my days to disbelieve in Popish miracles, had not Mr Scott proved that he has performed one, to match which, he may boldly challenge all the saints in the calendar, and the holy well into the bargain.

This is no less than keeping a series of accounts, of many thousand pounds, collected in small sums, from thousands of persons, during a period of seven years, without having a date to ascertain when any particular sum was received; and keeping these accounts so correctly as to satisfy his bishop, who passed, and doqueted them, thus pledging his episcopal authority for their accuracy. I have past most of my life among books of accounts, and have been familiar with all sorts of book-keeping; and I am sure nothing less than a miracle would have kept my accounts right, if I had not been as particular in marking the dates of receiving and paying money, as in entering the money itself. But Mr Scott has proved the fact as above stated, by his own oath, and that of bishop Cameron, so that no one can lawfully doubt it; and I candidly confess, I never saw a Popish miracle so well attested.

This is a thing of so much importance, and so singularly miraculous, that I hope the reader will thank me for a more particular account of it. I shall introduce it with an extract from Mr Cockburn's speech:—"Under the forms of pleading in this court, as I am sure will be shown to you from the proper quarter at the proper time, when a defender says he will prove his defence, he is bound to mention his statements as specifically as if he, in reference to these statements, were the pursuer. The court, therefore, called on Mr M'Gavin to say what were the facts he meant to prove. He gave in a very thick and formidable paper—a great number of statements, extended to a long period of time, which might have embraced half the town with the evidence. When he was required to state a little more specifically what he meant, so specifically as to be intelligible, and to give *names, times, circumstances*, he attempted to do so during a year; but the whole fabric crumbled from him inch by inch, till at last the charges resolved into the four last cases mentioned in the Issues before you," p. 30. This is not quite correct, for he offered evidence on widow Hanlin's case specifically, which was the third Issue; but he was not allowed to enter into it. By the by I am much obliged to Mr Cockburn for the statement here given, because it lets the public see that I had no want of materials for my defence, had the forms and rules of court allowed me to make use of them. Indeed nothing could exceed the zeal and industry of Mr Blair, my agent in Glasgow, who procured and arranged such a mass of materials, as must have surprised Mr Scott himself; and he would have been still more surprised had I been allowed to examine all my witnesses. But to use Mr Cockburn's expression, p. 32, I was "put to the wall by the court," by their requiring not merely the names of persons, but also the "*times*" and "*circumstances*" of incidents which had taken place years before. It was not enough that I offered to prove the refusal of ordinances to John or James, because they were behind in their contributions; but I was required to condescend upon the date and circumstances of each particular case. Now this was impossible with regard to most of the cases, from the long time that had elapsed,—from the removal of some persons, and the death of others; and Mr Scott had taken care not to institute his action till he knew that I would have these difficulties to contend with.

There seemed to be only one way by which I could ascertain the dates of particular incidents; that was, by access to Mr Scott's subscription books, by which, I supposed, it would appear when such and such persons paid up their arrears, and were admitted to their privileges. Application was therefore made for a diligence to recover these books, which was opposed by Mr Scott, and refused by the court, see Report of the Trial, p. 135, till after the Issues were fixed. Then indeed the diligence was granted, and the books recovered. They were delivered in three parcels with their respective inventories. No. I. contained 48 books: No. II. 38: No. III. I forget how many, but they were about 100 in all. Along with my agent and Mr Sym, I set first to the examination of No. I. and on turning over the 48 books of this inventory, we found that not one of them had a date, either at the beginning, middle, or end. They might all have been a hundred years old for any thing that appeared by them; except, indeed, the book kept by Mr Scott himself, which proves itself to belong to the present century, not by any date, but by containing the names of several of my

Protestant friends whom I know to be alive, and who were liberal subscribers to the chapel. Inventory, No. II. were also without dates, except the first book, which had upon the corner of the cover, Sept. 12th, 1819, perhaps by accident. Those in the third inventory seemed to be duplicates. The whole were given up under oath in the following terms, see the Trial, p. 123. "At Glasgow, the 4th of June, 1821, appeared the pursuer, Andrew Scott, who, being solemnly sworn, *ut supra*, and interrogated and called upon to exhibit the lists of contributors, or accounts of contributions, towards the Roman Catholic chapel, lately erected in Glasgow, depones and exhibits the whole of the documents of the description called for, in his possession, as per inventories, Nos. I. II. III. marked by the deponent and commissioner, as relative hereto. Farther, depones, that the exhibits now made, as contained in three separate parcels, contain the lists and accounts of the whole contributions, towards the Roman Catholic establishment in Glasgow, made in Glasgow, or the adjacent counties, *down to the present month.*"

It appeared to us that we could make nothing of a set of books that contained no dates; accordingly we applied for a supplementary diligence to make Mr Scott produce books or accounts with dates. We obtained this, and had him examined again, on the 15th of June, when he swore as follows, see the Trial, p. 124, —"That he is not in possession of any books or other documents, tending to instruct the dates of the contributions to the erection of the said chapel, having, when formerly examined as a haver, exhibited and produced the whole documents of the description called for, in his possession. That he is not aware that it is usual to affix particular dates to subscription papers, and he was not in the habit of marking the dates on the contribution papers, which he, from time to time, received from the different collectors. That the contributions were begun about the middle of August, 1813, as far as he remembers; and that *the last were received about the end of December*, 1816. And being specially called on to produce any cash book, or other book or writing, in which he marked the sums contained in the inventory, No. I. of the productions formerly made, or any part thereof, specifying dates in reference to the said contributions,—depones, that he is not possessed, and to the best of his knowledge, *never was possessed of any books, or other documents*, specifying the dates of the said contributions, farther than may appear from the productions formerly made, particularly, No. I. of inventory, No. I. of said productions." See the rest of the deposition in the Report of the Trial. The book here referred to, in inventory No. I., contained no date at all; and, therefore, Mr Scott depones, that he never kept any date of the money he thus received.

Let us see now how bishop Cameron proves the accuracy of these books; at least, that he was satisfied with them.

"*Examined by Mr Jeffrey.*—Q. Had you any duty to perform in auditing the accounts of the chapel?—A. I had a right, which I exercised for some years while the building was going on.

Q. Were you satisfied with the collection and distribution of the funds.—A. I was." P. 46.

"*Cross-examined by Mr Moncreiff.*—Q. You said, in regard of the accounts for the erection of the chapel, that you had a right to control the accounts, and did so for some period?—A. I did, for several years, see them.

Q. Were they sent to you?—A. No; I inspected them there, and put my name to them.

Q. What kind of accounts were they?—A. I do not understand the question.

Q. Was there a book of accounts?—A. There was.

Q. Did you put your name to that book?—A. I did, for some years.

Q. Did you put your name more than once?—A. I must have put my name two or three different years, or perhaps oftener. I do not recollect particularly.

Q. In this book, was an account kept of disbursements and receipts?—A. It was not kept in a commercial way. It showed what was spent, what was got in, and how it was got in,—what was borrowed, &c.

Q. Did it appear, from the book, at what time the sums were received and given out?—A. It must have appeared *when they were given out. They did not come in regularly.* When there was not money, there was a necessity to borrow.

Q. What like a book was it in appearance?—A. I cannot answer that question I do not recollect at all. It is some years since I was there; and, from age and infirmity, I cannot rely upon my memory so much as to describe it to you.

Q. When you put your name to this book, did you put any doquet upon it—did you write any thing?—A. I must certainly have done that—I must have given a declaration that I had examined the accounts, and that I approved of them. I do not recollect in what form this was done, but I must have done it.

Q. In whose possession was this book at the time you went over it?—A. In Mr Scott's." Report, &c. pp. 48, 49.

After reading the above documents, and the bishop's deposition, I hope none of my readers will call in question the reality of the miracle which I have described. Mr Scott swears distinctly, that, to the best of his knowledge, he never was possessed of any books or accounts, specifying the dates of contributions to his chapel. And bishop Cameron swears as dis-

tinctly that he must have given a declaration that he had examined these accounts, and had approved of them. When interrogated as to the dates of money received, he evades the question by a remark which in any case but a miraculous one, would have made dates particularly necessary; that is, the money *did not come in regularly*. Had it come in at regular periods, as Martinmas and Whitsunday, the lines would have indicated their own dates, supposing the first only to have been dated. But the very irregularity of the payments rendered the dates absolutely necessary to the accuracy of the accounts, had the case been an ordinary one, especially as the contributions received were mixed with borrowed money, and money belonging to other individuals, which Mr Scott was in the habit of receiving and putting into the bank according to the sequel of his second deposition, p. 125. This is a mere mercantile question about the accurate keeping of pounds, shillings, and pence; and I ask all the merchants and accountants in Glasgow, and many very acute and accurate men are among them, whether they do not feel as I do, that without a miracle they would find it impossible to keep distinct accounts of money transactions without dates? I am sure they will unanimously say they would find it impossible. They may be very sure then, that a Romish priest, who knows little more than the common rules of arithmetic, could not, without a very signal miracle, keep such accounts as he has done, without dates, so as to satisfy an ordinary auditor, much less his right reverend superior, the diocesan of the lowlands of Scotland.

The reader of the Report will see, pp. 59—61, that James Bowman depones to certain statements, which differ materially from both Mr Scott's depositions. The contributions are not made to come down to either December, 1816, or June 1821; but are divided into two periods from August, 1813, to March, 1817, and from the latter date, to December, 1820. Bowman swears that these are correct abstracts, and that he did his best to make them so; but he was under no supernatural influence. He possessed nothing but the ordinary arithmetical power of summing up, and extending by means of pen and ink; and as the materials from which he made up the statements were without any dates that could show when money was received, it would be unfair to place the result of his operations in competition with the other result so evidently miraculous.

The reader will perceive by this time, that the subscription books could be of little use to us. Having no dates themselves, they could not prove the date of any thing else. And though they had been dated; and though they had enabled us to fix the time of every fact we wished to prove, they would have been of no use, as we afterwards found, for the court would not allow us to prove any thing but what was contained in the last four of the seven Issues, which were fixed before we obtained the diligence to recover the books. In looking over the lists, however, Mr Sym discovered a great many names which were familiar to him as hospital paupers, who were considerable subscribers, two or three of whom were actually living in the hospital at the time. Whether these were all the same persons, or merely persons of the same name, I cannot say for certain. We meant to try to prove their identity, by Mr Buchanan, who visits all the hospital poor at their own houses, and for this purpose he had brought the hospital books; but the reader will see by the Trial, p. 135, that we were not allowed to get an answer to a single question about any person or fact but what related to one or other of the four Issues; and thus three-fourths of my witnesses were not examined at all. I merely state the fact, without any reflection whatever. There is no doubt a reason for the rule under which the court acted; and it may be a very equitable one; but I state the fact, as it is of great public importance; and the knowledge of it may save a great deal of expense to those who may be brought into court as I was. Had I known the rule beforehand, it would have saved at least a hundred pounds, which was expended in the travelling and maintenance of persons who were not called, and would not have been heard if they had.

A man who professes to come into court "with clean hands," as Mr Cockburn says Mr Scott did, though he obtain a verdict in his favour, gains no triumph when he dreads to let *any man's* testimony be heard. A man conscious of nothing amiss would desire all the world to speak what they knew of him. But Mr Scott oftener than once, by his counsel, stopt the mouth of witnesses, when he was afraid they would say something he did not wish the jury to hear. This was particularly glaring in the case of Mr Buchanan, when he was questioned about widow Haulin. Had her history, and that of her deceased husband, been as Mr Cockburn represents it in his speech, nothing could have served Mr Scott's cause better than to have had the case examined. Mr Jeffrey pleaded that we had no need to go into that case at all, and the court sustained his plea. Mr Scott knew that I had the widow in waiting for examination. She is one of his own people; she would not have said a word against him if she could help it; and could she have said a word for him would gladly have done it. Now had she been examined, and cross-examined;—had she proved Mr Cockburn's statement and disproved Mr Sym's, Mr Scott would have obtained a complete triumph. But he would not trust his cause to the oath of one of his own people, who is dependent upon him for the very pardon of her sins. Whence was this but from a consciousness that her ex-

amination could not be made to serve his cause, and might operate against it? Had he stood upon such high ground as Mr Cockburn represents, he should have heard what every one had to say. He ought to have left it to the court to check any one who went into irrevelent matter, either in asking questions, or answering them; but his counsel actually presumed to control the procedure, and to command my witnesses to be silent. See pp. 133, 135.

Mr Scott will perhaps reply, that I might have suborned witnesses to appear against him; but I have just as good reason to say this of him. But no man in his right mind, who knows what the ordeal of cross-examination is, would attempt such a thing. It is very easy to detect the contradictions of a false witness, for nothing but truth is consistent throughout. It is perhaps still more easy to get the truth out of honest witnesses, though injurious to the cause which they are originally adduced to support by their evidence. I would have elicited a great deal of truth in my own favour from Mr Scott's witnesses, had they been all examined. Indeed I did so from three or four of them, by cross-examination. James O'Conner proved Mr Scott's mentioning from the pulpit by name, certain persons who were guilty of drinking and falling behind in their payments for the chapel, p. 53, which must have been equal to a threatening. James Bowman, p. 62, proved the existence of a committee, of Mr Scott's congregation, organized for the purpose of giving circulation to the Catholic Vindicator, and bearing any loss that might be incurred by it. He proved farther, that the Vindicator reflected very much on Mr M'Gavin; and authenticated one of the placards by which he had been posted on the corners of the streets as a "defender of adultery," p. 63: and Mr Henniker proved Mr Scott's recommending to his people to buy up the work that contained such slander, p. 73. In short, by the two last mentioned, I proved a combination of Glasgow Papists, all of course under Mr Scott's influence, with his knowledge, and presumed concurrence;—a combination, I say, to blast, if possible, the character of Mr M'Gavin, by holding him up to the world as a monster not worthy to live in it. See Mr Moncrieff's speech, p. 117, and my 156th Number. And this same Mr Scott comes forward, claiming £3000 of damages from Mr M'Gavin, for injury alleged to have been done to his character, though Mr M'Gavin never wrote a sentence against his private or *personal* character; but merely against his *official operations*, and that solely for the purpose of illustrating the character of Popery, of which he is the active and official agent in this city.

It must have been from finding that his witnesses, like honest men, told the truth against himself, when examined by my counsel, that he did not venture to call more of them, for as Mr Moncrieff says, p. 129, there were in waiting about 60 whom he did not call. As it was, enough came out to convince those who heard it, that his hands were not so very clean, at least on the subject of calumnies uttered against his opponent; and when a man has thus taken the law in his own hand;—supposing him to have been slandered, when he publishes, or gives countenance to slander in return, he has no right to come into a court of law with a claim of damages. It is proved by several of his witnesses that he knew of the publication of the Vindicator; and some of them depone that he disapproved of it; but such is his influence over his people, that had he been sincere in his disapprobation, no committee of them would have dared to support, or give circulation to such a work. Besides, it is clearly proved, that he so far made himself a party, as to exhort his people, in the chapel, to buy it up, which does not indicate much disapprobation of it.

Now the slanders against me in the Vindicator, are of a personal nature. They do not relate merely to my authorship, which is a fair subject of censure to those who differ from me; but the accusations were against my personal moral character, when I was called a forger, a liar, and a defender of adultery. Here is fair ground for an action of damages against all who subscribed to support a work containing such libellous matter, as well as against any man who can be proved to have publicly recommended it, and advised those under his influence to purchase it. I do not say that I was injured by these calumnies, for happily I was too well known to admit of their making any impression; but what is called the *animus injuriandi*, the injurious intention, is sufficiently manifest, and is deserving of signal punishment.

No. CLXXIX.

SATURDAY, December 15th, 1821.

I return for a moment to the subject of Mr Scott's subscription books and calculations, which was discussed in the Number before last, I have to remark that my statement is confirmed by a statement of his own, which I had forgotten. If the reader will turn to No. CX. p. 461, he will find an allusion to a controversy in the Glasgow Courier, about the number of Papists in Glasgow and suburbs. A writer in that paper, who signed Julius, gave the number at 20,000; and referred to Mr Scott, by name, whom, he said, he had often heard, both in public and private, declare this to be the number; and moreover, referred to lists of names in Mr Scott's possession, as a proof of the fact. I had previously published a letter, in the Glasgow papers, in reply to the above writer, and in defence of Mr Cleland's tables, which I

knew had been made up with great care. It was in answer to my letter that Julius stated the persons of his communion at 20,000, for the truth of which he referred me to Mr Scott's lists. I instantly wrote a reply, in which I called for the production of these lists; but its publication was superseded by Mr Scott, who voluntarily went to the Editor, and dictated the following paragraph:—

"To JULIUS. We are authorized to state, that the assertion in the letter signed Julius, in this paper of Saturday last, given as on the authority of the Rev. Mr Scott, that the number of Catholics, within the city and neighbourhood, nearly amounted to 20,000 souls, is not founded on fact. If Mr Scott ever made use of any such assertion, he could only mean, when the city and suburbs of Glasgow, with all Lanarkshire, parts of Renfrewshire, Dumbartonshire, Stirlingshire, and Linlithgowshire, were included. Julius published his statement wholly without consulting, or even the knowledge of Mr Scott. As to the lists which are said to have been handed to Mr Scott, as a farther proof of Julius's statement, that reverend gentleman DECLARES, that these lists *never, in whole,* contained more than from 2000 to 3000 names, including the counties above-mentioned. Glasgow, 10th May, 1820." See Glasgow Courier of the day following.

This is a declaration taken down from Mr Scott's own mouth in the Courier office; and it states explicitly that, down to May 1820, his lists *never, in whole,* exceeded from 2000 to 3000. By a mere common sense calculation, without recollecting that he had published such a statement, I made the number of his regular subscribers, down to March, 1817, 2319, to which add the 72 larger contributors, and we have within 109 of the medium between his two extremes. But he brings his statement down three years and two monhts later than his first inventory of productions, upon which my calculation was founded. Many new names must have been added to his lists during that time; and, therefore, allowing him to take the higher extreme as the whole number in May, 1820, my statement must be substantially correct for the time to which it relates, even allowing that the occasional donors of small sums were not then entered as subscribers.

It is a further corroboration of my statement, that bishop Cameron gives the number of Catholics, in and about Glasgow, who attend to their religious duties, as about 2000; Report, p. 45. Now, we know what is meant by attending to their religious duties:—it is being regular in their devotions, and punctual in their payments. The bishop means, of course, grown up men and women; he does not include children, as Mr Cockburn most absurdly did, in his halfpenny a week calculation. The bishop must have been thinking of the dream of Julius, when he mentioned the number of "nominal Catholics" here, as high as 18,000; and by his leave, I must object to the expression *nominal Catholics;* for, properly speaking, there are none such. He must know, at least as well as I, that all who have received canonical baptism are real "Catholic Christians," and have a right to all the other sacraments in their due order; and without this, they are not Catholics in any sense whatever. We say properly, a nominal Christian; that is, one who professes the faith, but who does not live the holy life of a Christian. But this distinction does not apply to the Catholic, for all are called and acknowledged to be such who have been baptized in the Church of Rome, and who have not become heretics, whatever their moral character may be.

It has been suggested that I ought to have deducted from the regular subscribers, all who paid only from ten to twenty shillings, in the course of forty-three months, that is, fifteen shillings, on an average, which is only about twopence a fortnight; and I believe there will be found not very many figures so low, in the *fortnightly* columns. The number that gave at the above rate is 692, see Report, p. 60; and certainly, if they and their contributions were deducted from the number of subscribers and the aggregate sum, the remaining subscribers must have paid a great deal more than sixpence a fortnight. But I do not think it necessary to make any alteration in my statement: for though we can form no average of sums stated merely as above £10, there is reason to conclude that these, together with those from £7 to £10, would amount to two or three hundred pounds more than the £426 3s., so often mentioned as the amount of the large donations. It is not necessary to go to work with such mathematical precision, as if we were calculating the hour when Jupiter and Saturn shall again be on the same meridian, as they seem to the eye to be, while I am writing this. From the documents produced, I have shown the average payments by each regular subscriber to have been sixpence a fortnight, or a small fraction more; and this being confirmed by Mr Scott's own books, I have no inclination to exaggerate the matter beyond what so plainly and indisputably appears.

I think I have now done with my calculations, which I am afraid will appear a very dull part of my work. I was induced to return to the subject at the beginning of this Number, from the recollection of Mr Scott's public statement in the Glasgow Courier. It is not for me to inquire how he, knowing that he had published such a statement, could instruct his counsel to give in, and argue upon one so different. I have nothing to do with this, or any of his private personal matters. I am discussing public documents, in which he does not appear in a character more sacred than my own, but merely as a dealer in pounds, shillings, and

pence, collected from thousands of persons, and applied for a public purpose. I never questioned the faithfulness of the application; but the fact of the object being public, and of the documents being made public, in consequence of their being adduced against me in an action of damages, makes them a fit subject of public discussion, in my own defence; which would have been less necessary had it been possible for my counsel to have met his erroneous statements in court; for though the documents were given in beforehand, it never occurred to my counsel or to myself, that they were to be made use of to prove, that the contributions which our Glasgow Papists made for building the chapel, were only at the rate of a halfpenny a week. It does not even appear that Mr Scott himself, or his counsel, ever thought of rating the contributions of his people so very low, until the thing was suggested in court; and it would have required an hour of abstraction to have made the calculations necessary for exposing the error.

"From the Issues that have been read, and put into your hands," says Mr Cockburn to the jury, "you might at first sight, perhaps, be led to imagine there was some discussion here between the Catholics and Protestants; and, I have no doubt, the defender will endeavour, as far as he can, to make the question assume that appearance. But, I state to you precisely, this is an action for calumnies," &c. p. 12. Mr Moncrieff's reply to this, p. 96, is so full and explicit, that it is not necessary that I should add much to it. Mr Cockburn speaks as if he had been aware of the fact, and, indeed, he could not possibly be otherwise, if he had read my work from the beginning, as it was his duty to do, when he undertook the cause of my pursuer; he must, I say, have been aware of the very fact, that here there was a discussion between Catholics and Protestants, or rather of the principles held by each respectively. He does not tell the jury there was no such thing, for that he could not do consistently with his own knowledge of the fact; but he attempts to draw away their minds from the fact, and to fix them upon two or three points, relating to what he calls calumnies. Now, Mr Moncrieff shows most distinctly, that the whole controversy, from the very commencement, was a controversy about principles, and nothing else; and that the few anecdotes which were considered libellous, on which the action was founded, were brought forward merely as an illustration of certain principles maintained by the Church of Rome.

Mr Moncrieff shows very clearly that the controversy did not originate with me, but that I was provoked and drawn into it, by some of Mr Scott's own people; and any person may see that it was so, by reading the first and second letters which were printed in the Glasgow Chronicle. The paragraph about the congregation of Protestants who attended the Oratorio, paying great respect alike to the subject and the place, which originated the controversy, appeared in the Chronicle, as an article of news, inserted by the Editor on his own responsibility. I knew that the Editor was a Protestant, and my letter to him was intended to correct the foolish mistake into which he had fallen, in representing an assembly of Protestants as paying as much respect to the building in which they met, as they paid to the most solemn passages of the word of God. Here the matter might have rested, for I had no intention of writing a word more upon the subject; and here it would have rested, had not some of our Papists been so elated with the popularity of their Oratorio, or with something else, I shall not say what, that they would write a reply to my letter; and they did so, defending the holiness of their chapel, and attempting to "expose the weakness and futility of censorious bigotry." This was the commencement of a series of hostilities which I had never contemplated. I had addressed a Protestant friend, pointing out an expression in his paper, which I considered inconsistent with Protestant principles. I did not know that a Papist was the writer of the offensive paragraph; but when my strictures upon it appeared, our Papists claimed it as their own; at least, began to defend it, and to assail the objector, as a weak and censorious bigot. This, I say, was the commencement of the controversy. It was challenged by the Papists themselves; and if nobody had accepted the challenge, they would have had reason to boast, that they had established in Glasgow the principle, that the stones and timber of their chapel are as holy, and as much to be respected, as the word of God.

I need not point out to the reader what a contemptible figure these writers made, when they shrunk from a controversy which they themselves had provoked,—when they hired a man in London to maintain the cause which they could not maintain; and when even he was unable to maintain it, but shrunk away in disgrace; and when, having no other resource, they attempted, by means of a legal prosecution, to quash the controversy, and silence and punish the individual whom they had drawn out into the field, merely upon the defensive at first, but whom they afterwards found too offensive to be endured.

From the bluster which Mr Cockburn makes about my being silent, and finding no fault with Mr Scott's procedure, during all the time his chapel was a building, but virtually acquiescing in it, one would suppose that I had been constituted and appointed the official guardian of the Protestant religion, with a salary equal to the revenues of a bishopric in England. But the fact is, I had no more to do with Popery than Mr Cockburn himself; it was as much his duty as mine, to expose its wicked abominations;

and, I suppose, had it fallen to his lot to be accused of "censorious bigotry," for merely stating a Protestant principle, which he holds as well as I, he might have been THE PROTESTANT, and I might have been one of his admiring readers:—for certain it is, that I had no more intention of commencing a controversy with the Church of Rome than he has at this moment. Such an attempt was as incompatible with my numerous avocations as it could be with his; but being unexpectedly drawn into it, I felt constrained by a sense of duty to both God and man, to persevere, regardless of the envenomed hostility of every Papist, and of the more offensive indifference of many a Protestant, who thought I had engaged in a very needless undertaking; and by the help of God I continue to this day, without having suffered the least injury from my Popish enemies, or the least embarrassment in the performance of any of the duties which devolve upon me, in my domestic, mercantile, and civil relations. Egotism is always a foolish thing; and there are few *isms* so apt to excite disgust; but from the example of an apostle (2 Cor. xi. xii.) we learn that it is lawful, when necessary, in self-defence.

Mr Cockburn goes on to say, after mentioning the inadequacy of the old chapel, and the necessity of having a new, and a larger one,—"I am sure there can be no idea or opinion but one, as to the expediency and piety of that design. As long as we happen to have such a town as Glasgow, of which a great part of the population is Catholic,—admitting it to be our duty to reclaim as many as we can to what we consider the pure faith,—the next object is to educate them according to their own religion." P. 12. I consider these as Mr Cockburn's own sentiments, and not any part of Mr Scott's furnishing; for there is an admission about "the pure faith," which Mr Scott would never have made with regard to any faith but his own. I ask the learned counsel, then, if it be really his opinion, that in any circumstances, it is the duty of Protestants to educate Papists according to their own religion? Mr Cockburn is not a mere lawyer. He is a highly respectable church-going man; and, if I am not mistaken, an elder of the Church of Scotland, which has been eminently distinguished for maintaining the doctrines of the Reformation, and for opposition to Popery. In this instance, then, I speak to a wise man, who knows the import of my question. Do you, Mr Cockburn, feel it to be your duty, when you fail to persuade a man to embrace the true faith, to teach him,—or to confirm him in his own faith, which you know to be false, and eternally ruinous to his soul? Do you think, that when Paul could not prevail upon the Ephesians to embrace the faith of Christ, he thought it his duty to educate them, and to confirm them in their devotion to the great goddess Diana, and the image which fell down from Jupiter? Unless you can answer this question in the affirmative, you must recall what you told the jury, about its being our duty to teach or educate Papists according to their own religion; for if you know what Popery is, and if you believe the doctrine of your own church, which I trust you do, you must be aware that Popery is as much opposed to the faith of Christ, as the worship of Diana was to that of the true God. If you did not know this before, you heard it from Mr Moncrieff, in his speech in reply to yourself, who, with much pathos, pointed out the destructive, but fundamental doctrine of the Church of Rome, that men must merit salvation for themselves, which doctrine is as much opposed to real Christianity, as the doctrine of Mahomet, or even of Voltaire, and his host of infidel disciples.

But the education of our Popish population is not the question. I never disputed Mr Scott's right to educate all who chose to submit to his lessons of instruction. I never called in question his right to build a chapel by means of the voluntary contributions of his people. The things which I objected to are so plainly laid down, that nobody could mistake them. They certainly are not objections to the education of Papists in any form, though if the subject had come in my way, I would have exposed the absurdity of Protestants undertaking the education of Papists "according to their own religion;" but the controversy, so far as I recollect, never turned upon this point.

If Mr Cockburn had alluded to the literary education of the children of our Papists, and spoken of this as a Christian duty, and work of piety, I should have made no objection. This is not educating Papists "according to their own religion;" but according to the common rules of grammar: and if this be a good work, "of the expediency and piety" of which there can be only one opinion, I shall put in my claim for a greater share of the *piety* than, perhaps, he can claim. It is not generally known, but it is a piece of genuine secret history, that the "Catholic schools" in this city are partly indebted to me for their very existence. The idea did not originate with me, but with a distinguished naval officer, who happened to spend a few months in this city, and who did not like to leave it without doing something for the benefit of his fellow-creatures. He had seen the good effects of establishing schools in St Giles', in London, for the education of the many thousands of poor Popish children which are to be found there. He thought something of the kind might be tried here; and, I believe, I was the first to whom he opened his mind on the subject. He could not indeed have taken a single step without the aid of some one possessed of local knowledge. His very first step was taken at my suggestion;—that was to wait upon Mr Scott, and respect-

fully state his object to him. If, said I, you get his concurrence, the thing will do; if not, you need not attempt it. He did accordingly wait on Mr Scott; and he, after considering the matter, and consulting his superior, gave his consent, and promised his co-operation; and, so far as I know, and have reason to believe, he has continued to fulfil his promise up to the present day. I was consulted in framing the constitution and rules of the society. I attended the first meetings of the committee, to see the machine set a going; and I became a subscriber to the funds.

Here there is more egotism; but it is necessary to bring such matter to view, to let Mr Cockburn see that I am not such a Goth as he would represent me to be;—that though I do not think it my duty to educate Papists "according to their own religion," I have given both my time and money to afford them the means of education in that which is really good and useful. This piece of secret history is also necessary to show, that so far from having any feeling of malice, or personal hostility against Mr Scott, I have given him, and am still disposed to give him, credit for what he has done, that is really useful to his people. There are few of his brethren who would have entered so heartily into the design of teaching the children of his communion to read the English version of the holy scriptures, and perhaps fewer that would have persevered as he has done, in actively superintending the schools, in which the English bible is read. It is also consistent with my knowledge, that he applied for, and obtained from the Bible Society, a number of bibles and testaments to be distributed among the poor of his flock. These things are honourable to him; and as such I state them to my readers. I wish it to be understood distinctly, that my controversy is not a personal one. As a citizen, Mr Scott is the same to me as another man; but as a teacher and preacher of Popery, and a promoter of the reign of antichrist among us, I am entitled to view him in his official capacity; and it is in that only that I wish to have any thing to do with him. It is Popery—the system of superstition, idolatry, and will-worship,—that I am opposing, and which I am determined to oppose to the uttermost. Great efforts, indeed, have been made to make this controversy appear as a mere personal squabble. Such it never was in my esteem; and such, I hope, it will not become. I am contending for principles, without regard to persons: they are principles intimately connected with our civil and religious liberties; and which, if abandoned, as they seem to be by many Protestants of the present day, will be remembered by a future age, with a feeling of contempt for those who could abandon privileges so valuable, and which had been procured at the expense of the blood of our more noble ancestors.

No. CLXXX.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22D, 1821.

I DO not know whether sleight of hand or sleight of tongue be the more honourable and useful science. The former serves to amuse and astonish children, and the latter often serves to amuse and surprise grown persons. This is what we may call the *legerdelingua* art; and we have a fine example of it in Mr Cockburn's speech, which I shall introduce here for the amusement of my readers:—

"I have already stated to you," says Mr C. p. 32, "that I think there was no great sin in Mr Scott taking an interest about the building of the Catholic chapel. If he had been careless about that *great* work, I should have thought very little of him indeed. The law does not impose a contribution for any church except the established one: it is therefore the more incumbent as a moral duty, upon all other sects, to maintain their own establishments;—and if I could name the thing that was most proper for a man in Mr Scott's situation to look to, as a moral and Christian duty, it was to forward all in his power whatever was calculated to promote the *education* and *moral good* of the Catholics in Glasgow."

This passage begins with a high commendation of Mr Scott's zeal in rearing a splendid chapel; and the art which I have been speaking of appears in gliding away from that to the *education* and *moral good* of the people, leaving the just commendation of the latter to be applied to the former. Now these are things as different as any two things can be; and there is no necessary connection between them. Mr Cockburn here exemplifies that logical vice, that is called arguing from one thing to another. It is something like this:—The law does not allow fishermen to take herrings except during the night, therefore it is unlawful to shoot partridges during the day. The greatest novice of a sportsman would detect the fallacy of an argument drawn from the law about herring fishing, when applied to the privilege of partridge shooting; and the merest novice in moral philosophy will also detect the fallacy of deducing an argument for the building of gorgeous temples, from the admission that it is a moral and Christian duty to *educate* and otherwise promote the good of the poor and ignorant. The fact will illustrate the difference between the two:—while the Glasgow Papists were spending their zeal, and strength, and money, in rearing a gorgeous temple, it was left to Captain Gordon and myself, and other Protestants, to devise means for their education and moral improvement, and to raise funds for the purpose. It does not appear that ever the Papists thought of *education* as at all necessary, or that they thought of devising means for imparting it, till it was urged upon

them by Protestants; and then, to be sure, as I said in my last, they gave their concurrence; but such being the fact, the reader will be able to appreciate the value of Mr Cockburn's eulogium of Mr Scott, for doing all in his power to forward "whatever was calculated to promote the education and moral good of the Catholics in Glasgow."

Perhaps Mr Cockburn meant it to be understood, that the building of the splendid chapel was the best means of promoting the education and moral good of the "poor Catholics;" and, I doubt not, Mr Scott "will do what he can to make the question assume that appearance." I consider this therefore as his sentiment, not Mr Cockburn's; and a very absurd sentiment it is:—For, in the first place, I have just shown, that while he and his people were exerting all their energies upon the building of this chapel, they do not appear ever to have thought of education as a thing with which they had any thing to do. And, in the second place, the erection of *such* a chapel, considering the state and condition of the people for whose use it was intended, was most absurd and ridiculous, and therefore could not promote their moral good in any way whatever.

I shall suppose for a moment, that when Mr Cockburn said *education*, he meant *instruction*; and that he considered the having a chapel to meet in as necessary for the instruction of the people; and I am willing to concede this to him, so far as it will apply to such a building as was suitable for such a people:—that is, a plain homely edifice, such as might have been built, in any part of the suburbs where Papists abound, for a thousand or twelve hundred pounds; or two such edifices, if necessary, at convenient distances. This is what sensible rational men would have done, upon the supposition that there was sense and reason in the instruction which was meant to be communicated. But I ask Mr Cockburn, or Mr Scott, to tell me, how the instruction or moral good of thousands of poor people could be promoted by building a palace, or a temple, which they cannot enter, or even look at, without being overwhelmed by a sense of their own poverty and meanness? And how they can be edified or instructed by the consideration, that they meet in a house which cost so many thousand pounds, when one built at an expense of less than as many hundreds would have been more like them, and would have suited them better? What would you think if you saw a dustman, or a coalporter, in his ragged and sordid apparel, having his head covered with a silk hat, or a velvet cap, ornamented with a gold band and buckle? You would say, the poor man was beside himself; that his friends or the parish officers ought to provide a suitable asylum for him. You would never imagine that those who were so foolish as to decorate him with such gaudy and costly finery, intended to promote his education, instruction, or moral good; but that they meant to make a fool of him, or to make him appear a fool. I leave it to those who have contrasted the magnificence of Clyde Street chapel, with the general poverty of the congregation that meets in it, to apply these remarks; and to tell the world, how the erection of *such* a building could tend to the education, instruction, or moral good of *such* a people.

The fact is, the chapel was not meant solely, or even chiefly, for the use of the poor people who paid their hard-earned sixpences towards the building of it. To suppose that it was, would be such an impeachment of the common sense of all concerned as I do not think they deserve. They imagined, that by the fascination of their fine building, "resembling as much as possible the majesty of that God to whom it was dedicated," as Amicus Veritatis said, and by the charms of their music, and the pomp of their ritual, they would gain over to their religion the principal inhabitants of the city and surrounding country. It must be allowed they had some reason to expect this, when they got Protestants to subscribe for the undertaking. But they must now feel the disappointment of not having made one convert, high or low, rich or poor; and if Mr Cockburn shall come here next circuit, I advise him to make strict search, and minute investigation, and then to say, whether one individual, man, woman, or child, has been benefited, in the way of education, or moral improvement, by means of this great Romish temple.

No remark seems necessary on what Mr Cockburn says about Mr Scott's glorying and boasting of the hand which he had in that great work. But we cannot silently pass what immediately follows, at the top of page 33, "It was pretty well known," says Mr C. "who were Catholics, and what was their number, about this time. Mr Scott did not go about among them himself—but all the respectable persons of his congregation, forty, fifty, or sixty, were named collectors. Each took a part of the town or congregation. You will see them here to-day." The learned gentleman proceeds to assert, that the number of Mr Scott's congregation was between nine and ten thousand; and yet in the same breath we are informed, that ALL the *respectable* persons among them were only forty, fifty, or, at the most, sixty; and that the jury would have an opportunity of seeing them all. Taking the number at only 8000, there are 7940 excluded from the rank of respectable persons, which lets us see what sort of a congregation Mr Scott has, if the statement which he put in Mr Cockburn's mouth be true; if it be not true, I advise the 7940 calumniated persons to raise an action of damages for a libel, against their priest and his counsel, jointly and severally; and if they do so, I think they will carve out

work for both, for the remainder of their lives.

It would be endless to animadvert on every sentence that dropped from the mouth of the eloquent counsel. I pass on, therefore, to page 42. "There is," says Mr Cockburn, "in Scotland a prejudice against Catholics, a prejudice which, I hope, will last, as most salutary; and at Glasgow it rages most, because there the lowest description of Catholics abound, and the people notoriously live in a sort of alarm from them. Therefore it was peculiarly patriotic and proper in Mr Scott, to endeavour to reclaim them; not by teaching them that their pastor was a rogue, despising their chapel and institutions; but teaching them, and recommending to them, 'send your children, and go yourselves to our chapel.' It was, therefore, peculiarly absurd for Mr M'Gavin to throw his firebrands into this place, knowing every publication was doing an injury not merely to Mr Scott and the Catholic religion, but to the peace of the country, which nothing he, or any person could do, could prevent."

There are some strange inconsistencies in this passage, which I cannot account for otherwise than by supposing, that it is partly Mr Cockburn's own, and partly the furnishing of Mr Scott; and these two, like the iron and the clay, in the feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image, could not unite to make one coherent substance. We are told that there is in Scotland a prejudice against Catholics—it should be against Popery, not against the persons of any:—Mr Cockburn hopes this prejudice *will last*, because it is most salutary; that is, necessary, or useful, for our welfare. Then how would it be a patriotic or proper thing in Mr Scott, or any man, to draw men to the chapel, for the purpose of teaching them, or confirming them in that against which a prejudice ought always to exist? If the people of Glasgow regard Papists with alarm, because they are Papists, and no other reason is assigned, how could it be patriotic in Mr Scott to confirm them in their Popery? It was patriotism to endeavour to reclaim them from Popery, and this praise belongs to me, not to Mr Scott. As for Mr M'Gavin's throwing firebrands into the place, it is a mere figure of speech, without meaning, and without truth, even as a metaphor. That I knew I was doing injury to Mr Scott, is also untrue; for he has suffered nothing in person or property, or character, by any thing I have written; and when he was put to prove the point, he could not bring a particle of evidence of injury sustained by him. That I was doing injury to what he calls the Catholic religion, but which I call Popery, may be true; just as the fever committee did injury to the typhus fever, when they laboured by lawful means, to stop its progress, and effect its extirpation. I have no hope of being so successful in extirpating Popery as my friends were in extirpating the fever; but I hold it to be my duty, and that of every good citizen, to do what he can to prevent the spreading of pestilence of every kind, especially the great moral pestilence of Popish error and impiety, that issues like smoke and brimstone from the mouth of the beast and the false prophet.

Mr Cockburn asserts further, that I knew that every publication of mine was doing an injury to the peace of the country. Here I meet him again with a broad contradiction; and I challenge him and his client to the proof. I do not say only, that I *did not know* such a thing; but I assert that no such thing ever happened by any writing of mine. This, however, is the common cant of modern Papists and their Protestant advocates. When a number of Protestants met in Greenock, to have their principles illustrated and confirmed, by reading The Protestant, though as quiet as if they had been hearing a sermon, it was declared by the Popish priest, to be endangering the peace of the town, and he actually applied to the magistrates to prohibit the meeting. In Preston the Popish priests had long been preaching against the established religion, no man forbidding them; but when a few Protestant ministers commenced a lecture in defence of their religion, the Papists applied to the magistrates to prohibit th's, as dangerous to the peace of the town. What is this but telling the world plainly, that the peace of the country depends upon keeping them in good humour,—in allowing them to declaim as much as they please against the Protestant faith; but that we must not write or preach a word against their superstitions? Yes: the Papists themselves thus tell us, they are ready to take fire at the slightest spark, or without a spark; and that they will break the peace, if Protestants shall publicly defend, merely by argument, the established religion, in opposition to their absurdities and idolatrous superstitions. This is the plain English of the language Mr Scott put into Mr Cockburn's mouth. Had Mr C. been on the other side; and had he said half as much against Papists, or even Popery, as he said against The Protestant, he would have fallen under the same condemnation. His speech would have been called an incendiary one, and calculated to injure the peace of the country. This should teach all Protestants how to value the allegiance, or patriotism, or good disposition of Papists toward their neighbours, or their country. All depends,—not on being allowed to hold their errors, for that no man can prevent,—but all depends on their being allowed to *propagate* their errors without opposition or contradiction; for he who shall publish a word against them will be accused of endangering the peace of the country.

But I must hasten to be done with Mr Cockburn and his speech. I pass on, therefore, to the next paragraph, p. 42. "Then observe,"

says he, "if there be any thing in his apology of his desire to resist the errors of Popery. For such resistance, there was no need to publish his calumnies against Mr Scott as he did. The best resistance is by argument, which men can read calmly and deliberately." Here we are perfectly agreed; and what Mr Cockburn calls the "best resistance," is the very thing that I have been doing all along. I have been combating the errors of Popery by argument, and by historical facts, for three years and a half; but this was the very thing which Mr Scott did not like, and which Popery could not endure. Why did not Mr Cockburn tell his client,—he had no occasion to bring this action as he did? Why did he not tell him as he tells me,—"the best resistance is by argument?" Why not tell him, that if his religion were the true one, calumnies would not hurt it; and if it was a false one, the result of a lawsuit could not help it; but that by argument it must stand or fall? This would have been sound advice; and since he condescends to tell me, as if I did not know it, that the best resistance of error is by argument, I advise him to impress his lesson upon Mr Scott, if he should ever return to him on a like errand.

The Numbers of my work now amount to one hundred and eighty; and all that Mr Scott and his counsel call calumnies are to be found in three of these Numbers, and a single paragraph of a letter in the Glasgow Chronicle. All the rest is argument, and fact, and illustration; and the very things which are called calumnies, are used merely for the purpose of illustration; and it is probable I would never so much as have mentioned Mr Scott's name if he had not thrust himself forward, as if to make himself a party in the controversy which two of his people had unwarily provoked. The things called calumnies were no doubt used in the course of argument; but arguments and principles are the things with which I have had to do throughout the whole of my work, for the truth of which I appeal to all who have read it.

Here I shall use the freedom to retort a little on the learned counsel. In pleading the cause of his client, he ought to have known that argument was the best weapon. "There was no need of publishing his calumnies against" Mr M'Gavin "as he did." He says to the jury, p. 16, "If you find Mr M'Gavin *equivocating*, or giving evasive answers,"&c. Here is a libel and a calumny as actionable as any thing I ever said of Mr Scott. It is true Mr Cockburn is skilful enough to put the charge of equivocating in a hypothetical form, to avoid, perhaps, the consequences of a direct charge; but this would avail him nothing, if he had not stood under the panoply of his official privilege. The first paragraph on which Mr Scott founded his first Issue, is a mere hypothesis of mine; yet it was argued upon by Mr Cockburn himself as if it had been a direct assertion; and as such, I suppose, the court viewed it. I consider Mr Cockburn, therefore, as having uttered a calumny and a libel against me, in open court, and which has gone forth to the world in the report of his speech; and a calumny without the shadow of a foundation, even according to his own showing; for he did not point out a sentence or syllable of my writing to which the word "equivocating" could be applied; and I defy him and all the world to point out any such sentence. I know that Mr Cockburn cannot be made answerable for this in a court of law, for he would plead his privilege of being entitled to say what his client had instructed him to say: but then the calumny reverts to his client, who, in bringing an action for calumnies, ought to have kept his own hands clean.

Only one word more on this celebrated speech, and I have done. The speaker attempts to show, p. 44, that the reports about Mr Scott's taking money from poor people for his chapel, had no existence till I raised them, or gave currency to them. In answer to which I refer to the depositions of Messrs Buchanan, Ellis, Cleland, Dickie, Leechman, Hood, Swanston, and Miller, near the conclusion of the Report, all of whom swore distinctly, that the thing was the subject of general conversation, report, and belief, in the years 1815, 1816, and 1817; that is, before THE PROTESTANT had any existence.

Mr Cockburn's speech is followed by the depositions of bishop Cameron and others, into the matter of which I need not enter particularly. The first seems to have proved himself a party in the cause, seeing he made Mr Scott appear in the character of his agent, and acting entirely under his authority and control. It is doubtful, therefore, how far the bishop's evidence ought to have been sustained; but no objection was made by counsel. The depositions of the pursuer's witnesses occupy a great space; those of the defender only four or five pages; the former having been taken down verbatim, while of the latter, only the substance is given, for the reason assigned, p. 132. Yet there are three of the four Issues which appear to have proof in support of them; to wit, that Mr Scott applied to Mr Fleming to have part of his workmen's wages retained, and paid to him for the building of this chapel; which shows that in this case the contribution was something else than voluntary. Henry Courtney and his wife deponed to the refusal of baptism to their child, till they paid five shillings towards the chapel, though they were very poor, and had only three shillings in the world. John Drain and his wife deponed to the refusal of baptism to their child, though apparently dying, because he could not pay a sum of money towards the chapel, in consequence of which they carried the child to Paisley, and had it baptized there.

Seeing so much appeared supported by evi-

dence, the reader will probably ask, "For what was it that the jury found you liable in £100 of damages, which saddled you with nearly £1000 of expenses?" and my answer is, "I cannot tell." The jury found nothing proved, and nothing not proved. Had Mr Scott made out his case, they would doubtless have given him more damages, for what they gave leaves him *minus* a large sum of expenses, which the court would not allow him; so that, like the Irish comedian, he gained a great loss by his benefit. In short, I do not know for what word, or sentence, or action of mine, I was ordained to pay this money; and it cannot now be known while the world stands.

I am ashamed when I reflect, that about this Trial, and about myself, I have occupied five Numbers of my work; and yet I have not said one-half of what might be said. I must, however, leave the subject for the present. I have heard it whispered that Mr Scott's agents had a Report of the Trial, which they delayed publishing till they saw what the other was like. Perhaps they will bring it forward now; and I am not without a hope that it may contain Mr Jeffrey's speech. If so, it will afford me materials for several Numbers; and there is nothing that I desire more in relation to this part of the controversy, than to have an opportunity of cutting up that most singular composition, if composition it could be called. I requested the shorthand writer to apply to Mr Jeffrey himself for it; and, if necessary, to go the length of twenty guineas for the expense of having it written at his dictation. A considerable expense was incurred by calling for Mr Jeffrey, and writing to his clerk on the subject; but, from what cause I know not, it could not be obtained. If it should never appear entire, I shall sometime find an opening for a few strictures on the fragment of it that is preserved.

No. CLXXXI.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29TH, 1821.

I AM indebted to an unknown correspondent for the following sensible Letter, which I think it right to dispose of, before entering upon another general subject:—

TO THE PROTESTANT.

SIR,

Amongst the readers of the Protestant, there is not one who more sincerely wishes you success than myself. Every one who is alive to the great struggle which has existed betwixt light and darkness ever since "light came into the world," and all who know what a grievous darkness Popery is, must bid you God speed, and must rejoice in the talent you have so successfully put forth in exposing the Man of Sin; for my own part, I feel a great interest in your enterprize, and when, by any slip, a door is opened for an irruption of the enemy, I feel as great a regret, and as strong a desire to repair it, as if committed by myself. This must be my excuse for troubling you just now, to remark, that in various cases of late, when you are instancing from the writings of others, the pernicious effects of the Popish tenets, you do not seem to have been careful enough in selecting, to avoid narrating cases, which are in reality not credible, and which are therefore easily perverted into an attack on the essential truths you are defending. You too well know the nature of Popish controversialists, to render it necessary for me to waste words on the unfairness of their dealings; honest argument is out of the question; they lay hold of some unguarded expression, or some accidental misstatement, and by harping on that, they endeavour to shake those substantial truths that they cannot otherwise touch. Now in some of your late extracts, it appears to me, that this advantage has been given them, I think, needlessly, because there is no want of the best authenticated proofs of the unrelenting and ferocious spirit of the Popish superstition; and there is no need of exaggeration to make us shudder at them. Thus, in your 116th Number, in speaking of the evil consequences of the celibacy of the Romish priests, you mention very gravely, and very shortly, that the skulls of six thousand children had been found in a fish pond. Now, had the author, from whom you quote, merely said, that, as a consequence of that most pernicious tenet, infanticide was common, and that in such a pond many bodies of infants had been found; nay, had he gone further and said, that to the amount of sixty had been found, the thing was credible; and for my own part, extraordinary as the thing appears now-a-days, I believe, that in a populous neighbourhood at the period alluded to, the thing may have happened; but when it is dryly said, that in such a pond six thousand childrens' skulls were found, the thing is utterly incredible, being repugnant to nature, to common sense, and to the very chemical properties of matter; the person who can seriously think of it, and then say he fully believes it, ought to find nothing incredible in transubstantiation. It is just one of those cases, by the dissecting and dilating upon which, a Papist would attempt to baffle the solid sense and sound argument of the Protestant; and therefore it was that I felt so much regret when I met with it. Supposing that, in the neighbourhood of Glasgow, a pond should be set apart for the deposition of the heads of murdered infants; suppose also Popery reigning in full supremacy; suppose further, that every Popish priest and shaveling within the bills of mortality had annually five bastards, which is a tolerable allowance;—

suppose that there was nothing either unnatural or disgraceful in the girls bringing the childrens' heads regularly to the pond, but that they would do it as unconcernedly as with eggs to market; still it can easily be shown that the number your author mentions could not by possibility be accumulated. The allowing, therefore, so monstrous an absurdity to appear in The Protestant, allows the enemies of truth to turn your main arguments against yourself, for there is no fable in all the legends of Popery that exceeds this. I know not how it can be now remedied;—should it seem an error of the press, and for 6000 read 60, I should be well pleased.

In your 125th Number, you mention about the garrison of Carcassone marching nine miles under ground. I meant to have made some remarks on the unguarded way you had made your extract on this subject, but I see my paper is nearly out, and I find my time will not permit it; besides, I do not know how you may take a communication of this sort; I hope you will not think it frivolous, for I can assure you the effect is not so, and whilst you bear the more noble and weighty task in hand, of enforcing essential truth, I trust you will excuse a friend of yourself, and your cause, for endeavouring to put you on your guard in points, which perhaps you may esteem superficial, but which, I am seriously persuaded, have a strong bearing on the general result of your endeavour in "enforcing the cause of truth."

With every wish for your success,

Yours, &c.

W. A. C.

I feel very much obliged to this writer, for his very judicious observations; and I should be unworthy of his good opinion, if it were possible that I could take such a communication otherwise than in good part. My object in writing is neither literary fame nor pecuniary profit; but solely to serve the cause of truth by opposing error; and, therefore, I rank among my friends and auxiliaries, all who do me the favour of pointing out any mistake into which I have fallen in my own arguments or statements; or any misstatement or mistake of others, to which I may inadvertently give currency.

The statement that six thousand heads of murdered infants, the fruits of illicit intercourse, were found in a fish pond, is given by the author of "Letters on Clerical Celibacy," on the authority of Balæus, *Acta Rom. Pont.* p. 46. I recollect to have seen the same statement in an old folio in my possession, in which the reason for draining the pond is given; but I cannot at present find the passage. I do however agree with my correspondent, that the thing is incredible; and I would probably have said so at the time, in a note, had I subjected the statement to a process of calculation. The author of the Letters on Celibacy, gives the number in words; so it can be no error of the press arising from the addition of a figure or two; but it is probable that some earlier writer may have given it in figures, and that by mistake a cypher has been added, turning 600 into 6000; for I see no occasion to go so low as 60.

But while I perfectly agree with my correspondent, that the story of six thousand is incredible, I am by no means prepared to say it is physically impossible, unless I am made acquainted with the population of Rome at the time; and unless I have it ascertained how long the decomposition of infants' bones requires. Suppose it were to require ten years in a marshy place, not exposed to the weather, six hundred a year for that period would make up the number. This I admit is incredible; but I am not convinced that it is impossible; considering the population and the profligacy of that city at the period referred to, or at any period before it was pillaged, and the monasteries broken up, by the French under Buonaparte. And now that some of the monasteries are restored, and the rooks have returned to their nests, as John Knox would have said, the thing is not impossible, if the statement of a late traveller may be depended on. I refer to an American work, entitled, "The Political State of Italy, by Theodore Lyman, jun." printed in Boston, N. E. in 1820. Speaking of Rome, this writer says, "In the great hospital of Spirito Santo, there were exposed during 1817, at the wheel, male children, 516, female 497, total 1013; at board in the country 1735 = 2748. Of these restored to parents, male 60, female 70 = 130; died in the hospital 419, at board 550, total 969; being nearly one in every three." "The children in this hospital," adds Mr Lyman, "are illegitimate, or destitute ones. They are put in the night upon a hollow wheel, near which is hung a bell, and whenever this bell is rung, an attendant comes, turns the wheel, and receives the child. They are maintained till twelve years of age; a letter is often placed with the child, so that it may be recognized at a future time. This institution would afford much less encouragement to vice, if children were only received in broad day light, and after proper examination of the situation of parents," p. 103.

At this time the population of Rome was only 131,256, considerably under the present population of Glasgow, and not half of what it must have been in the days of Rome's glory and greatest profligacy. In 1817, the number of male ecclesiastics in Rome, was 2899, and of nuns only 1303. Before the Reformation the latter must have been a great deal more numerous, and perhaps also the former. But I shall take the population of that year for my datum; and I think I can show by it, that however incredible the above statement may

be, it is by no means impossible. There were 1013 children exposed in Rome, and for the most part abandoned, in the course of one year, only four years ago; that is, nearly three every night, upon an average. Now make the supposition that instead of exposing them in the hospital wheel, or that there were no such asylum for them, and that the unnatural mothers had thrown them into the lake or pond, the incredible number of six thousand would have accumulated in less than six years. This is, indeed, a most horrible supposition; but there is nothing impossible in it; for it is only supposing a greater degree of depravity in these females than that which leads to the abandonment of their offspring. Nay, if child murder be possible in one instance, it is not physically impossible in any number of instances in proportion to the population of a city or district. I hope, therefore, my correspondent will be convinced that one may believe the statement, monstrous as it is, without imitating the absurdity of those who believe in transubstantiation.

W. A. C. makes a supposition with regard to Popish priests and shavelings, which, if applied to those in Rome, would produce a monstrous result indeed,—no fewer than 14,495 illegitimate children annually! If this were the case, I am sure he himself would see nothing even incredible in the statement on which he animadverts. He has not considered the state of the population of Rome, where the proportion of ecclesiastics is a hundred to one of the number of clergy necessary for the service of a Protestant city like Glasgow. The nuns, according to Mr Lyman's statement, were comparatively few in 1817; but that was only three years after the restoration of the ancient order. In a subsequent statement, he gives a list of seventy-seven nunneries in the city alone; and in 1819, the number of nuns had increased to 1463. No doubt there is a farther increase by this time; and they will continue to increase until all the houses be as full as they were before the French invasion. It is needless to dilate on such a subject, or to point out the horrible immoralities that must be the consequence of such a state of things. Luxury, idleness, and celibacy, on a large scale, are enough to qualify the world for another deluge; and because of these things, I have no doubt, the wrath of God, will, by and by, come upon Rome to the uttermost.

With regard to the statement relating to the garrison of Carcassone, it is given by Jones in his History of the Waldenses, and it does not appear to me incredible. Many greater works have been effected in our own day than digging an excavation of nine miles, arching it over, and then using it as a subterraneous passage.

Upon the whole, I am perfectly aware of the truth and propriety of my correspondent's remarks. Papists cannot meet an opponent with fair argument; and they seldom attempt it. It is their constant practice to draw away the mind from facts and principles, and to fix it on some trifle, that is really or apparently incredible or absurd; but which is of no importance in relation to the general question in dispute. When they cannot find real absurdities and things incredible, they will feign them, and endeavour to make their own inventions appear the arguments and statements of their opponents. Their whole system is built on falsehood, of which there cannot be a better evidence than the manner in which they constantly try to defend it.

They will no doubt attempt to find a flaw in Mr Lyman's statement too. They will say, it is impossible in the nature of things, supposing all the nuns to be as bad as possible, that 1303 of them could produce 1013 children annually. And this objection will startle some persons; and they will disbelieve the whole story; but let it be observed, the author does not confine his statement to priests and nuns; nor does he speak of them at all as particularly implicated. He regards the convents with much respect and tenderness; and he indeed speaks of the system in such a manner as makes me believe that he belongs to the Church of Rome. He does not so much as hint a suspicion that the ecclesiastics of either sex have any hand in filling the hospital wheel with three children every night. It is the general profligacy of manners in Rome that he brings to view; and the reader is left to make his own remarks, and draw his own conclusion, with regard to the influence which clerical celibacy may have had in producing that profligacy.

Persons acquainted with the history of Rome, and with human nature, will find no difficulty in drawing conclusions from clerical celibacy to general profligacy of manners; and such persons will regard with real concern, and serious apprehension, the introduction of the monastic system among ourselves, at least among our neighbours in Ireland. Several attempts have been made of late to make celibacy popular in that kingdom, by pompous representations of the ridiculous solemnity of foolish young girls taking the veil, as if this were a most meritorious act, and worthy of the admiration of angels and men. The following has appeared in several newspapers, in the present month:—

PRESENTATION CONVENT, GALWAY.

(From the Connaught Journal.)

"Miss Joyce, daughter of Walter Joyce, Esq. of Mervieu, was received to-day (Monday week) amongst the pious and exemplary sisterhood of the Presentation Convent. Scarcely have we ever witnessed a scene more sublimely imposing. The young and promising daughter of one of our most respectable and esteemed

citizens presenting herself at the altar of her God,—in the abandonment of every earthly consideration,—in the sacrifice of every thing that could bespeak permanency to social life and to social happiness,—in the dedication of her exalted talents—of her young and innocent loveliness—of the world's promise and the world's hopes,—must, indeed, be capable of awakening in the breasts of all a generous and a dignified association, whilst it affords a high and important colouring to the completion of her future existence, and her ultimate destiny.

"At half-past nine, the 'O gloriosa virginum' was sung from the higher choir, in the masterly accompaniment of select musical performers. The procession then began to move from the vestry, through the lower choir, to the chapel, in the following order:—

The Thuriferere,
The Acolytes,
The Master of the Ceremonies, Rev. Mr DALY,
The Sub-Deacon, Rev. Mr GILL,
Deacon, Rev. Mr O'DONNELL,
The High Priest, Rev. Mr FINN,
The Celebrant, Very Rev. Warden FFRENCH, and his Train-bearer.

"The very Rev. Warden Ffrench having been conducted to his faldastorium, under a rich canopy, the high priest and his officiating ministers retired to their places at the gospel side of the altar.

"And now all was breathless expectation: the young postulant appeared in the attendance of the reverend mother and her assistant, robed in all the gaudy extravagance of fashionable splendour, and beaming in the glows of youthful modesty, which taught us to believe, that had she remained in the world she forsook, she would have moved the attraction of every heart, 'the leading star of every eye.'

"The very Rev. Celebrant was then conducted to the platform of the altar, and the postulant and her attendants having genuflected, the ceremony of reception began with the preparatory prayers and responsories. When the novice was seated, and the Celebrant reconducted to the faldastorium, high mass commenced with peculiar dignity, and with a strict precision in all the various ceremonies, which always render the Catholic service sublime. After the gospel, the Rev. Mr Daly delivered an excellent sermon, addressed peculiarly to the novice, and prefaced by a text admirably pertinent to the subject he handled:—'Hearken, O daughter, and see, and incline thine ear; thou shalt leave thy people, and thy father's house, for the king hath greatly desired thy beauty; and he is the Lord thy God.'—Psal. xlv.

"After mass the novice retired, whilst the clerical choir chanted in full tone, the psalm, '*In exitu Israel de Egypto.*' At the conclusion of the Psalm she appeared disrobed of her worldly habiliments, and vested in the simplicity of penance and retirement. In the different answers to the questions put to her by the Celebrant, she was clear and decisive, like one whose determination of embracing a life of religion, and of chastity, was that of long and conclusive reflection. The ceremony on the whole created a deep and general interest.

"The chapel and lower choir were crowded with the first of rank and distinction in our town and its vicinity. We recognized among them the respectable families of his grace the Archbishop of Tuam, Collector Reilly, our worthy Mayor, Colonel Carey, &c."

On the above statement some very judicious remarks have been made in some of the newspapers; but none of the writers seem to have been aware of the shocking enormity that the Church of Rome has the impudence to practise in open day. Let them call this what they will, it is as really a human sacrifice as the burning of widows in Hindoostan, with the ashes of their husbands; and I can easily imagine, that in the case of the young girl above described, it may be a greater sacrifice than that of a wretched widow who offers herself to the flames, to terminate her sorrows, as she believes, in a few minutes, rather than to drag out a life of misery. Here a silly young creature is represented as devoting herself to a life of celibacy and perpetual seclusion from the world, which must be a life of delusion or of misery, or of both; because it is contrary to the appointment of God, who requires no man or woman to relinquish the advantages of social and domestic intercourse, or to become thus secluded from the world; but who rather commands all to occupy the sphere which in his providence he assigns them in the world, for his glory, and the good of their fellow-creatures.

There is something inexpressibly shocking and revolting in the style of the above narrative. The writer allows his fancy to luxuriate on the personal beauty of the victim brought to the altar to be sacrificed—to what, I shall not say or surmise. From the abominable profanation of the word of God, by the accommodation of the "text admirably pertinent to the subject," we cannot say what the priests may not devise and execute. Men who can so prostitute the word of God, as to apply what he says of spiritual and inward holiness to carnal beauty, may, by and by, alter the same passage by putting the word "priest" in place of "king," and then use the bible itself as a pander of wickedness.

It is a fact not generally known, that there is a convent of nuns in the heart of London. They belong to an order that left England on the suppression of the monasteries at the Reformation, and settled in the Netherlands. The seminary, if such it could be called, was kept up chiefly by recruits from England, for more

than two centuries; when, on the disasters following the French revolution, the sisterhood were driven to seek refuge in England, from which their predecessors had been driven. They were living in London in great comfort in 1814, as appears by the Orthodox Journal for that year, when a controversy arose about their dress, which it seems was offensive to London Protestants; and they were ordered by authority to lay it aside, and dress like other people. This, so far as appears, was merely an order by their spiritual superiors, who were afraid of the odium that might be occasioned by the monastic habits in London; but great pains were taken to make the order appear an act of the ministry, who, I suppose, knew no more of the matter than I did at the time.

No. CLXXXII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5TH, 1822.

WHEN I first saw the title of Dr Milner's great work, "The End of Religious Controversy," I understood him to mean the "final end" or design of the thing; which is, or should be, the discovery of truth and the exposure of error. But I had not read many sentences till I discovered that he meant the actual conclusion, or termination, of all controversy on religious subjects. Yes: this foreign bishop, and vicar apostolic, has actually the vanity and presumption to tell the world, that this work of his settles all controversies, and puts an end to all disputes about religion. He tells us that Christianity is the religion of Rome, and submission to the Pope; and this must end all disputes; for he has said it, and that is enough. Had there been no disputes before, this work would have been properly called the beginning of religious controversy; for it suggests innumerable subjects of debate; but as things are, and have been, I think it ought not to have been called either the "beginning," or the "end," but the "middle;" for there was religious controversy before, and there has been since, and there shall be yet more; and this same work of Dr Milner is calculated to produce more controversy than any other publication by the Papists of the present day. The Rev. Mr Grier has added a large volume to "the end," or termination; and THE PROTESTANT is about to add to it something more; so that the vicar apostolic will find that he has not *done up* his subject so completely as he imagined.

The work is preceded by an address to the Lord Bishop of St David's, and followed by an appendix relative to the writings of the same prelate; in both which the writer displays a spirit of rancorous hostility, too strong for even the cunning of Jesuitism to conceal. Had he imbibed a sufficient portion of the spirit of the great father of the order, he would have studied to conciliate a dignified individual, whose vote will tell in the House of Lords whenever the "Catholic Question" comes to be agitated, and whose profound learning, and well known attachment to the constitution, as established in 1688, give him an influence with other members of that noble house. But Dr Milner so far forgets his duty as a member of the holy fraternity, which is to promote the interest of the order, and of the Pope, by all possible means, that he allows himself to indulge in personalities, calculated to irritate the persons of whom he asks the favour of emancipation, which shows the irritability of his own temper, and also how deeply he feels the injury which my lord of St David's has done to the cause of Popery by his writings.

The introductory address and the appendix are both in the same style, only there is more venom in the latter than in the former. In both there is a petulance, and impudent disregard of historical truth, which cannot find a parallel in the writings of any other author with which I am acquainted, except in those of his own protegee, W. Eusebius Andrews, the Catholic Vindicator, concerning whom bishop Cameron swears,—he never approved of any thing that came from that man.—See *Report of Trial*, p. 47. Dr Milner's style, like that of Mr Andrews, is petulant but never rises even to the dignity of manly sarcasm. It is more polite, indeed, more grammatical; and his vocables are better chosen and arranged; but, upon the whole, he discovers nothing of a superior, or well cultivated mind. Considering the rank and learning of the person whom he addresses, his style partakes as much of insolence as petulance; and I do not know any thing to which it can be so justly compared, as to the rudeness of ill-bred boys and girls, in the streets, who delight in throwing dirt on the clothes of such passengers as show by their dress that they are superior to themselves.

This "End of Religious Controversy" bears one of the most prominent marks of the beast in its very front; that is, downright lying and imposition. Of the bishop of St David's the author writes as follows:—"He comes forward in his episcopal mitre, bearing in his hands a new Protestant Catechism, to be learned by Protestants of every description, which teaches them to *hate* and *persecute* their elder brethren, the authors of their Christianity and civilization," p. vii. In this short sentence there are several things which require animadversion; but the first and most prominent is the impudent misrepresentation, that this Catechism teaches Protestants to *hate* and *persecute* their brethern. I have read it over again and again, and can assure the reader that it teaches no such thing; nor does it contain a syllable that by fair construction can be made to imply that it is right to hate and persecute any man

of any sect whatever. With as much truth Dr Milner might have said, that this Catechism teaches treason, and that it recommends the confiscation of the revenues of the church of which its author is a distinguished ornament and zealous defender. My present business, however, is not to defend the doctrine of the Catechism, but merely to expose the falsehood of the vicar apostolic, and the unblushing effrontery that could make such an assertion, when he must have known that any child could detect it.

It is but fair, however, to state the ground on which Dr Milner makes such an assertion; and we have it in the following words:—"In fact, this Christian bishop begins and ends his Protestant Catechism, with a quotation from a Puritan Regicide, declaring, that 'Popery is not to be tolerated, either in public or in private, and that it must be thought how to remove it, and hinder the growth thereof;' adding, 'If they say, that by removing their idols we violate their consciences, we have no warrant to regard conscience which is not grounded on scripture.'" This is a quotation from the great poet Milton, which his lordship gives, in the introduction, and at the conclusion of his Catechism. It is because he has quoted these words, that Dr Milner makes the monstrous assertion above noticed, that the bishop's Catechism teaches Protestants to *hate* and *persecute* their brethren. The question is not, whether Milton perfectly understood the subject of liberty of conscience? Perhaps he did not; as few men of his day understood it so well as it is generally understood now; but taking his words in the strongest and most exceptionable sense that they will bear, they imply nothing like that which Dr Milner affects to find in them. They cannot without gross violence be made to imply, that it is right to *hate and persecute Papists*. The sum and substance of them is that "*Popery* is not to be tolerated, either in public or in private."

Now though I have always been an advocate for liberty of conscience, and an enemy of persecution for conscience' sake, and hope to continue so to the end of my life, I cannot but express my agreement with the great poet, that "*Popery* is not to be tolerated," because I believe it is quite intolerable to every man whose religion is derived from the bible; and that it ought to be opposed, and put down, and extirpated by every means by which it is lawful and possible to oppose and extirpate error. Toleration is not a mere negative; it is so far a positive thing, that if we say a thing is tolerable, it implies acquiescence; it is to say, it may be suffered, or endured; it is not necessary to oppose it. Now I say, with Milton, that Popery is not to be tolerated; that no Christian can tolerate it without compromising his Christianity, and becoming a traitor to his Saviour. It ought to be opposed in every way by which error can be successfully opposed: that is, by instruction, by argument, by manifestation of the truth, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left; and by prayer to God night and day, that he would maintain his own cause, and bless the labours of his servants in the ministry of the gospel. Those who know that Popery, as well as every other system of error, is intolerable, will labour in this way for its extirpation, and I know of no other way by which it can be extirpated.

Now I know well there are men of such perverse minds, that they will apply what I have said of principles to persons—of errors to the individuals who hold them,—and what I have said of extirpation by means of truth and argument, to extirpation by fire and sword. I must therefore tell them again, though I cannot give them a mind to understand it, that the things are quite different and distinct; and that what applies to the one cannot be made available with regard to the other. It is as impossible to convince a man by force as to kill him by an argument. To attempt, therefore, to extirpate heresy or error by fire and sword is as absurd as to punish a murderer by a syllogism. I would never apply force of any kind to extirpate error, while yet I hold that error in general, and Popery in particular, ought not to be tolerated, but extirpated, by the only means which can reach error, which has its seat in the mind, and can be affected only by rational and spiritual weapons.

With regard to *persons*, I do not say that Papists ought not to be tolerated, neither does Milton in the obnoxious passage under consideration. A Papist may be as tolerable in civil society as another man. Many of them, no doubt, are so, and ought not to be punished on account of their errors. They ought not to have power over Protestants, for their principles would compel them to use such power, not for the extirpation of *heresy* merely, but of *heretics*; for they have not learned to make the distinction between principles and persons which I have here laid down. But as members of civil society, without power to injure others, they are tolerable, ought to be tolerated, and are tolerated, in this country as much as other dissenters. I hope I shall never see it otherwise; but as for their errors, idolatries, and superstitions, I hold these to be quite intolerable and insufferable; and wherever they are obtruded, they ought instantly to be put down by truth and argument. If they practise their idolatries in private, they must answer for this, and their other secret sins, to God; we have nothing to do with them, for toleration does not apply to that which is unseen and unknown. But if they were to erect their idols in our streets, and worship them there, I would say, they ought to be put down by the magistrates, as insulting to public decorum, and as

tending to a breach of the peace; and though they should plead conscience in such a case, I would say with Milton, it ought not to be regarded, not only because the thing is contrary to the word of God, but because the streets do not belong to them, but to the public; and they have no right to prostitute public property for idolatrous purposes.

It is true, the bishop of St David's prefixes to his Catechism a quotation from Mr Locke, which may imply that Papists as well as Popery ought not to be tolerated. Papists are not specially mentioned, but they may take the passage to themselves if they please; and if they find it excludes them from toleration, it is for a reason which they themselves must approve. The words are:—"*These* have no right to be tolerated by the magistrate that will not own and teach the duty of tolerating all men in matters of religion." Locke was the great advocate of toleration in the seventeenth century; and I have no doubt his Letters on the subject had no small influence in preparing the minds of men for the tolerant laws established by King William. Indeed, except Dr Owen, I do not recollect any other writer of that age, who so explicitly maintains the principle of toleration, now so universally admitted. It was his very zeal for the "toleration of all men in matters of religion," that led him to exclude Papists from the general rule; because, seeing they would not tolerate others, he thought they could not safely be tolerated. His remark applies to a state of society resembling that of civil warfare, in which the natural principle of self-defence requires and admits of certain rigours not necessary or lawful in other circumstances.

But let the very worst be made of these words of Locke, and of the rest that are quoted from him, they cannot imply that it is our duty to *hate* and *persecute* any sect, or any individual. To refuse toleration to those who will not tolerate others, is not persecution, but a just exercise of civil power, like the punishment of other evil doers. But this scarcely applies to the state of things in England and Scotland in the present day, where Papists do practise toleration, because they are without power, and few in number; and the rule of their church, as laid down by Bellarmine, is, that in such circumstances, they ought to be tolerant; and that they ought not to attempt to extirpate heresy by force *except where it may safely be done.* Thus we tolerate Papists for the very reason why they would not tolerate us; that is—we have power, and they have not.

But there is more objectionable matter in this sentence of Dr Milner's than the misrepresentation which I have pointed out. He speaks as if it were granted that Popery was genuine ancient Christianity;—as if it were indisputable and admitted, that Papists were the authors of our Christianity and our civilization. It would not have occurred to any man of right thinking or feeling, that any creature, angelic or human, was the author of his religion. We know that Jesus Christ himself is the author as well as the finisher of our faith; but Papists seldom, if ever, think of looking so high. They cannot trace their religion to a higher source than some fellow-creature of a saint; or, perhaps, rather a sinner of their own rank; and here Dr Milner roundly asserts, that the AUTHORS of our Christianity are the Papists who happened to live in England prior to the Reformation!

There is nothing in which the bishop of St David's is more successful, and nothing in which any author could desire to be more successful, so far as the evidence of ancient history goes, than his lordship is, in proving that the original Christianity of Britain was not Popery; and that the British Christians of the first six centuries had no more to do with Rome than they had with Jerusalem, or Antioch, or Alexandria, or with the man in the moon, so far as regarded authority on the one hand, and subjection on the other. But Dr Milner, in his introductory address, without invalidating the overwhelming evidence adduced by his lordship on these points, shortly contents himself with re-asserting what has been asserted and disproved a thousand times, that Popery is the "ancient religion;" and that Papists were the "authors of our Christianity and civilization." Here again we have something like the impudence of a petulant boy, who having been reproved for a lie which he had told, after having its falsehood demonstrated, holds up an unblushing face, and tells it over again. Parents and tutors have been subjected to the painful necessity of witnessing such depravity; and so must every man who shall enter into controversy with Papists. It has been proved a thousand times, that their errors are mere novelties, unknown to the Christians of the apostolic age; and yet I suppose no Papist ever wrote a hundred lines on the subject, without asserting that his religion is as old as the era of Christianity.* They hope by this incessant repetition of their lie,

* In my 175th Number, I gave an extract of a letter from a Papist in the Highlands to his son in Glasgow; which, along with some good advice, contained the boasting assertion, that his religion had existed nineteen centuries. There appears no necessity for his having introduced this, unless it be a rule with Papists that it must find a place in all that they write. Having mentioned this subject, I take the opportunity of requesting my correspondent, Z. Malcom, to read that letter over again, with my remarks upon it, and he will find that he is mistaken in supposing that I meant an unfavourable reflection against the people of the Highlands in general. What I said related exclusively to Papists, who are now more numerous in the Highlands than he seems aware of, particularly in the western parts of Inverness-shire, and in some of the islands.

to exhaust the patience of Protestants, and so get them to believe it for the sake of peace and quietness: and such is the simplicity of Protestants in general, that there is a probability of their being successful, as they have been with regard to their designation. It was by sheer impudence and perseverance, that they got Protestants to drop the term Papists, and call them Catholics, though they have no more right to that name than the Episcopalians of England, the Presbyterians of Scotland, or the Independents of both kingdoms.

In his postscript, Dr Milner has a little nibbling at the bishop's authorities with regard to the religion of the ancient British ; but he has not adduced a particle of evidence to show that Popery as it is now, and has been for twelve hundred years, in Italy, was professed in this island during the first six centuries. The following statement by Judge Blackstone, prefixed to the Protestant Catechism, remains uncontroverted; and it will readily be admitted that few men were better acquainted with our national history :—"The ancient British church, by whomsoever planted, was a stranger to the bishop of Rome, and his pretended authority. But the Pagan Saxon invaders having driven the professors of Christianity to the remotest corners of our island, their own conversion was afterwards effected by Augustine the monk, and other missionaries from the court of Rome. This naturally introduced *some few* of the *Papal corruptions* in point of faith and doctrine; but we read of no civil authority claimed by the Pope in these kingdoms till the era of the Norman conquest."—*Comm.* B. IV. ch. viii.

It is equally true with regard to Ireland, that Popery is a mere novelty, so far at least as regards subjection to the Pope, and paying him tribute. Ireland is said to have been an island of saints fourteen centuries ago ; but certainly they were not Papists for many hundred years thereafter. For this we have no less than Papal authority, contained in a bull of Adrian IV., inserted in the postscript to the Protestant Catechism ; on which the right reverend author writes as follows :—"The Bull of Adrian IV., in which he gives his consent to Henry the second's conquest of Ireland, on condition of his paying Peter-pence, is a curious and important historical document, and contains indisputable evidence that Popery was *not the ancient religion* of the Irish,—*not the religion of Ireland*, before the middle of the twelfth century. If this fact, *the modern introduction of Popery* into Ireland, were more generally known in that country, it might tend not a little to break that spell, which blinds the eyes of the Irish Papists to the errors of the Church of Rome." Then follows a quotation from archbishop Usher, strongly expressive of the same sentiment. The archbishop had paid particular attention to the state and history of the ancient Irish, and he writes thus: —"As far as I can collect by such records of the former ages as have come into my hands, (either manuscript or printed,) the religion professed by the ancient bishops, priests, monks, and other Christians in this land, was in substance the very same with that, which now, by public authority, is maintained therein against the *foreign doctrine* brought thither in *latter times* by the bishop of Rome's followers."

This is perfectly consistent with the fact of missionaries being sent from Rome to Ireland in the fourth and fifth centuries, supposing that to be a fact ; for Rome itself was not then thoroughly *papified ;* and the fact of receiving the gospel by the preaching of missionaries from Rome did not then imply subjection to the see of Rome, any more than the fact of America receiving the gospel from England implies subjection to the see of Canterbury.

Now the fact is,—Pope Adrian IV. knew that Henry II. of England had a great liking to Ireland, and wished to have it annexed to his dominions. Adrian accordingly issued a Bull authorizing the king to invade and take forcible possession of that island, which he justified and commended by the following reason :—"Your highness' desire of extending the glory of your name on earth, and of obtaining the reward of eternal happiness in heaven, is laudable and beneficial ; inasmuch as your intent is, as a Catholic prince, to *enlarge the limits of the church,* to declare the truth of the Christian faith to *untaught and rude nations,* and to eradicate vice from the field of the Lord." Nothing can be more conclusive than this. Ireland did not then belong to the Church of Rome, else the conquest of it could not have tended to enlarge the church. Ireland had not then received the religion of Rome, else the Pope would not have called it an *untaught* and rude nation. This conclusion is confirmed by several other expressions in the Bull for which I have not room. His lordship gives this curious document in the original Latin, with a translation ; and for its authenticity he refers to a host of great and well known authors ; such as Giraldus Cambrensis, Matt. Paris, &c. ; and there is a translation of it in Rapin's History of England, Collyer's Eccles. Hist. Great Britain, Leland's Hist. Ireland, Lord Littleton's Hist. Henry II. &c. &c.

I have to thank my Cambuslang correspondent, for informing me, that the story of the 6000 sculls of infants, is mentioned by Flavel, in his discourse, entitled, "Tidings from Rome," with much more shocking matter, not fit to meet the eye of a modern reader.

No. CLXXXIII.

SATURDAY, January 12th 1822.

My last Number was occupied chiefly by an exposure of the misrepresentations contained in one single sentence of the introductory address to Dr Milner's "End of Religious Controversy." Were I to do equal justice to every sentence,—were I to expose in detail every misstatement, misrepresentation, quibble, and sophistry, which this book contains, it would occupy the remainder of my life; and the vicar apostolic himself would probably not live to see an "end" of the controversy which his "End of Religious Controversy" had created. It is not my design to go so much into detail; but rather to apply my attention to a few leading principles, which may be called pillars of the great Romish temple; and if I can subvert these, the whole fabric must fall;—I mean, in argument, not in reality, for I believe the final fall of antichrist is not just yet.

I have introduced Dr Milner as asserting that Popery was the Christianity of ancient times; and that to it England was indebted for her Christianity as well as her civilization. This is a main pillar of Popery; yet it cannot stand a breath of such writers as the late Archbishop Usher, and the present bishop of St David's. It is, in fact, demolished by every Protestant writer who attacks it; yet Dr Milner writes as if it never had been touched; and he seems to think he obtains a great triumph when he detects the following paradox in the Protestant Catechism:—"The great and fundamental paradox of the Right Rev. Catechist is, that Protestantism subsisted many hundred years before Popery; at the same time that he makes its essence consist in a renunciation of, and opposition to Popery!" p. xiii. In descending to answer such a contemptible quibble, I feel as if I had returned to the Catholic Vindicator, and his "endless contradictions;" for no doubt, Dr Milner here insinuates that he has detected a contradiction, though it is evident he has performed no such achievement. Allowing the thing to be a paradox, as he states it, it is not a contradiction; for the Protestant religion, though as old as Christianity, in *substance*, has not existed more than three hundred years under *the name* of Protestant. The essence of Christianity is, to believe and confess that Jesus died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and rose again, according to the scriptures; yet the apostle Paul said the truth, when he told his hearers, that he taught no other thing than what the prophets had written, hundreds of years before Christ came into the world. Christianity is the old religion of the patriarchs and prophets, under a new dispensation, and a new name; so Protestantism is the religion of the primitive Christians, reformed and emancipated from the errors and the bondage of Rome. It takes its present name from the circumstance of *protesting* against Romish corruption and idolatry; yet it is essentially the same religion, which under the name, Christianity, spread over a great part of the world, before there was an organized church in Rome; and far longer before any bishop of Rome had the effrontery to put himself forward as universal bishop, and head of the Catholic church.

As an example of the summary manner in which Dr Milner disposes of some fundamental points of the controversy, take the following. He is speaking of the propriety of Papists defending themselves against the attacks of adversaries; and he says,—"It is not only lawful, but also a duty which we owe to our fellow-subjects and ourselves, to repel these charges by proving that there was reason, and religion, and loyalty, and good faith among Christians, before Luther quarrelled with Leo X., and Henry VIII. fell in love with Ann Bulleyn," p. v. Here he undertakes to prove what nobody denies, that good principles and good conduct were always to be found among *Christians;* though he knows quite well that the question is about *Papists;* and if he means to use the terms as convertible, he is guilty of the logical vice of begging the question. But what I wish the reader particularly to attend to here, is, the impudent assumption, that the Protestant religion originated from the passions of two men. There is not a word of argument to prove that such was its origin. The vicar apostolic merely mentions the thing *en passant*, as a thing which all the world knows, and which requires no proof, and yet this very thing, which he tries to pass over as indisputable, is what all the world knows to be a downright falsehood. Luther had no quarrel with the Pope when he began to preach against indulgences, which was the commencement of his reformation. It was the Pope that first quarrelled with him, because he would not forbear exposing the wickedness of the system of indulgences, which had become a scandal to all Europe. It is equally certain that whatever might be the wickedness of Henry VIII. with regard to Ann Bulleyn, or any other woman, the reformation in England did not originate with him. For more than a century, that is, from the time of Wickliffe, the minds of the people had been gradually opening to perceive the abominable superstitions of Popery. They were quite ready to throw off the yoke, before the king was ready to allow them. Had this not been the case, much as the Pope thwarted his designs, he would not have been able to throw the yoke off his own shoulder. He did ultimately effect this; but so far as the reformation of religion was concerned, he was rather a hinderer than a promoter of it. It is

not denied that he abolished certain superstitions, and removed many abominations from the established religion; but he retained enough of the "dead fly" of Popery to give a stinking savour to the whole mass of his ecclesiastical system, when his people would have delighted in a more thorough reformation, and cleansing of the church from her filthiness and her idols. If our Papists had a particle of candour, they would take the model of the reformation in England from the reign of Edward VI., against whose moral character they can find no exception; or, at least, from that of Elizabeth, when the church was established nearly as she is now; for I suppose there are none of her sons that defend the procedure of Henry VIII. *in toto*, or maintain the purity of the church as modelled by him. I have adverted to this subject, not for the purpose of defending the Church of England, but merely to exhibit an example of the manner in which Popish writers disregard historical truth, and the impudence with which they can obtrude falsehood on the world.

But leaving the introductory address, let us attend to the matter and design of the work itself. Dr Milner, in order to put an end to all controversy about religion, conjures up a society of Protestants, all very *candid* and *open to conviction*, and *willing to be convinced* by such arguments as he is able to adduce; and as he had the making of the society as well as of the arguments he found no difficulty in fitting the one to the other. The following is the manner in which he makes his principal creature, "James Brown, Esq. of New Cottage," introduce the subject. It is in a letter to Dr Milner himself:—

"REVEREND SIR,—I should need an ample apology for the liberty I take in thus addressing you, without having the honour of your acquaintance, and still more for the heavy task I am endeavouring to impose upon you, if I did not consider your public character, as a pastor of your religion, and as a writer in defence of it, and likewise your personal character for benevolence, which has been described to me by a gentleman of your communion, Mr J. C—ne, who is well acquainted with us both. Having mentioned this, I need only add, that I write to you in the name of a society of serious and worthy Christians of different persuasions, to which society I myself belong, who are as desirous as I am, to receive satisfaction from you on certain doubts, which your late work in answer to Dr Sturges has suggested to us.*

"However, in making this request of our society to you, it seems proper, Rev. Sir, that I should bring you acquainted with it; by way of convincing you, that it is not unworthy of the attention which I am desirous you should pay to it. We consist, then, of about twenty persons, including the ladies, who, living at some distance from any considerable town, meet together once a week, generally at my habitation of New Cottage; not so much for our amusement and refection, as for the improvement of our minds, by reading the best publications of the day which I can procure from my London bookseller, and sometimes an original essay written by one of the company.

"I have signified that many of us are of different religious persuasions: this will be seen more distinctly from the following account of our members. Among these I must mention, in the first place, our learned and worthy rector, Dr Carey. He is of course of the Church of England; but like most others of his learned and dignified brethren, in these times, he is of that free, and as it is called, liberal turn of mind, as to explain away the mysteries and a great many of its other articles, which in my younger days were considered essential to it. Mr and Mrs Topham are Methodists of the Predestinarian and Antinomian class, while Mr and Mrs Askew are mitigated Arminian Methodists of Wesley's connection. Mr and Mrs Ranken are honest Quakers. Mr Barker and his children term themselves *Rational Dissenters*, being of the old Presbyterian lineage, which is now almost universally gone into Socinianism. I, for my part, glory in being a stanch member of our happy establishment, which has kept the golden mean among the contending sects, and which, I am fully persuaded, approaches nearer to the purity of the apostolic church, than any other which has existed since the days of it. Mrs Brown professes an equal attachment to the church, yet, being of an inquisitive and ardent mind, she cannot refrain from frequenting the meetings, and even supporting the missions of those self-created apostles, who are undermining this church on every side, and who are nowhere more active than in our own sequestered valley.

"With these differences among us, on the most interesting subjects, we cannot help having frequent religious controversies; but reason and charity enable us to manage these without any breach of either good manners or good-will to each other. Indeed I believe we are, one and all, possessed of an unfeigned respect and cordial love for Christians of every description, one only excepted. Must I name it on the present occasion?—yes, I must, in order to fulfil my commission in a proper manner. It is, then, the church which you, Rev. Sir, belong to; which, if any credit is due to the eminent divines, whose works we are in the habit of reading, and more particularly of the illustrious Bishop Porteous, in his celebrated and standing work, called, 'A Brief Confutation of the Errors of the Church of Rome, extracted from Archbishop Secker's Five Ser-

* "Letters to a Prebendary, in answer to Reflections on Popery, by the Rev. Dr Sturges, Prebendary and Chancellor of Windsor."

mons against Popery,' is such a mass of absurdity, bigotry, superstition, idolatry, and immorality, that to say we respect and love those who obstinately adhere to it, as we do other Christians, would seem a compromise of reason, scripture, and virtuous feeling." Pp. 1—4.

In another long and wordy paragraph, Mr Brown tells the Doctor, that his former work (Letters to a Prebendary) had removed many of his difficulties, and refuted the most odious of the charges brought against the Church of Rome. Some points, however, it seems, had not been cleared up in that work; and Mr Brown, in name of the society, writes to the author, requesting him to undertake the task of satisfying them on these points. In compliance with their request, he wrote this great volume of 525 pages, imperial octavo. It was written, it seems, twenty years ago, that is, fifteen years before its first publication; and suppressed because, as he says, Bishop Horsley, who had obtained some influence over him, and who had praised his "Letters to a Prebendary," in the House of Lords, wished him to suppress it. The reader is thus left to infer, if he pleases, that Bishop Horsley, one of the most powerful writers of his day, considered this work of Dr Milner's so formidable, that it would endanger the established church, and that he begged the author to spare the venerable fabric. This is what is pretty plainly insinuated; and if it be a true state of the case, I must say of Bishop Horsley, what no man ever suspected of him, that he was one of the greatest literary cowards of modern times. But I cannot help suspecting, that the insinuation owes its origin more to the literary vanity of the Popish, than to the literary cowardice of the Protestant bishop.

Creatures of the imagination will in general be found to possess the image of their creator. This is more particularly the case when an author forms an individual or a society after his own heart, and according to his own taste. The society of New Cottage are quite of Dr Milner's creation; and according to their own account, by the pen of their accredited organ, they are all "*serious* and *worthy Christians.*" This is an epitome of the holy and infallible Church of Rome, which has neither spot nor wrinkle. This they are as a society; and no doubt the author of their existence meant to make them as perfect in their individual characters; but this he could not do, for when we begin to examine them one by one, we find such rank Popish stuff in the composition, as to convince us that the father of lies himself must have had a hand in their formation.

To begin with the "learned and *worthy* rector, Dr Carey:" he appears in a character the most infamous that can be imagined; and yet I believe it is perfectly consistent with Popish morality. He has subscribed, and professed *ex animo*, to approve the whole articles of the Church of England. That is, he declares from his heart, with the solemnity of an appeal to the Searcher of hearts, that he believes every doctrine contained in the articles, homilies, and liturgy of the Church of England. With equal solemnity he promises, in the presence of God, to teach the doctrine contained in these articles and homilies, to the people whom God has committed to his charge; and on the understanding that he does so, the law of the land allows him to receive the emoluments attached to his office,—perhaps five hundred pounds a year. But instead of believing the doctrines which he professes to believe, instead of teaching what he has sworn to teach, and for which he receives such a handsome provision he deceives the people committed to his charge, by explaining away, that is, in plain English, denying and subverting the articles of his church! I defy Jesuitism itself to produce a more flagrant example of downright villany. And this is the learned and *worthy* rector whom Dr Milner is pleased to place at the head of his society of serious and worthy Christians! Truly, he gains nothing by the conversion of such a man to Popery; for he is a Jesuit already; and like persons of that order two hundred years ago, he must have thrust himself into the church for the purpose of effecting her ruin.

I do not profess to be intimately acquainted with the Church of England; but I have read her articles, and some at least of her homilies, and frequently, when I happened to be in England, I have been present at the church service; and I have no hesitation in declaring, that these do contain the true Christian doctrine which Christ himself and his apostles taught,—the doctrine, which, if a man believe, he shall be saved,—and which, if he do not believe, he shall perish. Now if there be within the church such a man as Dr Milner has described, who, eating her bread, lifts up his heel against her, and who, instead of feeding his people with the sound doctrine of the articles which he has subscribed, explains away, or denies the truth contained in these articles, and feeds, or rather poisons them with his own inventions, or the inventions of others, he is a swindler in the worst sense of the word, or what the bible calls a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is not wonderful that such a man should be easily converted to Popery; for among Jesuits only can we find men of his own stamp.

The next couple in the group are, Mr and Mrs Topham, who, it seems, "are Methodists of the Predestinarian and Antinomian class." I am at a loss what to say of this class of religionists; but if I may judge from the designation which Mr Brown gives to this branch of his society of *serious* and *worthy* Christians, I would advise him to take care of his plate, and to have all his valuables under lock and key, when he admits them into his house,

whether it be for reading, or refection, or simple, silent meditation. Intimate though I have been with Calvinists, who hold the doctrine of predestination, I never met with an Antinomian in my life; and I do not know what it is like, though I have heard that there are such creatures in England. This, if I understand the word, is a creature who believes, or at least professes to believe, that he is not under any obligation to obey the law of God. I know there are thousands of practical Antinomians, who live as if they were under no obligation to obey God's law; just as there are many practical atheists, who live as if there were no God; but as I never met with a man who maintained in theory, that there is no God,—so I never saw a man who would maintain the proposition, that he was not under obligation to obey God's law, or that held the doctrine of predestination in such a sense as to imply this. But perhaps there are such in England; and Dr Milner did right to place a couple of them in the society of persons whom he meant to convert to Popery; for they are already Papists in the worst sense, who think that there is any power in heaven, or earth, or under the earth, that can lawfully dispense with the obligation to obey that law which is holy and just and good; for the honour of which Christ came into the world, and laid down his life; and who did this for the very purpose, not of relieving men from the obligation, but of renewing them to a life of obedience to the law, by infusing a new principle, supplying new motives, and imparting the efficient aid of his Spirit for the purpose of enabling his people to live a life of obedience to the law.

The next couple are "mitigated Arminian Methodists of Mr Wesley's connection." I never heard of mitigated Arminianism before; and as I do not know what it is, I must be excused from dissecting it. The next two "are honest Quakers." I know a good many of the respectable body who bear this name, and I am persuaded they are too *honest* to spend their time in any sort of religious intercourse with persons of such doubtful principles and character as the rest of the group. The *Rational Dissenters*, as they presumptuously style themselves, as if all others were irrational, like the Antinomians, are not far from Popery, having nearly met with it in the opposite extreme of infidelity.

Now we come to Mr Brown himself, who, by his own account, is the most inconsistent character of the whole collection. He tells Dr Milner, that not only Dr Carey, but that *most others* of his learned and dignified brethren, explain away the articles of the church as he does; that is, that most of the clergy of the established church are swindlers and Jesuits, as well as his rector; and he glories in being "a stanch member of this *happy establishment*," which "approaches nearer to the purity of the apostolic church than any other which has existed since the age of it!" I request the reader to remember that this is a caricature representation by Dr Milner himself, put into the mouth of a pretended friend, but a real enemy of the established religion; and by such trickery does the vicar apostolic form what he calls a society of Protestants, whom he may soon convert into *serious worthy* Christians, according to the faith of Rome.

This said stanch member of the establishment commences his letter by a few civil words of flattery to our vicar apostolic,—"a sop to Cerberus," to bribe his good humour and avert his growl. And we may form some idea of the vicar's appetite for adulation, by the flavour of what is offered, and the greediness with which he swallows it, from so "worthy" a fraternity. The writer tells him, that "his personal character for benevolence" has been "described to him," and he appears to have intended to ascertain the dimensions of this benevolence, by trying whether it could induce him to accept of praise from a set of people, who unblushingly avow that hypocrisy, barefaced lying, and a contempt of the law of God, are principal ingredients in their composition. I think that even "James Brown, of New Cottage, Esquire," must have been amazed at the vicar's simplicity, in transferring this letter to the pages of his polemical tome, as a certificate of his "benevolent disposition;"—I am sure that no other than a Papist could have had the courage to offer a similar testimonial. He previously informs him, that "it is a heavy task he is endeavouring to impose upon him;" but seeing that Mr Brown and his friends have succeeded in convincing him, that their society "is not unworthy of his attention," they may assuredly take courage,—none of their scruples upon "modes of faith" can be of so stubborn a texture as to occasion the vicar much trouble: I think it probable, however, that he might find it necessary to avail himself of the assistance of the civil magistrate, in teaching them correct "modes of practice."

No. CLXXXIV.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 19TH, 1822.

DR Milner enters professedly on the subject of his work in Letter V. which is entitled, "Method of finding out the True Religion," and which commences thus:—"Dear Sir,—It is obvious to common sense, that, in order to find out any hidden thing, or to do any difficult thing, we must first discover, and then follow the proper method for such purpose." Here, at the very outset, we find this great Romish doctor laying down a principle, as obvious and

indisputable, which has no more to do with the subject than the dimensions of a circle have to do with properties of coal gas. He speaks of something that is "hidden," that is to be "found out," which finding out is "difficult," and in order to which, "we must first *discover*, and then follow the proper method." In his opinion, therefore, religion is an occult science, and the study of it is like the search for the philosopher's stone, or the discovery of a self-moving machine that is to find out the longitude.

Now, I say, this has nothing to do with Christianity, that is, "the true religion" which Dr Milner speaks of "finding out;" for if this depended upon our *seeking*, or rather upon our first *discovering*, and then *following* a way to *seek it*, it is not probable that ever we should find it. Christianity is not a hidden thing which men are to find out by seeking; it is a published thing which finds out men who are not seeking *it*, though they may be seeking something which they mistake for it. It consists in the knowledge of the only true God, and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. Now this is not by any means a hidden thing, or a thing, the knowledge of which is of difficult attainment. I grant that the attainment of it would be not only difficult, but impossible, if it depended upon human seeking, and human discovery; but Christ tells us plainly,—"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil;" John iii. 16—19. This is not a hidden thing which we are to find out by diligent seeking. Christ told it to Nicodemus, —made it known to all his apostles, and commanded them to publish it to the whole world; which they did when they went preaching the gospel to all nations.

I grant that men in all ages have entertained the mistake, that they might do something to *find out* a religion for themselves. The folly of this is exposed by the apostle Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, chap. x. verses 2—11. Speaking of his brethren the Jews, he says, "they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; for they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God." They went about seeking to find out a way of approaching to God, different from that which he had prescribed, but which would be more agreeable to themselves. But the apostle tells them, that they had nothing to seek for, or find out, for the thing they inquired about was published, and brought nigh to them, and urged upon them, as a full development of the true religion; and it is this:—"Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness of the law,—that the man who doeth those things shall live in them. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down from above; or, who shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring Christ up again from the dead. (What endless seeking this would be!) But what saith it? *The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart;* that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."

From this passage it is very evident, that the "true religion," that is, the way of a sinner's salvation, is not a hidden thing which the sinner must find out by seeking, but a published *notorious* thing, urged upon him by the word of God in the scriptures, and by the preaching of the gospel, if he will open his eyes to the one, or his ears to the other; and a thing, of which, in such a country as this, he cannot be entirely ignorant, unless he be of those who love darkness rather than light, and who will not come to the light lest their deeds should be reproved.

But Dr Milner's whole work proceeds upon the assumption that the true religion is a *hidden* matter. He does not attempt to show that it is so. He assumes it as undisputed and granted, that it is a "hidden thing," yet to be *found out;* and he proceeds to lay down rules for finding it out, as an astronomer lays down rules for calculating an eclipse, or the revolution of a planet; but unhappily for Dr Milner's system, his rules are not so certain and satisfactory as those of the astronomer.

Now if I have shown, as I hope I have, in few words, that Christianity,—"the true religion," is a revealed, published thing; and seeing Dr Milner builds his whole work upon the false assumption, that it is a secret, hidden thing, I am entitled to say, not merely that I have shaken a main pillar of his system, but that I have swept away its foundation. His great fabric falls to the ground at once; and his whole 525 pages are involved in the ruin of a single sentence; and that the first sentence of the systematical part of the work. All that follows is no better than waste paper; I might very honourably pass it over without farther

notice, and without forfeiting my pledge that I should answer the book, for the above is a very sufficient answer and refutation. But I have no wish to dispose of the adversary in so summary a way. His work contains a great deal of curious matter, which will occupy my attention for many weeks; and as I take it to be the standard work of modern Papists in England, at least of the *Anti-veto* party among them, I consider the exposition of its principles a matter of importance to Protestants, and even to the Papists themselves.

To the above doctrine, however, I anticipate an objection which it is proper to dispose of before I leave the subject:—Is not the true religion that which Solomon speaks of under the name of wisdom? and does he not say, "If thou *seekest* for her as silver, and *searchest* for her as for hid treasure, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and *find* the knowledge of God?" It doubtless is so; and it is of the true religion that he speaks again, when he says, "get wisdom, and with all thy getting get understanding." But we must connect with this what is said in another passage;—"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding." The seeking and searching here, do not relate to a thing hidden, or altogether unknown; but to a thing dimly represented under types and shadows: and it was the study of spiritual enlightened men under that dispensation to inquire into, and find out the meaning of, these typical representations. This was to find the knowledge of God, in his characters of goodness and truth, justice and mercy, which were formerly shadowed forth, but now clearly displayed by the incarnation, obedience, and death of his own Son. Respecting these things we are told, that the prophets searched and inquired diligently, when they testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. It does not appear that they understood the full import of the prophecies uttered by themselves, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. But they inquired diligently into their meaning, and into the meaning of those rites and institutions which Moses had prescribed; and that which required much inquiry and searching on their part, is as clearly revealed in the New Testament as human language can express it. Thus the apostle Paul says, God had revealed by his Spirit to him, and he had made known to the churches, that of which Isaiah had said;—"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man," 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10. And again he says;—"God hath made known to me the mystery (*i. e.* hidden or secret things) whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge of the mystery of Christ; which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." Then he proceeds to tell us, that grace was given him to "preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, to make *all men see* what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been *hid* in God," &c. See the whole passage, Eph. iii. 3—10. Thus, things which were comparatively hidden from the fathers, or even unknown to them altogether, are plainly unfolded to us in the writings of the apostles.

I do not say, there is no part of the word of God, even of the New Testament, that does not require much study and research to find out its meaning; for there are things which no human understanding has yet reached, or is, perhaps, able to reach in this world; but the essence of Christianity,—"the true religion," is not one of those things. It stands conspicuously forward in the discourses of Christ himself, particularly in the third chapter of John's gospel; and in the discourses of Peter and Paul in the Acts of the Apostles; and it meets us in a great variety of expression and illustration in every epistle. It is, that "Christ was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification;"—that "he bore our sins in his own body on the tree; that we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes we are healed:" and "it is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Every one of these sentences contains the truth, which if a man believe he shall be saved; but which if he do not believe, he shall without doubt perish everlastingly. There are hundreds of passages in the New Testament equally plain and explicit; and what is thus made known to the sons of men, in language which they understand, cannot be called a secret, hidden thing, that they cannot find out but with difficulty.

We must, indeed, admit the melancholy fact, that there are many to whom this gospel is hid, notwithstanding the clearness of its manifestation; just as there are many to whom the sun in the firmament is a hidden object, because they are naturally blind, or wilfully shut their eyes that they may not see. The apostle Paul tells us of some to whom the gospel was hid, "because the god of this world had blinded their minds, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." These are described as not believing the gospel. Their hearts are preoccupied with worldly things, and with the love of sin, which they must abandon, if they receive the gospel; or they are in bondage to carnal ordinances, which they cannot be persuaded to relinquish. This was the miserable condition of the Jews in the days of the apostles; and it is the no less miserable condition of Papists in our own day.

But to proceed with Dr Milner.—He says in the same fifth Letter:—"Before I enter into

any disquisition on this all-important controversy concerning the *Right Rule of Faith*, on which the determination of every other depends, I will lay down three fundamental maxims, the truth of which, I believe, no rational Christian will dispute.

"First, Our divine master, Christ, in establishing a religion here on earth, to which all nations of it were invited, Matt. xxviii. 19. left some RULE *or Method*, by which those persons, who sincerely seek for it, may certainly find it.

"Secondly, This Rule or Method must be SECURE and never-failing; so as not to be ever liable to lead a rational, sincere inquirer into error, impiety, or immorality.

"Thirdly, This Rule or Method must be UNIVERSAL, that is to say, adapted to the abilities and other circumstances of all those persons for whom the religion itself was intended; *namely*, the great bulk of mankind.

"By adhering to these undeniable maxims, we shall quickly, Dear Sir, and clearly dicover the method appointed by Christ for arriving at the knowledge of the truths which he has taught; in other words, at *The Right Rule of Faith*."

The above, the reader will perceive, are proposed, and laid down with great solemnity, as "fundamental maxims," which "no rational Christian will dispute;" and as "undeniable maxims." Yet I am sure, the intelligent reader will see at once, that they are mere gratuitous assumptions, and absurd quibbles and sophistries. Christ did not establish a religion here on earth, or on any spot of the earth, such as Rome, to which all nations were invited to come, and for the purpose of coming to which they required a Rule to know where it might be found; but he commanded his servants to go to all nations of the earth, preaching the gospel to every creature; that is, bringing it home to every man's bosom, with demonstration of the Spirit, and with divine power; and those to whom it thus came, received it, not as the word of man, but as the word of God. So it is still the duty of those who preach the gospel, not to prescribe a rule by which men may find out the true religion, but to make the true religion find out them; that is, bringing home the word of God to their hearts and consciences; for where that word is faithfully preached, it does commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God; either by provoking the enmity of the carnal mind by its divine purity, or subduing the carnal mind, and imparting a new mind to the acknowledging of the truth, by its divine energy.

But the sophistry and shuffling of the vicar apostolic appear more manifest in the last of the sentences above quoted, where he says, we may "clearly discover the method appointed by Christ for *arriving at* the knowledge of the truths which he has taught; in other words, at *The Right Rule of Faith*." I do not stop to inquire, why it is that he puts the truths which Christ has taught, at such a great distance from the people, that they must *arrive at them* by a laborious process, such as he describes. I shall direct the reader's attention rather to the Jesuitical artifice, which confounds things that are different, evidently for the purpose of deceiving, or at least bewildering the reader. He says, the truths which Christ taught, are, in other words, the right Rule of faith; meaning it to be understood that the terms are convertible. Now the latter phrase is a piece of Popish manufacture, invented, and constantly used for the purpose of drawing away men's minds from what is meant by the other phrase, namely, the truths which Christ taught. "The right Rule of faith," as we shall see by and by, comprises an immense heap of traditions, to which the truths which Christ taught bear no proportion, in point of quantity, and to which they are directly opposed in spirit and quality; yet in the above shuffling way does Dr Milner attempt to make them pass for the same thing.

So far as I recollect, there is nothing in scripture that corresponds with Dr. Milner's "*Right Rule of Faith*." The truths which Christ taught are the *subject matter* of the faith of all true Christians; and the things which he commanded are the *rule* of their conduct. The former are the things most assuredly believed by us; and the latter are the things most diligently practised by us, if we be indeed his disciples. But a *Rule* of faith; that is, a rule of believing; and a *right* rule of believing, which implies that there is a wrong rule of believing, appears to me no better than unintelligible jargon, fit only for the meridian of Popery. The word of God distinguishes between them that believe, and them that believe not; and assures us, that while the former shall be saved, the latter shall perish. The faith of the one, and the unbelief of the other, relate to the same thing; that is, the gospel of the grace of God, which brings salvation to all men, by the free and unlimited invitation of all men to partake of its benefits, which are actually imparted to all that believe; and which are withheld from unbelievers, because they will not have them, but spurn them away, judging themselves unworthy of eternal life. In short, if there be any thing in the bible about faith, that can properly be called a *Rule*, it is this; "He that believeth shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be condemned."

Dr Milner having taken it for granted that the *finding out* the Right Rule of faith is the same thing as ascertaining what is the true religion, proceeds in his sixth Letter to describe three different rules, which he introduces to our notice in the following manner:—"THE FIRST FALLACIOUS RULE OF FAITH. DEAR SIR, Among serious Christians, who profess to make the discovery and practice of religion their

first and earnest care, three different Methods or Rules have been adopted for this purpose. The first consists in a supposed *private inspiration*, or an immediate light and motion of God's Spirit, communicated to the individual. This was the Rule of faith and conduct formerly professed by the Montanists, the Anabaptists, the Family of Love, and is now professed by the Quakers, the Moravians, and different classes of the Methodists." This fallacious Rule leads the vicar apostolic to introduce a variety of topics on which he expatiates at great length, and apparently with extreme delight. He professes at the outset to speak of *serious Christians;* but it is evident he uses the words in derision, and with a sneer at what he means to represent as serious religion. He fills about fifteen large pages with the most nauseous ribaldry that can be imagined; and with most exaggerated accounts of the extravagances of enthusiasts of various denominations, from the German Anabaptists in Luther's time, down to the late prophetess Joanna Southcote. All this he has been pleased to ascribe to this first fallacious Rule of faith; and he handles the subject in such a manner as to make it appear that Protestantism is chargeable with all the folly and mischief on which he dilates with so much pleasure. He sets one set of enthusiasts a fighting with another; and he stands by, with as much delight and exultation as ever a company of savage villagers enjoyed at a bullbaiting, or the conflict of two game cocks. This is an exercise and a triumph truly worthy of a right reverend bishop and vicar apostolic of the holy Roman church! of one who professes to reconcile all differences, and end all disputes about religion, by ascertaining the right Rule of faith! It would be easy to retaliate, and overwhelm him with confusion if he were capable of it, by a detail of far greater extravagance, folly, and wickedness practised, not by persons whom all acknowledge to have been fools, but by great saints whom the Pope has canonized, and whom Papists at this very day worship with bended knee. I could relate the monstrous extravagances of St Francis, the founder of the Franciscan order, the mad enthusiasm of St Ignatius Loyola, the father of the Jesuits, who thought he was divinely inspired to kill every man who denied the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary; and I could insert the absurd and impious revelations of St Bridget, which are hawked and sold in the streets of Dublin and Cork every day. These are fairly chargeable against the Church of Rome, because she approves of them, and honours and worships those who wrote and did such things; but Protestantism cannot justly be charged with the impieties and absurdities of John of Munster, or Joanna Southcote, because they are disavowed and condemned by the whole body of Protestants, with the exception of a few crazy old men and women, who scarcely know their right hand from their left.

I should, however, think it unworthy of my time and paper, and insulting to my readers, to answer a fool according to his folly in this instance; or to retaliate, by exhibiting the great Romish saints as he has done the poor enthusiasts of the Reformation; for these saints cannot be exhibited in their true characters, or have their extravagance exposed, without laying open such scenes as would make every modest reader throw my work into the fire.

No. CLXXXV.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 26TH, 1822.

IN my last Number, I introduced Dr Milner as laying down certain rules for *finding out* the true religion. I disposed of his first Rule in a summary manner, as a thing with which I had nothing to do, seeing it related merely to the extravagances of certain enthusiasts whom no sober Protestant acknowledges; such as Joanna Southcote, and John of Munster. I showed also that there was a fallacy in his very enunciation of the subject,—that the true religion was a thing to be *found out*, whereas it is a thing plainly published to all the world.

I come now to the second of his Rules for finding out the true religion, which he represents as also fallacious; that is, "The written word of God, or the bible, *according as it is understood by every particular reader or hearer of it.*" "This," says he, "is the professed Rule of the more regular sects of Protestants, such as the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Socinians, the Church-of-England-men." *Let.* VI. p. 29. I shall take the liberty of dismissing the Socinians, as not belonging to any regular "sect of Protestants" that I know of, and because I know nothing about their Rule of faith, or whether they have any Rule at all except their own reason. Dr Milner introduces them, along with the Lutherans and Calvinists, by way of banter, as he does the Southcotians under his first Rule, in order to make it appear that Luther, and Calvin, and Socinus, and Joanna Southcote, are all upon a par, as acknowledged regular Protestants. This is a very childish trick of his; and any child might retort upon his holy and infallible church, that she nourished in her bosom principles as impious, and encouraged practices as absurd, as any that can be justly laid to the charge of either Socinus or Joanna Southcote, bad as these are.

But what will the reader say, when I have shown, as I shall do presently, that Dr Milner himself is a greater juggler than even Joanna Southcote? She deceived only a few simpletons by her pretended revelations; but here the Doctor attempts to deceive the whole world

by a silly sophism, or false representation; and I suppose, the whole world of Papists are deceived by it; for the thing is repeated by every little scribe who undertakes to defend his holy church. It is, that the Protestant Rule of faith is "the bible, *according as it is understood by each particular reader or hearer of it.*" This is what Dr Milner represents as the *professed* Rule of Protestants. All Popish writers of the present day say the same thing; and the vicar apostolic in this instance may be considered the leader of the faith of his brethren. But it is a piece of barefaced imposition, and downright falsehood, for I must call things by their own names, be the consequences what they may. The Protestant Rule of faith is not the bible according as it is understood by every particular reader or hearer of it. No Protestant church in the world ever professed such a rule; and I never knew an individual Protestant who professed it. Yet all modern Papists take it for granted that it is our only Rule. They argue upon the assumption that it is so; and they draw many absurd conclusions from it, which they attempt to identify with Protestantism, though they are only wicked fancies of their own.

The subject matter of our faith, and the rule of our conduct, is not the word of God *as understood by every reader, or by any reader or hearer of it,* but the word of God *as dictated by his Spirit, and written by his apostles and prophets.* This is the perfect standard to which all consistent Protestants appeal. It is not affected by the *understanding* or the *misunderstanding* of it by any man or body of men in the world. It is immutable and infallible truth in itself; and as it was meant for the instruction and salvation of men, it is addressed to men in their own language, with sufficient plainness for effecting the purpose intended by it.

I know it will be replied, that it is possible to misunderstand the meaning of scripture, and that, in point of fact, many do misunderstand it. This is true; but it is just as possible to misunderstand any other communication that is made through the medium of words and sentences. Allowing that Romish tradition is of equal authority with the written word, which is the Popish doctrine, is not the language of tradition as liable to be misunderstood as the language of the written word of God? Papists say, no; because, they say, they have the living voice of the church which determines the true meaning of every doubtful passage. But is not the living voice of the church, supposing there were such a thing, as liable to be misunderstood as God's own word, written by his own inspired messengers? I think this can scarcely admit of dispute. The church is composed of men like ourselves, who do not in general possess more knowledge of human nature than other men. Their language may therefore be equivocal, and inadequate to convey the truth with certainty to the minds of other men; but the Holy Ghost, who dictated the scriptures, knows with infallible certainty, what is level to our capacity; and it would be most impious to say that he has not brought down to the understanding of men, what he commanded to be published for the salvation of men.

Here the great question is, How shall man, who is a sinner, escape the punishment of his sins, and be restored to the enjoyment of the favour of God? The whole of Christianity hinges upon the answer to this question; and surely, if the bible does not furnish an answer sufficiently plain and intelligible, it is vain to look for it from any other quarter. The bible tells us, that God himself found out a ransom for us;—that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;"—that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;"—that "we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of his grace." The same thing is brought to view in almost every page of the bible; and if the language is not plain and level to the capacity of any child, let Papists tell us what is plain and intelligible. The fact is, no human language can make the truth more plain than as it stands in the bible; and I never knew any person attempt to make it more plain, without throwing a mist and a darkness about it, more calculated to bewilder than to guide the path of a sincere inquirer after the truth.

But if the truth by which sinners are saved; that is, the truth which constitutes the essence of Christianity, be so plainly revealed in the bible, how comes it, it will be asked, that so many apparently sincere inquirers come short of it, and seem never to attain the knowledge of it? The apostle Paul tells us how this happens:—"The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. Here it is evident the apostle represents the gospel—the essence of Christianity—as a glorious light shining all around. And why did it not shine into the hearts of all men? that is, why did not all men understand and receive it? It was hid by means of certain things. It was hid from the Jews by their obstinate adherence to the rites of the law of Moses, which were now abolished, as the apostle tells us in the context;—"They could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished, but their minds were blinded; for unto this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their minds;" 2 Cor. iii. 13—15. Christ

took away the veil, so that all who would open their eyes, might see the meaning and consummation of the law of Moses. But they would not open their eyes to the light. Their minds were preoccupied by carnal things. They wanted to have nothing to do with such heavenly and spiritual things as the gospel brought to view, and pressed upon them; and this is ascribed to the influence of the god of this world, by whom their minds were blinded; they were so fascinated by things of a carnal nature, that the light of the glorious gospel of Christ had no charms for them.

The same thing in effect happens to men in general, who, under the influence of a carnal mind, come to read the scriptures. Every thing is strange and foreign to them. They are not merely without ideas on the subject of religion; for if this were the case, they might receive information theoretically correct, as they would do in reading a book of natural science; but they come to the bible with minds preoccupied by *religious* notions fundamentally and intrinsically erroneous. They do not know the state of their own minds, or so much as suspect that they have received a wrong bias. Instead, therefore, of giving all their former ideas to the winds, and submitting to receive the simple testimony of the Holy Spirit, as it is given in the bible, they strive to reconcile what they find there with their own preconceptions of what should be. This leads them to misunderstand, and to pervert the plainest passages; and thus the god of this world takes occasion from the things which occupy the minds of carnal men to blind them to the truth of the gospel. Every man who receives the divine testimony must become as a little child. This lesson we have from Christ's own lips; and surely nothing can show more clearly that the gospel is a plain and simple thing; and that none shall miss the understanding of it who honestly apply their minds to the subject.

Of all the men in the world, Papists are most apt to mistake the meaning of the divine testimony; for they have not only the vicious and self-righteous preconceptions of the carnal mind to blind their eyes; but they have added to these, the accumulated errors and absurdities of more than twelve centuries, which stand as an insurmountable barrier between them and the plain gospel report. The Church of Rome did not directly obliterate all that Christ and his apostles taught. If she had, it would, humanly speaking, have been much more easy to impress the plain truth of the gospel upon the minds of her children. She accomplished the work of the devil much more effectually, by taking scripture truths and divine institutions, and dressing them up in a fool's coat, which makes the bold infidel laugh, and impresses the ignorant superstitious vulgar with a sort of indefinable dread upon his mind, like that which a heathen feels when he worships a cow, or a monkey, or any other ridiculous idol which his priest has set up. Whenever, therefore, a Papist reads the bible, and has an important truth presented to his mind, his attention is diverted by the recollection of something like that truth which his church inculcates, but which is entirely a different thing; but it is a thing which in his mind has the privilege of occupancy, and the right of prescription. He cannot therefore part with it; but if he has any respect for the bible, and if he wishes to keep his conscience on good terms with it, he will not directly reject what he finds there; but he will labour to reconcile it to what his church teaches him. Having his mind preoccupied by a belief that what the church teaches must be true; and that the church is the sole judge of the meaning of what is contained in the bible; he feels no difficulty in receiving the bible testimony, in the church's meaning, however perverted it may be, and though it should be, as it really is in many instances, directly opposed to the genuine sense of the divine record.

For instance; Christ addresses sinners in these words;—"Repent ye, and believe the gospel;" Mark i. 15. Obedience to this command implies an entire change of mind; and a real turning from sin, to the love and service of God; whose grace is brought to view by the gospel of Christ, which works effectually in renewing unto holiness all who receive it. But these important and comprehensive words —"Repent ye and believe the gospel,"—are presented to every Papist, by his church, in this form:—"Do penance, and recite the belief." This is a mere carnal image of the spiritual doctrine which Christ taught; but it supplies the place of that doctrine; and it diverts the mind from it as effectually, as if it were flatly contradicted, and much more insidiously. To do penance at a priest's bidding, and to the extent which he requires, and to recite the creed, are what any man may do, without the least change of mind, or turning from sin to holiness; and this is in fact the essence of Popery:—it is to make men believe that they are serving God, when their hearts and all that is in them are devoted to the service of the devil.

I have made this digression to show how naturally a mind preoccupied by erroneous notions is led to pervert the plainest passages of scripture. This is no disparagement of the word of God. It is plain enough to those who honestly attend to what it contains; and had the truths of divine revelation been so expressed, that it was impossible for human ingenuity and depravity to pervert or misapprehend them, I suppose an exception against them would have been taken on that account,—that they did not leave men to the exercise of their natural understanding, or to the freedom of their will.

Now if it were true, as Dr Milner says, that the Protestant Rule of faith is the bible *as understood by every particular reader*, it would infer the absurdity of being a rule, and no rule at the same time. The Doctor, indeed, argues through many a long page as if it were so. He might as well have spent his time in beating the air, or thrashing the water. He is combating what no Protestant church ever believed; but a mere, and a malignant, invention of his own, or borrowed from some other author equally malignant.

While Protestants take the word of God as their rule, in the sense which God intends, and in that sense only, they maintain that every man has a right to read it for himself, and to form his own judgment of its meaning. This is a right which he has, however, merely in relation to his fellow-men. In relation to God, he has no right to form any judgment of *his own*. He ought to receive implicitly, and with devout gratitude, what God has graciously been pleased to reveal for the salvation of fallen men, and for the rule of their conduct, without presuming to add a thought of his own to the divine communication, or to give a shade of meaning to that communication, different from what the words of it necessarily bear. If he act a different part, he must answer to God for his arrogance and presumption. To man he is not bound to answer, farther than the rights of other men may entitle them to put him away from their communion, if he shall persist in maintaining principles inconsistent with Christian fellowship. This the very nature of religious society admits and requires; but more than this, no church has a right to do with regard to any individual, be his errors what they may. If one is so perverse and presumptuous as to impute his errors to the holy and perfect word of God, it is an aggravation of his guilt; and it seems to be the design of Popish writers in general, and Dr Milner in particular, to urge men on to be guilty of this wickedness, by their insidious misrepresentations of the bible, as if it necessarily led men into error.

But it is time to return to Dr Milner's proposition, That the bible alone is a fallacious Rule of faith. This he attempts to illustrate by means of a number of propositions, of which the following is the first:—"If Christ had intended that all mankind should learn his religion from a book, namely, the New Testament, he himself would have written that book, and would have enjoined the obligation of learning to read it, as the first and fundamental precept of his religion; whereas, he never wrote any thing at all, unless perhaps the sins of the Pharisees with his finger upon the dust, John viii. 6." Such is the impious and presumptuous hypothesis of this right reverend vicar apostolic. *If Christ had intended that men should learn his religion from the New Testament, he himself would have written it!* It is doubtful if even Tom Paine himself ever made a more impudent attack upon the authority of divine revelation than this. It goes indeed to set aside both the Old and New Testament, with the exception of the ten commandments, which alone were written by the finger of God; and his right reverence could easily, by another stroke of his pen, set these aside too, by pleading, as he does with regard to the apostolic writings, that we have not the autograph, or original copy, written by their own hands. By the above passage from Dr Milner's work, the reader will be reminded of the indignant interrogatories which the Holy Spirit, by the prophet Isaiah, addressed to the idolaters of his day, who seem to have been men of the same spirit, and also guilty of the impiety of saying what the Lord *ought* to have done:—"Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or, being his counsellor, hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and showed him the way of understanding?" Isa. xl. 13, 14. Were such questions addressed to the people of England in the present day, Dr Milner would perhaps step forward, and say, "Here am I, ready to instruct the Almighty!" It is painful to be obliged to put such blasphemy upon paper; but it is really no more than what his words imply. Thus he appears a little antichrist himself; and would be a great one if he could,—exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.

Dr Milner lays great stress on the fact of Christ's having commanded his apostles to go into all the world and *preach* the gospel by word of mouth; but an infidel objector might retort upon him in this manner:—"If Christ had intended that all men should learn his religion from preaching, he would have gone himself and preached to all mankind." He might reply;—"We know the fact is otherwise, for he commanded the apostles to go and preach." So we say the fact is against Dr Milner's hypothesis, for we know he inspired his apostles to write the gospel for the instruction of all nations; which fact rests upon the same authority as that of the commandment to go and preach.

After a number of pages of irrevelant matter, our author returns to the same subject in the following terms:—"When I remarked that our blessed Master Jesus Christ wrote no part of the New Testament himself, and gave no orders to his apostles to write it, I ought to have added that, if he had intended it to be, together with the Old Testament, the *sole* Rule of religion, he would have provided means for their being able to follow it; knowing, as he certainly did, that 99 in every 100, or rather 999 in every 1000, in different ages and countries, would not be able to read at all, and much

less to comprehend a page of the sacred writings. Yet no such means were provided by him: nor has he so much as enjoined it to his followers in general to study letters." Page 63. Here again we have the presumption of prescribing what the Lord should or would have done, had he meant the bible to be "the *sole* Rule of religion." But the argument is of no force unless Dr Milner can show that he knows with infallible certainty what is best to be done. The very giving of the scriptures in the language of men is a proof that Christ intended them for the instruction of men in things which relate to their salvation. He provided also means for their reading and understanding them, when he endowed them with rational powers and promised the aid of his Spirit to guide men into all truth. But the Doctor, it seems, will not be satisfied without the interposition of a miracle, to teach the mechanical art of reading, in which he is as unreasonable as the unbelieving Jews, who, after all the miracles which they had seen Christ perform, still demanded of him a sign from heaven. To say that Christ did not intend the bible to be "the sole Rule of religion," because he did not miraculously teach all men to read, is as absurd as to say, that he did not intend the fruits of the earth to be the food of man, seeing he did not miraculously instruct them in the art of husbandry, and in those other arts by which the implements of husbandry are constructed.

I conclude at present by asking Dr Milner to tell the world, how he knows that Christ "gave no orders to his apostles to write" the New Testament? He will say, he cannot lawfully be called upon to prove a negative; then, I say, he ought not to assert a negative which he cannot prove. We are sure that Christ, after his resurrection, appeared repeatedly to the apostles, and spoke to them of the things concerning the kingdom of God. Acts i. 3. For any thing that we know, the writing of the New Testament was one of those things. But the fact of the case renders argument upon hypothesis quite unnecessary. The apostle John was expressly commanded by Christ to write epistles to seven churches in Asia. Rev. ii. and iii. Besides, when Christ was going away, he told his disciples that he would send them the Holy Spirit, who would guide them into all truth. The Holy Spirit guided and inspired them to write the New Testament, from which we are sure that it was the will of Christ that they should write it, and leave it as their testimony to the world of what they had seen and heard, after they should cease to speak by their living voice.

No. CLXXXVI.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2D, 1822.

THOSE who have read my work from the beginning will recollect, that on the subject of bible reading, I made large replies to a correspondent in Mr Andrew's Orthodox Journal, who argued, that we could not be sure that any of the books of which the New Testament is composed, were the genuine writing of the apostles; particularly, that seeing the apostle Paul intrusted his epistle to the Romans to a female servant, named Phebe, to be conveyed by her to the Christians in Rome, we could not know whether she had not lost or destroyed the original epistle, and composed out of her own head that which stands in our bibles as the epistle to the Romans. The writer to whom I then replied, was this same Dr Milner himself, the bishop of Castabala, and vicar apostolic of the midland district of England! It is he who makes the above very absurd supposition; and I find in his great work, "The End of Religious Controversy," the identical letters, to which a reply will be found in The Protestant, p. 162, 163, 552, 553.

It is needless to go over the same ground again. The sum of the matter is, the right reverend vicar apostolic maintains the proposition, that the bible alone is not sufficient for our information and instruction in matters of religion. I have endeavoured to show that it is sufficient; and it remains with the reader to judge whether I have established the point. Passing this, therefore, as disposed of already, I shall treat my readers with some curious matter, contained in his ninth letter, which, with remarks upon it, will occupy the remaining part of this Number.

"I have said enough concerning the *contentions* among Protestants; I will now, by way of concluding this letter, say a word or two of their *doubts*. In the first place it is certain, as a learned Catholic controvertist argues, that a person who follows your rule *cannot make an act of faith;* this being, according to your great authority, Bishop Pearson, an assent to the revealed articles, with a *certain and full persuasion* of their revealed truth: or to use the words of your primate, Wake—'When I give my assent to what God hath revealed, I do it, not only with a *certain assurance* that what I believe *is true*, but with an *absolute security that it cannot be false.*' Now the Protestant, who has nothing to trust to but his own talents, in interpreting the books of scripture, especially with all the difficulties and uncertainties which he labours under, according to what I have shown above, never can rise to this certain assurance and absolute security, as to what is revealed in scripture. The utmost

he can say is—'such and such appears to me, at the present moment, to be the sense of the text before me:' and, if he is candid, he will add—'but perhaps, upon further consideration, and upon comparing these with other texts, I may alter my opinion.' How far short, dear Sir, is such mere opinion from the certainty of faith! I may here refer you to your own experience. Are you accustomed in reading your bible to conclude, in your own mind, with respect to those points which appear to you most clear,—'I believe in these with a certain assurance of their truth, and an absolute security that they cannot be false;' especially when you reflect that other learned, intelligent, and sincere Christians have understood those passages in quite a different sense from what you do? For my part, having sometimes lived and conversed familiarly with Protestants of this description, and noticed their controversial discourses, I never found one of them absolutely fixed in his mind, for any long time together, as to the whole of his belief. I invite you to make the experiment on the most intelligent and religious Protestant of your acquaintance. Ask him a considerable number of questions, on the most important points of his religion; note down his answers, while they are fresh in your memory. Ask him the same questions, but in a different order, a month afterwards; when, I almost venture to say, you will be surprised at the difference you will find between his former and his latter creed.—After all, we need not use any other means to discover the state of doubt and uncertainty, in which many of your greatest divines and most profound scriptural students have passed their days, than to look into their publications. I shall satisfy myself with citing the pastoral charge of one of them, a living bishop, to his clergy. Speaking of the Christian doctrines, he says;—'I think it safer to tell you, *where they are contained*, than *what they are*. They are contained in the bible, and if, in reading that book, your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity should be different from those of your neighbour, or from *those of the church*, be persuaded, on your part, that infallibility belongs as little to you as it does to the church.' (Bishop Watson's charge to his clergy in 1795.) Can you read this, my dear Sir, without shuddering? If a most learned and intelligent bishop and professor of divinity, as Dr Watson certainly is, after studying all the scriptures and all the commentaries upon them, is forced publicly to confess to his assembled clergy, that *he cannot tell them what the doctrines of Christianity are*, how unsettled must his mind have been! and, of course, how far removed from the assurance of faith! In the next place, how fallacious must that Rule of *the mere bible* be, which, while he recommends it to them, he plainly signifies, will not lead them to a uniformity of sentiments, one with another, or even with their church!" Pp. 76—78.

To the latter part of the above paragraph; that is, respecting the sentiments of Bishop Watson, Mr Grier has made a particular reply; —showing that Dr Milner has been guilty of the usual Popish trick, of omitting a very material clause in the sentence; in which Dr Watson told his clergy very plainly, that *he knew* what the Christian doctrines were *to him*, as they appeared in the bible; but he did not wish them to take them upon his authority, but to search the scriptures for themselves. This is certainly very different from declaring that he *did not know* what the Christian doctrines were, as Dr Milner insinuates.

Yet while I condemn Dr Milner's Jesuitical trick of suppressing part of the sentence in which Dr Watson expresses his sentiments, I must so far agree with him, that the bishop's language, if not the language of doubt, is at least that of hesitation. Dr Watson was neither the most sound nor the most spiritually minded of Christian bishops. From his Theological Tracts, as well as from the account which he has given of himself, in the history of his life, published since his death, I suspect that he really did not know the Christian doctrine in its divine simplicity; because he would philosophize about it, as about every thing else, instead of becoming as a little child, as every one must become who will receive, and really understand the truth of the gospel. The fault was not in the divine word; but in the proud and carnal mind of the self-seeking philosophical prelate, who, in the might of his understanding, would not descend either to receive or communicate instruction by what the apostle Paul calls the foolishness of preaching, the plain apostolic testimony, concerning Jesus of Nazareth. Let Dr Milner make the most he can of such an author, and of all whose faith stands in the wisdom of men, not in the power of God. The Protestant religion can maintain its ground much better without the aid of such men than with it. I mean no disparagement to the popular and useful works of Bishop Watson, in opposition to the infidel writings of Gibbon and Paine, which contain a masterly defence of the Christian revelation; but one may write ably and unanswerably on the subject of Christianity as a whole, while yet his mind refuses to submit to its divine and self-denying truths, when presented in detail. Many a brave man has ventured his life in defending the walls of a city in which he had no inheritance; and it is a melancholy reflection, that many a man of transcendent ability, like Dr Watson, has spent his life in speculating about Christianity as a system, and even in defending the outworks of the city of God, who yet would not descend to taste of the living and life-giving stream that flows in the midst of it.

Passing from this, I come to reply to what Dr Milner says about the doubt and uncertainty which every Protestant must necessarily feel, because he trusts to the bible alone. This Dr Milner thinks he has established beyond contradiction; and he triumphantly adduces the authority of a learned brother of his own, to prove that a Protestant *cannot make an act of faith.* I dare say few Protestants ever think of such a performance, or so much as know what it is. I shall therefore insert it here, *verbatim*, from the Douay Catechism, that all my readers may be aware of the mighty achievement, which none but a Papist can perform. "ACT OF FAITH—O great God, I firmly believe all those sacred truths which thy holy Catholic church believes and teaches: because thou, who art truth itself, hast revealed them. Amen." This is the sum total of a Papist's belief; and it is in fact no belief at all, but what almost every heathen believes; namely, that there is one God, and that he is truth itself. To profess to swallow in the lump all that the Catholic church believes and teaches, does not imply, much less does it express, a belief in any one doctrine; for it does not so much as imply a theoretical knowledge of any doctrine or fact on which Christianity is founded, except the being of God and his character of truth. This is the vast advantage which the Church of Rome possesses over Protestants; namely, certainty as well as unity of faith. But in this respect Mahomedans have the advantage of Papists; for their act of faith is more simple: it is expressed in nine words—"There is one God, and Mahomet is his prophet." Dr Milner and all Popish writers boast, that in every part of the world you will receive the very same answer from a Catholic, when you ask him about his faith; but as the same happens with every Mahomedan, it proves nothing in favour of the Church of Rome. It rather excites a suspicion that she is very nearly allied to the false prophet of the east; for both alike deprecate the impertinence of the common people being more particular in their belief, or inquiring into their religion in detail.

I have seen somewhere a Papist highly commended for the following discreet answers to certain questions about his faith. Quest. "What do you believe?" Ans. "I believe what the church believes." Q. "What does the church believe?" A. "The church believes what I believe." Q. "Well then, what is it that both you and the church believe?" A. "We both believe the very same thing." It was impossible to get more out of him, for there was no more in him. He knew no more about Christianity than a Hottentot before the missionaries went to Africa, except, indeed, that he bore the name of Christian, which only increased his guilt, and would make his condemnation more dreadful than that of any mere heathen. The monstrous wickedness of the Church of Rome appears here in a very striking light. She takes the bible declaration, that if a man believe not he shall perish; which in the bible refers to the truth of the divine testimony about Jesus Christ as the only Saviour of sinners, which is the only thing which connects a man's believing with his salvation: but instead of presenting the divine testimony to men for belief and salvation, as the apostles did, and as consistent Protestant teachers do, the Church of Rome presents herself, and herself alone, to be believed in, under the penalty of eternal damnation; for this and nothing else is the import of the "act of faith," which she teaches all her children to make—"I firmly believe all those sacred truths which thy *holy church believes and teaches.*" By repeating this to himself with suitable seriousness of mind, a Papist is deceived into a confident persuasion that he is a believer and a true Christian in the bible sense of the words; while in reality he believes nothing at all upon divine authority; and is, therefore, as destitute of that faith which is connected with salvation, as those who never heard of a Saviour, or even those who, having heard, reject him. A deceived heart turns such persons aside from the only method of salvation. They incur the curse pronounced against the man that trusteth in man; but to the church and her false teachers, belongs the greater condemnation.

This is the boasted certainty of the Church of Rome, as opposed to the doubt and uncertainty of Protestants. It is the certainty of falsehood, if the reader will allow a seeming contradiction; for there is such a thing. It is possible to believe a lie with a full assurance of its truth; which was no doubt the case with Eve, when her faith in the serpent effected the ruin of the world. So when one has been persuaded to receive implicitly the word of a fellow-creature, or of any company of fellow-creatures, called the church, with regard to matters of divine revelation, he may feel fully assured of the truth of that which will eventually prove a lie. This is particularly the case of those who have had the truth of the gospel presented to them, but who did not like it. "Because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved; and for *this cause* God shall send them strong delusions, that they should *believe a lie;* that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness," 2 Thess. ii. 10—12. From the connection of the passage, there is an evident reference to the wicked one, who came with signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, which very plainly points out the character of the Church of Rome.

In reply to what I have said about the general, unmeaning profession which is made in their "act of faith," I shall be told that in her catechisms the Church of Rome lays down

and explains every article in the apostles' creed, the ten commandments, the seven sacraments, &c. It is true;—but still in such a way, that the common people must receive all these things in the sense which the church imposes, and in that sense only, so that they are not articles which any one believes upon his own conviction; for if they were to think, and examine, and reason about them, their boasted unity and certainty would soon be at an end; and they would exhibit as great variety of sentiment as Protestants do; which is in fact the case among the learned of the Church of Rome, with whom there is not, and never was, more unity of sentiment than among their neighbours.

According to Dr Milner, the matter comes shortly to this point:—Papists have no *doubts* with regard to the truth of their religion, because they believe the church;—Protestants have no *certainty* of the truth of their religion, because they believe the word of God. Let Papists shuffle as they please, this is the issue to which they must come at last. I perfectly agree with Archbishop Wake, whose words Dr Milner has quoted:—"When I give my assent to what God has revealed, I do it, not only with a *certain assurance* that what I believe is true, but with an *absolute security that it cannot be false.*" I am here entitled to assume as admitted, that the holy scriptures are the word of God; for that is not directly denied by Dr Milner; nay, he tells us, (Let. XI. p. 112) that "Catholics, believing in the tradition of the church as a *divine rule,* are enabled to believe, and do believe in the scriptures, with a *firm faith,* as the certain word of God." Nothing of the nature of certainty can exceed that with which I regard the divine record; that is, every truth and fact contained in the bible. I doubt many things which the Church of Rome teaches, because they are supported by mere human testimony; I deny many others, because they are opposed to the divine testimony; but I cannot, without renouncing sense and reason, as well as religion, entertain a doubt of any thing which God has revealed.

Yet Dr Milner does not hesitate to make the following absurd remark on Archbishop Wake's words:—"Now the Protestant who has nothing to trust to but his own talents, in interpreting the books of scripture, especially with all the difficulties and uncertainties which he labours under, according to what I have shown above, never can rise to this *certain assurance* and *absolute security,* as to what is revealed in scripture." In reply to this, I remark, first, that the Protestant puts no trust in his "own talents," in reference to what is here supposed. His trust is in the faithfulness of God, who will tell him nothing but the truth; and in the goodness of God, who will tell that truth, and who has told it, in language level to the meanest capacity. Secondly; "interpreting the books of scripture" is not a work to which men in general are called; and it has no necessary connection with the belief of the gospel, by which alone sinners are saved, and constituted Christians in the bible sense of the word. That which is perfectly plain and intelligible requires no interpretation; and that this is the character of the gospel record is experienced by all who receive it. It is a revelation of mercy to sinners deserving to perish. It comes from the Father of mercies as a proclamation of pardon, and peace, and reconciliation, to the very chief of sinners. It tells them that for the sake of Christ's obedience and sufferings, God will pardon any man, and every man, who will take the benefit of this general proclamation of pardon; that is, every man who believes what is thus brought to view, and urged upon him in the word of God. Those who believe enjoy the benefit of it in their own personal salvation; they rely upon its truth with infallible certainty; and by the fruits of the Spirit they have a witness in their own hearts, that that word must be true which has turned them from sin to holiness; and which, instead of anxiety and dread of a judgment to come, has given them the peace of God, and the assured hope of a blessed immortality. Here is an *evidence* and an *assurance* which is altogether unknown to those who receive their religion on mere human authority, though it be the authority of a body that impiously calls itself the "Holy Catholic Church."

Suppose the case of a man condemned to death for certain crimes against the state; and suppose the king, influenced by certain considerations, to grant a pardon, and cause the same to be intimated in the usual terms; does any one imagine that, in such a case, the poor criminal would not be able to understand, or to take the benefit of such a message, because he had not talents to interpret all the statutes of the realm, or even the law relating to the royal prerogative of which he enjoyed the benefit? Certainly the criminal to whom the pardon came, would find the message of mercy plain enough. He would take the benefit of it; and he might study the laws and their interpretation afterwards if he pleased. Now, it is impossible for the king, or his secretaries of state, to draw up the terms of a pardon to a condemned criminal, in language more plain and explicit than Christ and his apostles have published the proclamation of mercy to sinners. For the truth of this I appeal to all who have been really convinced that they are sinners, such as the word of God describes all men to be by nature and practice, and who have taken the benefit of the proclamation of mercy. I mean all who believe the gospel; in receiving which they had not to *interpret* a doubtful message, but to submit to what proved itself to be of God by its suitableness to their case, and its bringing that relief which none but God could give.

Dr Milner, and all such writers, and worldly men in general, do, however, refuse their assent to such doctrine as this. They are confounded by its very plainness and simplicity. And the reason is, they do not consider themselves such sinners in God's sight, as to resemble the condition of a condemned criminal; and, therefore, they cannot comprehend what a proclamation of mercy has to do with them. As I am not conscious of having done any thing to subject me to death by the laws of the land, if a message were to come to me from the king, under the great seal, bearing that he had been graciously pleased to remit the sentence of death upon certain considerations, I would probably say there was some mistake here—that I was not the person intended; and if any one would insist upon it, that I was the very person, I would be unable to understand what was meant, and would probably feel deeply offended. Now this is the very reason why the gospel message is so generally misunderstood. It takes for granted that those whom it addresses are condemned criminals in the sight of God, on account of their manifold transgressions. To those who are not really convinced that such is their condition, the gospel will ever be unintelligible, and, in general, offensive. Popery promises to save men in a way more palatable; but the day will declare how many millions she has thus seduced to their everlasting perdition.

No. CLXXXVII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 9TH, 1822.

THE grand art by means of which Dr Milner succeeds in bewildering and deceiving his readers, is to present one thing to their minds as an important subject of discussion, and then to make all his discussion relate to another and a quite different thing. It requires no small degree of art to do this dexterously; and few men but such as have been bred in the Jesuit school can do it to purpose. The "true religion" is what Dr Milner proposes as the subject of his writing; and his professed object is to show how this may be found out. He takes care, however, not to tell his readers, that the true religion is the knowledge of that by which a sinner is saved, and taught how to serve God acceptably; for this is expressed in few words, and exhibited in almost every page of the word of God, in language level to the capacity of a child, as I hope I have proved in my late Numbers. But all Dr Milner's discussions, for I cannot call them arguments, relate to something entirely different; and to something so general and undefined, that no man can say what it is, except that it is what "the Catholic church believes and teaches."* We may perhaps guess at what he means from what he says about the doubts and uncertainty of Protestants. In an extract which I gave in my last Number, he lays it down as an indisputable fact, that Protestants are certain of nothing in religion: and this may be true of such Protestants as he condescends to converse with, and of such as choose to spend their time conversing with him. In a country where the Protestant religion is established, the name indicates no more than external conformity to the established religion, or to that of such as are called Protestant dissenters. In many instances it does not indicate even so much; for many are called Protestants who do not even externally conform to the rites of either the established worship, or of any mode of separation from it; many who, in short, do not believe in revealed religion; but who are content to be called Protestants, merely that they may not be taken for Papists. It is needless to expect that such men should be certain of any thing; and it is a very common Popish trick to set down their doubts and scepticism to the account of Protestantism. The infidelity of such is quite inexcusable upon any Christian, and upon any Protestant principle; but for every religious purpose, it is just as good as Popish faith; I mean, the implicit belief of any thing that the church teaches upon her own authority: and with all the other crimes which the Church of Rome has to answer for, I am persuaded a dreadful account stands against her, on the ground of the many infidels she has made by her impious caricature of Christianity.

But there is a larger class of nominal Protestants, who take the name merely because it designates the established religion, or that of the sect in which they have been brought up. The former believe in the Protestant religion because it is the established one, and, perhaps, the latter believe it for the very opposite reason,—that it is not established. The traditional faith of the one is no better than that of the other; and as they have not made the true religion a matter of personal interest, they are almost as ignorant of what it really is, as any Papist can be. He who makes religion a personal matter, and who really believes the truth which brings peace and salvation to his own soul, knows with infallible certainty what that truth is; and if he were asked questions about

* This is what in Italy is called *fides Carbonaria*; that is, the collier's faith. The person mentioned in my last (p. 759.) as making the truly *Catholic* profession, "I believe what the church believes," &c. was, it seems, a collier, and this gave the designation to that most perfect kind of implicit faith, which certain great Romish doctors consider the sum of necessary and saving knowledge in a Christian. See Campbell's Lect. Eccl. Hist. Lect. XXIII. In this lecture implicit faith is traced to its source and exposed in a masterly manner.

it every day of his life, he would give substantially the same answers. But Dr Milner takes care never to bring this fact to view; and, to do him justice, I believe he does not know that there is such a thing. He has no idea of a man resting with entire confidence upon the bare word of God; though this was the only thing that supported the mind of an apostle when about to be put to death for the faith which he believed and preached:—"*I know* whom I have believed, and that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day."

I suspect that Dr Milner has seldom if ever come into contact with Christians of this description; for if he had, he would have found them perfectly certain, and unanimous in the profession of their faith, which is not a mere system of speculative opinions, sound or unsound, not a mere agreement in the understanding of a few doubtful passages of scripture; but an entire submission of mind and heart and conduct to the will of God, as plainly made known by the general tenor of his word. This, I say again, is the true religion as it exists in those who believe the gospel, that is, who are Christians in the bible sense; and I would like to hear what Dr Milner can object to the proposition.

He endeavours, however, throughout his whole work, to make the true religion appear something very different from this. With him it is a system of opinions and dogmas, which a man must believe upon the authority of the church, without presuming to think differently upon any of them from what the church is pleased to dictate. "The faithful," that is, all good Papists, submit to these conditions; and thus they are all agreed, and all undoubtedly certain of the infallibility of their creed. Taking it for granted that the faith of Protestants rests upon a similar foundation, and that their religion is no better than a system of opinions, Dr Milner thinks he obtains a great triumph when he finds a difference of opinion among Protestants; and when he finds that the same persons are not always of the same mind, even with regard to the same things. Hence the silly cavil contained in a quotation which I gave in my last Number:—"The utmost he (a Protestant) can say, is, 'such and such appears to me, at the present moment, to be the sense of the text before me;' and if he is candid, he will add, 'but perhaps, upon further consideration, and upon comparing these with other texts, I may alter my opinion.' How far short, dear Sir, is such mere opinion from the certainty of faith!" This is the way in which the vicar apostolic glides away from the subject, and bewilders his readers. The question is, What is the true religion? and had he proved that Protestants were necessarily uncertain of this, he would have done something to serve the cause of Popery. For instance, had he put the question to a Protestant thus:—"You know you are a transgressor of God's holy law, and that you deserve everlasting damnation; how do you expect to escape the punishment which your sins deserve?" If the Protestant had replied:—"My present opinion is, that Christ died for the ungodly such as I am, and that I hope to be saved through him; but perhaps, upon further consideration, I may alter my opinion." If, I say, Dr Milner were to find this the current language of Protestants, I should agree with him, that there was here not only no certainty, but no faith. This, however, is not the language of any one who believes the gospel. "I KNOW whom I have believed," is the triumphant language of the man who relies upon the "faithful saying" of him who cannot lie: and though the devil and his agents on earth may perplex and tempt him, it is not in the power of both united to shake him from this foundation.

But Dr Milner's triumph proceeds upon the supposition that a Protestant may not be sure of the meaning of *certain texts;* and that though he has his mind made up about them for the present, he may see cause to alter it upon obtaining further information. What is there in this that may not happen to any honest man; and which must have happened to Dr Milner himself, if ever he read the bible, and presumed to exercise a thought about what he read? The question is not about the *truth* of what God has revealed, for of that no Christian entertains any doubt: it is merely about the *meaning* of certain texts which he has not been pleased to reveal very clearly, and the perfect understanding of which is not necessary for our future salvation or present comfort. For instance, it is a question among Protestants, and, I suppose, among Papists too, who Melchisedec was. I have my opinion at present; but I may see cause to alter it; and so I suppose every man will say, that reads what is said of him in the Old and New Testament, and who spends an hour in thinking about it. But this implies no doubt, or uncertainty, or want of faith; for the question does not relate to a matter of faith, seeing it is not revealed. That Melchisedec was an illustrious type of Christ is plainly revealed. Of that, therefore, I have no doubt; but who, and of what family he was, is not revealed, and I am not required to believe any thing about it. I may have one opinion to-day, and another to-morrow, without indicating any doubt or uncertainty about any fact or doctrine of divine revelation. The same remarks will apply to other passages of scripture; especially with regard to the meaning of prophecies not yet accomplished; and because Protestants are not all of one mind with regard to such things; and because individuals may see cause to change their opinion, and give one answer to a

question now, and a different one a month hence, Dr Milner, in his profound wisdom, comes to the certain conclusion that no Protestant can be sure of what he believes.

I grant that among Protestants there are differences of opinion upon very important subjects; and that even among those who are agreed in their views of Christian doctrine, worship, and practice, there are various degrees of clearness of apprehension of divine truth, as well as of steadfastness in maintaining, and zeal in propagating it; yet all who believe the divine truth on the footing of the divine testimony, are substantially of the same mind with regard to it; for as it is one in itself, it is uniform in its effects. It produces peace of mind, love to God and man, and holiness of heart and life, whatever be the external form of the church or churches to which they belong. I do not say, that in this respect Protestant churches are all alike agreeable to the word of God; or that the order and worship of all are alike calculated to edify, and promote the other ends of Christian fellowship; but differences in this respect do not break the spiritual union of all who believe in Christ, in different churches, any more than difference of temper, and different degrees of knowledge, break the union of individuals in the same church. In short, all who receive the truth as revealed in the bible, speak of it in the same manner; it teaches them to pray for the same things; with regard to the essence of Christianity they are perfectly of one mind; and they are so in consequence of every one's own personal conviction of the truth which has brought salvation to himself in particular. Thus, to use the language of the New Testament, they are all one *in Christ;* which is certainly a more glorious union than that of Papists, which, by their own account, is merely being one in *the church.* Theirs is not a union in faith from a conviction of the truth of Christ's word; but a mere carnal image of unity in the implicit belief of what the church teaches, without any more personal conviction of the truth of what they believe, than if they had no personal interest in it.

But, after all, the thinking and reasoning part of the Church of Rome have not even this carnal image of union. It is only the ignorant vulgar that enjoy this happy privilege; for the learned are as little agreed in sentiment as the same class in any other communion; of which the most abundant evidence is to be found in the long continued warfare between the Franciscans and Dominicans, and the Jansenists and Jesuits; besides the endless skirmishing of innumerable smaller bands; and it was part of the cunning policy of the court of Rome to encourage and keep alive dissensions among the principal orders, that no one might gain so much strength as to be able to contend with the "Head of catholic unity," who connived at every species of hostility among his children, provided they maintained their allegiance to him.

On this subject I shall adduce an authority, which, I am sure, Dr Milner will not reject; that is, the authority of his own great self, in reference to what may fairly be considered a fundamental article of Popish belief; namely, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. "The church," says he, "does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or the unwritten word; and therefore leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning them." *Letter* XII. p. 129. Here it is admitted, that, notwithstanding the infallibility of the church, there are several disputed points which she cannot determine. What advantage then has she over other churches who lay no claim to infallibility? But what I advert to here is an article of vital importance, which Dr Milner tells us the church cannot, at least does not, decide; that is, "the conception of the blessed Virgin." Now, surely, if the church has the power of deciding any thing it ought to be a matter of such immense importance. It is well known that the Virgin Mary is an object of worship throughout the whole Church of Rome, next to the sacred Trinity. There are several devotional writers that place her upon an equality at least with Jesus Christ, and some that exalt her above him; but I shall not ground my remarks upon the horrible and impious extravagances of certain "holy saints," whom even Dr Milner would blush to acknowledge. I shall state his own faith on this subject; and then show how cruel a mother the Church of Rome is, seeing she leaves so dutiful a son in a state of uncertainty with regard to the original purity of this object of his devout invocation. Addressing his intended convert, James Brown, Esq. he says:—"You believe also that, among the saints of God, there is one of supereminent purity and sanctity, pronounced by an archangel* to be, not only gracious, but full of grace; the chosen instrument of God in the incarnation of his Son, and *the intercessor with this her Son,* in obtaining his first miracle, that of turning water into wine, at a time, when his time for appearing in the world by miracles was not yet come. John iii. 4. It is impossible, as one of the fathers says, to love the

* I suspect Dr Milner is here guilty of falling into an error in which he has the countenance of many Protestants. Where does he find in Scripture that the heavenly messenger who came to Mary is called an *archangel*? or where does he find this title given to any creature? There is only one to whom the title is given; and he is styled emphatically THE Archangel; meaning, no doubt, the Lord of angels. The "voice of the Archangel" is evidently the same thing as "the trump of God," 1 Thess. iv. 16.

Son without loving the mother; *beg then of her*, with affection and *confidence*, to intercede with Jesus, as the poor Canaanites did, to change the tears of your distress into the wine of gladness, by affording you the light and grace you so much want. You cannot refuse to join with me in the angelic salutation: 'Hail, full of grace, our Lord is with thee;' nor in the subsequent address of the inspired Elizabeth: 'Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.' Luke i. 42. —Cast aside, then, I beseech you, dear Sir, prejudices, which are not only groundless, but also hurtful, and devoutly conclude with me, in the words of the whole Catholic Church upon earth: *holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen.*" *Letter* XXXIII.

Here Dr Milner tells us enough to let us see that he believes the Virgin Mary to be omnipresent and omniscient, seeing the whole Catholic Church addresses prayers to her, which prayers she hears and answers, and procures the tears of distress to be turned into the wine of gladness to those who devoutly call upon her. Yet he says the church has not determined the question of the conception of this one who hears prayer from all the ends of the earth; that is, whether she was really born in sin like other women; or whether she was not favoured with a special exception from the moral pollution which attaches to the rest of the human race. Now it is certain that a great part of the Church of Rome believe, and stoutly maintain, that she was born without sin, as really as Jesus was; and that in order to her bearing him without sin, it was absolutely necessary that the same should have happened to herself. This is a fundamental article of faith with the Franciscans, though denied by the Dominicans. The original Jesuits agreed with the Franciscans; but their faith in general is what suits them best to avow where they happen to reside; and where it is not convenient to make an explicit declaration of what they believe on this point, they escape by saying, like Dr Milner,—the church has not determined it.

But why has she not? It is surely a matter of more importance than fifty things which she has determined. If the Franciscan doctrine be true, it leads to some very strange consequences. If, in order to bearing the Saviour without sin, it was necessary that Mary should have been also born without sin, then, in order to the bearing of her, it was necessary that her mother should have had the same privilege; and indeed the worshippers of St Ann are not far from asserting this; (see No. 39.) and then the mother of Ann must also have been born without sin; and thus we shall get up to Eve herself, and arrive at the conclusion, that before she committed sin, she had a daughter who was the mother of a race of sinless women from whom the holy virgin descended. Thus the doctrine goes to set aside the whole scriptures; and yet Dr Milner gravely tells us, that the church "sees nothing absolutely clear and certain" on this point, "either in the written or unwritten word of God," and therefore she has determined nothing about it. It is time then that she had done with the boasted certainty and unity of her faith, when she cannot so much as tell, whether the object of the daily prayers of her devout children was, or was not, born in sin like themselves.

Among the mendicants in Spain and Portugal, the immaculate conception is believed more firmly than any article of divine revelation. They have a book of three folio volumes on the subject, said to have been written by a nun, mother Mary of Agreda, to whom the Virgin appeared almost every night, and told some story of her own history, of which her immaculate conception, of course, bears a prominent place. "This book," says the author from whom I quote, "is still looked upon by the natives of both Spain and Portugal, as an immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and I have heard them call it a thousand times, *un libro divino*."—"I have seen it, and even undergone the drudgery of reading it quite through."—"As I was reading these heavenly visions, a Dominican friar of my acquaintance chanced to enter the room: I asked his opinion of them, though I pretty well knew beforehand what answer he would give; he replied, with indignation in his countenance, that they were nothing but a heap of old wives' tales; and advised me as a friend not to waste my time in reading such trash. Now you must not imagine from these expressions, that the Dominicans are less bigots, or less adorers of our lady, than the Franciscans, except in the point of her immaculate conception, which happens to clash with the sentiment of their angelical doctor, Aquinas; for, as to the rest, they maintain that she was as free from actual sin as Christ himself."—"Not long after this, a Franciscan chanced to pay me a visit, and found me in the same employment. The moment he cast his eyes on the book, he ran to it and gave it a most devout kiss; assuring me that every word in it was as true as the gospel; to which he added, with a heavy sigh, that the Dominicans were a pack of wicked wretches, for attempting to depreciate so inestimable a treasure." A fine specimen of the unity that exists in the "one holy Catholic church!"

"When these divine revelations made their first appearance at Rome, they were judged by the Pope to be so excessively absurd and ridiculous, that he published a decree to prohibit the reading of them. This put the Spanish mendicants in such an uproar, that they stirred up the whole kingdom, and prevailed so far by their clamours and remonstrances, that the king himself was induced to interpose

in favour of a book they had spent so many years in composing (for it was they who had inspired the nun). At this prince's request the Pope suspended his decree; and though he did not think it prudent to confirm these visions by his apostolic authority, yet by a second decree, he permitted the faithful to read them for their private edification; which concession the people of Spain and Portugal have made so good use of, that few families are to be found without them." See *Authentic Memoirs concerning the Portuguese Inquisition, Letter* XII. London, 1761.

No. CLXXXVIII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 16TH, 1822.

DR MILNER argues that while Protestants must ever be agitated with doubts with regard to the truth of their religion, Papists are perfectly at ease, because they rest with implicit confidence in the truth of what the church teaches. In my last Number, I endeavoured to show that this was a vain boast;—that while all who really believe the word of God are certain of what they believe, and substantially of the same mind with regard to it, those who implicitly believe the church without a personal conviction of the truth of what is told them, possess no more than a dead image of union and certainty; and that the learned among them do not possess even so much; for there are as many disputes among them as among Protestants. This is a fact known to all the world, though perhaps Dr Milner would have denied it, if he had not found it convenient to tell the English Papists, that whatever their brethren in Spain believed about the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, they were at liberty to believe what they pleased. Nay, though the bible tells us plainly, that of the race of Adam, born in the ordinary course of nature, there is *none* righteous, no, *not one;* that *all* have sinned and come short of the glory of God; the Church of Rome, clear-sighted as she is, cannot see any thing in the *written* or unwritten word of God to determine, whether or not the Virgin Mary was born in sin. They admit that she died; but whether she died on account of sin, or on some other account, the holy and infallible church cannot tell! There is not a Protestant child who has received the first lessons of religious instruction, that could not answer this question, which has baffled the Pope, and cardinals, and Dr Milner himself; and yet they are the people who alone possess the prerogative of being infallibly certain of every article of faith!

But it is time to proceed to Dr Milner's concluding and strongest argument, to prove how certain Papists are of the truth of their religion, while we have no certainty with regard to ours. It is at the conclusion of his ninth letter; and it runs thus:—"There can be no doubt, Sir, but those who entertain doubts concerning the truth of their religion, in the course of their lives, must experience the same, with redoubled anxiety, at the approach of death. Accordingly there are, I believe, few of our Catholic priests in an extensive ministry, who have not been frequently called in to receive dying Protestants into the Catholic church, while not a single instance can be produced, of a Catholic wishing to die in another communion than his own. O Death, thou great enlightener! O truth-telling Death, how powerful art thou in confuting the blasphemies, and dissipating the prejudices of the enemies of God's church!" Part I. p. 79. There are two notes appended to this paragraph, containing many great names, said to have been converts from Protestantism to Popery, among whom we find Anthony Ulric, Duke of Brunswick.

In his eleventh letter Dr Milner treats us with more to the same purpose:—"The same method which God has appointed to keep peace in his church, he has also appointed to preserve it in the breasts of her several children. Hence, while other Christians who have no Rule of faith but their own fluctuating opinions, *are carried about by every wind of doctrine,* and are agitated by dreadful doubts and fears, as to the safety of the road they are in; Catholics, being moored to the rock of Christ's church, never experience any apprehension whatsoever on this head. The truth of this may be ascertained by questioning pious Catholics, and particularly those who have been seriously converted from any species of Protestantism. Such persons are generally found to speak in raptures of the peace and security they enjoy in the communion of the Catholic church, compared with their doubts and fears before they embraced it. Still the death-bed is evidently the best situation for making the inquiry. I have mentioned in a former letter," &c. referring to the quotation given above,—a challenge "to the whole world, to name a single Catholic, who, at the hour of death, expressed a wish to die in any other communion than his own." p. 115.

The above extracts excite a number of reflections which will occupy the remainder of this Number. It seems there are few priests of the Romish church, "in an extensive ministry, who have not been frequently called in to receive dying Protestants into the Catholic church." On this subject, my doubts are stronger than my faith; and I call upon Dr Milner for a proof of his assertion. I have it declared by Bishop Cameron upon oath, that our own Mr Scott is a priest in a most extensive ministry; that there is none like it within the jurisdiction of the diocesan of the lowlands of Scotland: and I hereby challenge him to ad-

duce a single instance of a real Protestant calling or sending for this priest, at the hour of death, in order to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, that he might have the benefit of dying in her communion. I am persuaded that nothing of the kind has occurred during the incumbency of this gentleman; but if he has indeed been called upon for the above purpose, in one single instance, I call upon him for the name and designation of the party; and if he shall furnish me with but one, the world shall hear of it, and all about it.

Dr Milner is speaking of persons, who, during their lives, entertain doubts of the truth of their religion. These are not truly Protestants; and, what is a more serious consideration, such persons are not truly Christians; for nothing can be more unchristian like than to entertain doubts of the truth of the Christian religion. Dr Milner will evade this by saying, he does not mean persons who entertain doubts of the *Christian* religion; "but those who entertain doubts concerning the truth of *their* religion." But this is admitting, and even pleading, that their religion is something different from the Christian religion; and, therefore, the boasted achievement of converting such persons to Popery, is merely turning them from one system of error to another.

Such persons are represented as experiencing "redoubled anxiety at the approach of death." And no wonder. They do not believe the divine testimony concerning Jesus Christ. They have doubts about the truth of their religion; which is quite inconsistent with a belief of the gospel; and in such a state of mind they must be horribly anxious in the prospect of death; unless, as is often the case, they be quite insensible of their sin and danger. These are the sort of persons, of whom Dr Milner boasts, as seeking, at the point of death, to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, that they may die in her communion.

This furnishes a strong argument against that church. It presents her in the light of a mere empiric; who, by certain incantations, can perform cures better than any regular practitioner. The regular prescription of the word of God to sinners in the prospect of death, as well as to those just entering upon active life, is, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ;"—"Repent and be converted, and ye shall receive the remission of sins." This is what we are authorized to say to the greatest sinners, even at the point of death; and the Lord may bless his own word for the salvation of the vilest, at the last hour, as no doubt he has done to many. But in general those who live in sin, are left to die as they have lived. They have, perhaps, no person about them who can tell them of the mercy of God in Jesus Christ, for the salvation of the ungodly; or, if they should be favoured by the presence of such: and if they should have the gospel of the grace of God stated to them ever so plainly and affectionately, their carnal mind, instead of being subdued, may revolt, and rebel against it, as insulting to them, who, notwithstanding innumerable transgressions, are still so far righteous in their own eyes, that they cannot submit to the gospel plan, or accept of salvation as the free gift of divine mercy.

Now Popery is just the thing that suits such persons. It flatters them with a hope of salvation without the hard necessity of denying themselves, of forsaking their sins, and submitting to the righteousness of God. It is not wonderful that persons who do not understand the gospel method of salvation, should submit to Popish teaching, which is so agreeable to the principles of our fallen nature. The mystery is, that so few, among thousands of merely nominal Protestants, should fall into the snare that is laid for them by a host of cunning seducers, in the form of Popish priests, who prowl about the country seeking whom they may deceive. They tell the simple and the serious—those who seem to be concerned for the salvation of their souls, but who have not found peace of mind, and hope towards God by the belief of his word, which is perhaps the melancholy condition of not a few,—that if they will become reconciled to the church, they will ensure their eternal salvation; and as drowning persons will catch at a straw in hope of being saved by means of it, so such persons as are here described will put implicit confidence in their ghostly advisers, and submit to their teaching and discipline, in the hope of finding that peace which the word of God does not profess to give to any man, but in connection with his being renewed from sin to holiness. The priest, as I have often said, promises peace of mind without this condition; and, considering how ignorant of Christianity many who are called Protestants are, it is not surprising that now and then, an individual, alarmed by the prospect of death, should grasp at the peace and security which a priest promises with so much confidence, and seek admission to the church that professes to save him by certain operations, such as the sacraments, without his being obliged to renounce either his sins or his righteousness. The wonder is, that Popery has not more of such converts to boast of; and it is indeed a wonder that our Glasgow Papists cannot boast of a single instance. There are, no doubt, many among us who would like to go to heaven, who do not like the gospel way; but to whom the Popish way would be perfectly agreeable, were it not for the expense; * yet we might expect

* Two Papists lately ventured into a Protestant place of worship, in the neighbourhood of this city, where they heard the gospel of salvation by free grace. This was so different from what they had been accustomed to hear, that it excited their serious attention; and one was heard to say to the other, on retiring;—"Well, if what this

that persons would get over this difficulty when about to die, though it seems they cannot; for I assert again, that of that which Dr Milner declares to be so common, I never heard of a single instance having happened in Glasgow; and I do not believe such a thing can be proved.

I shall here give an illustrious example of the sort of conversion of which Dr Milner boasts, and of the means by which it was effected. It is that of Anthony Ulric, Duke of Brunswick, whose case is cited by Dr Milner himself, as an evidence of the truth of his statements. The duke took it into his head, in his old age, to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, from which his fathers had separated. He had been brought up a Protestant; but never having known what true Christianity was, he fell into doubts, and began a *search* after the true religion, which, according to his own account, he pursued most systematically, until he thought he found it in the Church of Rome. He wrote a book, or some one for him, entitled, "The Duke of Brunswick's Fifty Reasons for Preferring the Roman Catholic Religion to all other Sects." The following is his concluding and crowning reason, which may be considered as comprising the substance of his whole Fifty:—"I observed that many sectaries, who had seemed for many years to be fixed in their persuasion, were converted towards the end of their days, and desired to die in the Roman Catholic faith. But never did I meet with any Catholic that wished to die in another religion. Now it is chiefly at the hour of death that the soul opens its eyes into a clearer prospect of things eternal. For my own part, I resolved to live as I should wish to die; and for that reason I came to a resolution to embrace immediately the Catholic faith; because death is as certain as its hour is uncertain. Besides that, the Catholics, to whom I spoke concerning my conversion, *assured me, that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves:* an assurance I could never extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion. Whence I inferred that the Roman Catholic faith was built upon a better foundation than any of those sects that have divided from it."

Such was one of the most noble converts to Popery since the Reformation, and such was his crowning reason for being converted to what is falsely called the Catholic faith. It is not surprising that an old dotard, whose conscience was troublesome, should desire such peace as the Church of Rome promises to give; and seeing he had adopted the notion that the Church and her priests were infallible, and could not tell a lie, it is not wonderful that he should have believed that they were able and willing to take his damnation upon themselves, if necessary to allow him to escape, seeing, no doubt, he would pay them well for it; but, I suppose, it will appear to some of my readers very surprising, that English Papists, in the nineteenth century, with the vicar apostolic at their head, should boast of such a convert, and hold forth to the world such an argument, or reason for his conversion;—"that if he should be damned for becoming Papist, they would answer for him at the day of judgment, and take his damnation upon themselves!" The impiety and the impudence of the thing are beyond all expression; yet it must be the sentiment of English Papists at this day, and probably one of the means by which they make converts, seeing the book is strongly recommended by Dr Milner, and the edition before me was printed in Manchester, as lately as 1802. This alone is enough to show that Popery has received no amelioration; and that even the intellectual condition of Papists is deplorably low, notwithstanding the advancement of science, and the general diffusion of knowledge all around them. Not a particle of light seems to have entered their minds. To things spiritual and moral they are as much in the dark as their fathers were in the age of lead; and they exhibit at this moment such a prostration of intellect as we would scarcely expect to find among the most ignorant Hottentots.

Here I expect to be condemned by my polite and ultra liberal readers, for using language too strong; but let them look at the passage again, and let them try if they can to find words sufficiently strong to condemn such diabolical villany. I should rather say *Popish* villany; for I believe there is nothing recorded of the devil in sacred or profane history that can match this. I never heard of him promising those whom he wished to deceive, that if they should be damned, he would take their damnation on himself. This consummate species of imposition was reserved to be practised by modern Papists, for the purpose of gaining converts to the Church of Rome.

What is thus urged to prove the certainty of His Highness' faith, shows, in a very strong light, that he had no certainty at all, but was agitated by doubts and fears. He was not satisfied by his previous forty-nine reasons. He catches hold of this last one; and upon it he is willing to venture his eternity. He is

priest says be true, I shall never go to chapel again; for here we are told that God will pardon our sins without *any money at all.*" I do not boast of this as a conversion from Popery, for the man's mind does not appear to have risen any higher than the idea of escaping punishment without expense. Had he thought of the necessity of his forsaking sin, which, according to the gospel plan, is as necessary as having it pardoned, he would probably have preferred paying money to the priest as before. I mention this as probable; but, perhaps, I ought to hope for better things.

conscious that he has nothing but the word of fellow-creatures to rely upon; but this satisfies him, seeing he believes that if he is deceived by them they must be damned for him. Yet, after all, he is not clear about this, for his words bear, that he *might* be damned first; and he trusts to their being able and willing to take the sentence upon themselves. A generous mind could feel no satisfaction in the reflection that others were damned in his stead. Had His Highness *condescended* to take the bible for his guide, he would have found, that the principle which he avows was enough to condemn the whole system. Upon the gospel plan, there is no such thing as one man's escaping damnation at the expense of his neighbour's falling into it. Christianity knows of no substitution but that of Jesus Christ, who voluntarily put himself in the place of fallen man, that he might put away sin by the sacrifice of himself; and, having made atonement and reconciliation by his sufferings to the death, he rose from the dead to bestow the benefits resulting from his death upon all, of every nation, who should believe in him. One of these blessings is reconciliation and love to our fellow-men, especially our fellow-christians. It is one blessed fruit of the reconciliation effected by Christ's death, that every one who believes, and becomes interested in it, is taught to love his neighbour as himself. It is absolutely impossible that such a one should enjoy peace of mind from the reflection, that if he were damned, his neighbour would take the sentence upon him, and suffer in his stead. This, however, is the grand consideration that gave peace to the mind of the Duke of Brunswick, whose example is in the strongest manner recommended by Dr Milner, for the imitation of his Protestant friends in England. Upon this ground alone, though there were nothing else, every intelligent reader will perceive that Popery is the very opposite of genuine Christianity.

His Highness complains, that he could never get the ministers of any sect to promise that they would take his damnation upon them, if he should die in their communion; from which he infers that the Roman faith was built upon a better foundation than theirs. Now had he possessed a particle of common sense, he would have come to the very opposite conclusion. He would have said, "these are honest men; they know what they are about; and they are careful not to promise what they may not be able to perform." Had they been deceivers and Jesuits, who had no higher end in view, than to make merchandise of his soul, they would have promised any thing he pleased: but they knew that no man could stand in the place of another at the day of judgment: they knew that no man could escape damnation but in the way of being personally united to Christ by faith, and personally renewed from sin to holiness, of which, I suppose, they saw no evidence in His Highness; and, therefore, they would not flatter him with the false hope of his being saved, by his merely remaining in their communion. The statement of the fact, under His Highness' own hand, does great honour to the Protestants with whom he had conferred. It proves that they were not time-servers; but faithful ministers of Jesus Christ, who invites the high as well as the low to partake of the blessings which the gospel brings to their view,—not in this communion, or that communion exclusively, but by coming to the knowledge of the truth, and submitting to the righteousness of God.

One main pillar in the Romish idol temple is, that the salvation of men is secured by their *being in her communion*. Let poor simpletons submit to this, and the priests take all the rest upon themselves. If they can prevail upon poor, ignorant, wicked persons, at the point of death, to believe in their miraculous powers, which may happen in some instances, for the sake of the false peace in which they would rather die than without any peace at all, they submit to be baptized and anointed by priestly hands, and absolved by certain Latin words from a priestly tongue; and then the poor sinner says, Peace, peace to himself, when there is really no peace; and he goes down to the grave with a lie put into his mouth by his ghostly deceiver. Such are the conversions of Protestants at the hour of death, which Dr Milner boasts of as so frequent; but I again challenge Mr Scott to produce a single instance of the kind under his ministry

My mercantile readers understand what is meant by a guarantee commission; and they are aware that this is, or ought to be, in proportion to the degree of risk. No doubt, therefore, the Duke of Brunswick paid largely for the risk which the priests took upon themselves; and if this Number of mine should ever reach a descendant of that illustrious house, from which our own royal family is sprung, I request that strict search may be made in the archives of the family, in order to ascertain what His Highness really paid for the accommodation which the priests granted to him. It must have been something very considerable; and yet, if we can suppose that these priests received a pecuniary consideration, for taking the duke's damnation upon themselves, we must suppose them to have been infidels of the most abandoned description. In this, however, there is nothing worse than what happens every day, in their trafficking for the release of souls from purgatory.

No. CLXXXIX.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23D, 1822.

IN taking leave of what Dr Milner calls the second false Rule of faith, I remark, that I have not attempted to reply to all the nonsense which he has introduced; but have endeavoured rather to maintain the general principle, that the bible alone is sufficient for the instruction of men in matters of religion; and that those who believe the heavenly doctrines which it contains, are certain of what they believe, and substantially agreed about it; while those who rely on the traditions of men possess no more than a dead image of certainty and unity; while in reality they have neither faith, nor unity, nor certainty about any thing, seeing they have no higher authority for what they believe than the bare word of creatures like themselves.

I come now to what Dr Milner calls "The True Rule," which he lays down in the following terms:—"The Catholic Rule of faith, as I stated before, is not merely *the written word of God, but the whole word of God, both written and unwritten;* in other words, *Scripture and Tradition*, and these *propounded and explained by the Catholic Church.* This implies that we have *a twofold Rule*, or *Law*, and that we have *an Interpreter* or *Judge*, to *explain it*, and to decide upon it in all doubtful points." *Letter* X.

There is here, as usual, a little trick by which the unwary may be deceived. Dr Milner professes to take as his Rule the "whole word of God," by which he insinuates that Protestants do not so: and he introduces tradition as forming part of that word, as if this were admitted by Protestants, while yet they refuse to submit to it. Now I say, that Protestants receive the whole word of God, without the exception of a syllable or letter of it; and that his foisting in "tradition" as forming part of that word is begging the question in dispute, and which is denied by his opponent. To the whole word of God we implicitly submit; but this implies no submission to the immense heap of rubbish that lies under the name of tradition.

On entering upon the proof of his proposition, Dr Milner lays down the following as an indisputable axiom:—"I enter upon this subject with observing, that all *written laws* necessarily suppose the existence of *unwritten laws*, and indeed depend upon them for their force and authority. Not to run into the depths of ethics and metaphysics on this subject; you know, dear Sir, that in this kingdom we have *common* or *unwritten law*, and *statute* or *written law*, both of them binding; but that the former necessarily precedes the latter." *Letter* X. We are then favoured with a view of the law of England, which, according to Judge Blackstone, may be divided into *lex non scripta* and *lex scripta*, as Dr Milner gravely tells us: but the Christian reader will naturally inquire, what has this to do with the "true religion," which is not founded upon the laws of England, however good these are in their own place, and for their own purposes? For the "true religion" we must have recourse to the law and to the testimony that existed many ages before England made any figure among the nations of the world. We are sure therefore that the laws of England can afford us no light while pursuing an inquiry of this kind.

Dr Milner says that *all written* laws necessarily suppose the existence of *unwritten* laws, and depend upon them for their force and authority. For this he gives us no higher authority than his own word. To put him to the proof of his proposition, I ask him, whether the law of the Ten Commandments, which was written by the finger of God, upon tables of stone, on mount Sinai, necessarily supposed the existence of *another* law that was prior to it, but not written, and upon which this written law of the Ten Commandments depended for its force and authority? To be consistent, Dr Milner must answer in the affirmative. He must maintain that there is another law antecedent and superior to that of the Ten Commandments. I shall feel extremely obliged to him if he will tell me what that law is.

I suppose he will refer me to the patriarchs who lived before, and after the flood, down to the time of Moses, when the law was first written; and he will tell me that these patriarchs lived under the authority of *lex non scripta:* that is, the unwritten or common law; but this will not serve his purpose, unless he can show that this was something different from the written law of Moses,—something superior to it, and from which the law of Moses derived its authority. I know he can show no such thing; and that what he asserts with so much confidence is a mere imagination of the carnal mind.

On this subject, however, I must dwell for a little, because one great argument which Papists advance for the authority of their tradition is connected with the history of the patriarchs. They tell us that the faithful had nothing but tradition to guide them for above two thousand years;* that is, from Adam to

* Dr Milner's words are:—"It is, then, certain, that the whole doctrine and practice of religion, including the rites of sacrifice, and, indeed, the whole sacred history, was preserved by the patriarchs, in succession from Adam down to Moses, during the space of 2400 years, *by means of tradition*: and when the law was written, many most important truths, regarding a future life, the emblems and prophecies regarding the Messiah, and the inspiration and authenticity of the sacred books themselves, were preserved in the same way." *Letter* XI. p. 107.

Moses;—and why should not we take the benefit of tradition from the birth of Christ to our own time, which is a shorter period? I reply, that the argument is founded on a falsehood; for it is not true that all, or that any of the patriarchs had to depend upon mere tradition, in the sense in which Papists use the word. The patriarchs were honoured by direct communications from God; and what he revealed to them, and they communicated to their families, was not human tradition but divine revelation, as much as the written word is, and it served all the purposes of divine revelation until the law and the testimony were written. Supposing the moral law, and the promise of a Saviour to come of the seed of the woman, had been matters of mere tradition, they passed through so few hands that they might have been preserved till the time of Moses without any great mixture of error; for Methusaleh was cotemporary with both Adam and Shem, and the latter was cotemporary with Isaac, so that the whole narrative of the creation, the fall, and the promise of redemption, came down to the family of Jacob through only four hands, whereas no apostolic tradition can have come down to us without having passed through ten times as many generations. But I do not admit that the family of Jacob received the knowledge of the will of God by such tradition, even through hands so few and so clean. God revealed his gospel to Enoch, to Noah, to Abraham, and to Jacob himself, who were all, therefore, inspired men as much as any of the prophets or apostles were; indeed in Psalm cv. 15. they are called prophets; and their living voice supplied the place of a written word until Israel went down to Egypt; and even after this for nearly a century they enjoyed the ministry of Joseph, who was endowed with the prophetic spirit. If the children of Israel had at any time nothing but tradition to depend upon, it must have been during the short period that elapsed between the death of Joseph and the calling of Moses; when, no doubt, they were reduced to great ignorance as well as great misery; yet we do not know that they had no prophet among them even then. There is reason to think that Moses' own parents had a divine intimation, when he was born, that led them to the means by which his life was preserved. Be this as it may, I hope it will appear from the above, that there is nothing in the history of the patriarchs who lived before the word of God was committed to writing, that can give countenance to the doctrine, that the word which has been written by inspired men must depend, for its meaning and authority, upon the unwritten traditions which have come to us through many ages of gross darkness, and through hands polluted by every crime.

If I have made this intelligible, I hope the reader will be convinced that there is nothing in the history of the patriarchs, or in the state of religion in their time, that gives the least countenance to that sort of tradition on which the faith of the Church of Rome is chiefly founded.

Now, with regard to the apostles, great stress is laid by Dr Milner, and all Popish writers, on the command of Christ to go into all the world and preach the gospel—"by word of mouth," is added by Dr Milner, though that is not in the commission as Christ gave it, and is not necessarily implied in the words, which are a command to publish, and make known, by whatever means. The additional words, however, are of great use to Popish writers, and they could not get on without them; for as they take for granted that all their bishops and priests are successors of the apostles, and endowed with the same authority and power, they could not prove the authority of their oral teaching, without referring to that of the apostles. Now, there is no dispute about the authority of what the apostles taught by word of mouth. The question is, what is it that they so taught? and where is it to be found? Protestants maintain that it is all summarily contained in the New Testament: Papists maintain that a great mass of it was never written at all, but handed down from age to age, by word of mouth; and what has thus come down to the present age, is as much the word of God as that which apostles wrote; and it is expressly called by Dr Milner "The unwritten word" of God. He represents this as analagous to the *lex non scripta*, the unwritten and common law of England; and as this gives force and authority to the written or statute law, so tradition gives authority and force to the written word of God.

This is the substance of some long and laboured paragraphs in Dr Milner's work, which I would have given in his own words, had not his style been so extremely diffuse, that I cannot afford space for one tenth of his verbiage. I am not, however, conscious of misrepresenting a single iota of his doctrine. Indeed his own words quoted in this Number will be found to imply all that I have said. And thus the foundation of his faith and his certainty is that which no man would depend upon, if he had an acre of land, or the value of it, to be secured to himself and his heirs. Undisputed possession for a certain period will indeed allow a man to claim a piece of land as his own; but he will take care to put the fact upon record, if he desires to preserve his right. But here the Church of Rome teaches her children to rest their eternal interests upon tradition; that is, a report of what was spoken eighteen hundred years ago, and has been transmitted by word of mouth through all the dark ages! I am verily persuaded Dr Milner himself would not venture a shilling of

his worldly property upon any thing that depended upon such evidence.

But does not the apostle Paul command Christians to obey tradition as well as the written word of God? Does he not say to the Thessalonian converts, "Stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by *word* or our epistle," 2 Thes. ii. 15? And again, in the third chapter of the same epistle, verse 6, does he not command them to "withdraw from every brother who walketh disorderly, and not after the *tradition* which he hath received of us?" This is all very true, and readily admitted; and if Dr Milner could tell us with certainty what these *traditions* were, and what it was that the apostle told the people by word of mouth, I would without hesitation receive it as the word of God: and if it did not evidently appear to be a thing of a temporary and local nature, I would say that it commanded the faith and obedience of Christians.

It cannot be doubted that a great part of the oral teaching of the apostles related to things of a local and temporary nature; such as the condition of the Jewish converts, and the conduct that became them in their peculiar circumstances, in the prospect of the destruction of Jerusalem, and after that event had taken place. Having a living and divine oracle in the persons of the apostles, who spoke by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the Christians would have recourse to them for instruction and advice in every emergency. When personally present, advice and instruction would be communicated by word of mouth, and when absent by writing. Either way, the communication was of divine authority, and as such it would be received by the individuals and churches to whom it was addressed.

It was not necessary that instruction with regard to every thing of a temporary nature should be committed to writing, seeing inspired teachers were continued to the churches as long as the occasion required; but that things of universal and permanent obligation were committed to writing we know by the fact, that such writings exist, with abundant evidence that they are the word of God. But whether that which apostles enjoined regarded things temporary or permanent, local or universal, it was imperative on Christians to obey, for the apostles spoke by the Spirit of God, whether it was by *word* or by epistle. That some apostolical instructions did relate to temporary things, is evident from the introduction of at least one of those things into one of Paul's epistles; and the reason seems to be, that application was made to him in writing, while he was absent, for advice relating to a matter of great importance at the time; and he gave his answer and his advice in writing, as we have it in the seventh chapter of 1st Corinthians.

Mistaking the design, and overlooking the occasion of this advice, many have understood the apostle as laying down the general proposition, that it is better for both men and women to remain single than to marry, which is directly contrary to his own words;—"I will that the younger women marry;" and, "marriage is honourable in all," 1 Tim. v. 14. Heb. xiii. 4. It was, however, to be regulated by prudential considerations; and it was solely because of "the present distress," that he advised the Corinthian converts to abstain from marriage; though even this he does not lay upon any one as a command, but merely suggests it as an advice. I have made this digression in order to show that the churches were in the practice of consulting the apostles in cases of difficulty, with regard to matters of a temporary and comparatively private nature; and that it does not thence follow that the responses which they received, were of permanent and universal obligation, unless they have been recorded and delivered as such, in the apostolic writings.

But we will come to a better understanding of the subject by attending to the meaning of the word. *Tradition* is not a word of native English growth, but like many others has been transplanted from the Latin; and its meaning in English, according to Dr Johnson, is, something delivered by *word of mouth* without written memorials;—or any thing delivered *orally* from age to age. But this is not the meaning, at least, not the whole meaning of the Greek word of which tradition is meant for a translation. Παράδοσις is the word which the apostle wrote, and it signifies, *precept, instruction, ordinance,* delivered *either orally* or *in writing.* See the Lexicons. But I have higher authority than that of any lexicographer; namely, that of the apostle Paul himself, who says, "stand fast and hold the traditions (παράδοσις) which ye have been taught, whether by *word* or our *epistle.*" The precept or instructions, therefore, to which he referred, had been communicated both orally and in writing; or might have been communicated either way.

Now this brings us to this point, that when the apostle Paul exhorted the believers in Thessalonica, to hold fast the traditions (παράδοσις) he meant the things which he had preached to them, and the things which he had written to them, in his former epistle. He refers in the first place to what he had taught them *by word.* What this was we may learn from what is recorded of the ordinary topics on which the apostles preached; and we know that their preaching related chiefly, if not solely, to Christ's life, death, and resurrection; in other words, they preached the gospel of the grace of God,—"how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." This is called, "the word,"—"the things *reported*

unto you,"—and "a faithful *saying;*"—expressions of nearly the same import with what is meant by tradition, when stripped of the dress in which Papists have disguised it. We know that this "word," or "saying," is from a sermon which the apostle Peter delivered in the house of Cornelius, Acts x. 36—48. It is a narrative of Christ's life, death, and resurrection; and this he expressly called *the word;* that is, saying, report, tradition, if you will; for it is said, verse 44, "while Peter yet spake these words,"—that is, while he was giving this narrative of facts, of which he had been a witness, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard *the word,*" which word was just this testimony concerning Christ. That Paul's preaching was in the same strain, we learn from the report of a sermon of his in Antioch, Acts xiii. 23—43. in which, along with a narrative of facts about Christ's death and resurrection, he tells the persons who listened to his preaching, that "through this Man was preached to them the remission of sins; and that through him all who believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses."* From these two eminent examples, and there are more in the same book, we may conclude that this was the substance of the preaching of all the apostles. It was by the power of this word or report, when accompanied by the blessing of the Holy Ghost, that sinners, whether Jews or Gentiles, were converted;—and "turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." Companies of men and women so converted, were instructed to meet together, for the purpose of prayer, and for the observance of the other ordinances which God had commanded. These were the primitive churches; many of which were organized by apostles in person, others by evangelists acting under their direction. Among some of them Paul continued to preach for a considerable period; and to many of them he wrote letters in his absence,—most of them, I believe, when he was a prisoner in Rome. In these letters he does not go over in detail the narrative of facts which he made the first subject of his preaching. He takes them for granted. He often alludes to them in a summary way; and again and again, he exhorts his correspondents to keep them in memory; —to hold them fast, and on no account to let them slip out of their minds. In these was the "faithful saying," "the word," "the report," *the traditions,* which he had delivered to them by word of mouth, and of which he reminded them in every epistle. I say he *reminded* them of them, for it was not necessary that he should repeat them all in his letters, seeing they were detailed in the narratives called the gospels, either published by this time, or about to be published. Before the publication of the gospels, these things were all communicated by word of mouth, but it was by the mouth of inspired men. They ceased to speak, one by one, as their Master called them to rest from their labours; but they were not all removed till they had committed to writing the things which they had so long declared by their living voice. These are what we have in the New Testament,—having which, we have their word, as really as those who heard them speak, and all the traditions which are of permanent use, and universal obligation among Christians. And I defy the Church of Rome to adduce a single article of doctrine, or ordinance of worship, which she has derived from oral tradition, that is not contrary to, or inconsistent with some part of the written word; and therefore it cannot be of God; for it is the height of impiety and blasphemy to say, that He commanded his servants to teach one thing with their pens, and a contrary thing with their mouths.

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God; —and is able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." Christians can desire no more than the *word* which is able to make them *perfect,* which must itself be a *perfect word.* But Papists dissatisfied with this, and seeking for something else, have landed themselves in ignorance, superstition, idolatry, and every evil work.

* The reader is requested to turn to the passages and peruse them attentively. It is of more importance to be acquainted with the tenor of the apostles' preaching than to study the style of any modern pulpit orator. It was the plain unencumbered doctrine of Christ crucified, that produced such wonderful effects by the preaching of the apostles; and it is the same doctrine, and nothing else, even now, that can be of any use in the way of converting sinners. The Moravians who went to Greenland, began to teach systematically. They descanted on the being and perfections of God;—very proper subjects, most certainly, for an enlightened Christian assembly; but they made no impression on the poor Greenlanders, whose minds were not prepared to take in such things. Almost in despair of doing any good, the Missionaries began at last to speak about Jesus Christ, and his wonderful kindness and mercy to poor sinners; and this was found to melt the hearts even of the men of Greenland. See *Crantz's History.* I have not the work at hand, and cannot refer to the page; but the above anecdote is well known.

No. CXC.

SATURDAY, MARCH 2D, 1822.

THE True Rule of faith, according to Dr Milner, "is not merely the written word of God, but the whole word of God, both written and unwritten; in other words, scripture and tradition, and these propounded and explained by the Catholic Church." In my last Number I did little more than clear the way for the consideration of this proposition. Seeing, in two passages of one of his epistles, the apostle Paul makes use of a word which is rendered tradition in English, Popish writers are in the habit

of citing his authority in favour of their traditions; but I showed that what he referred to were communications made by himself under divine inspiration, including the apostolic testimony and report concerning Christ, as recorded in the gospel history: and, seeing Dr Milner alleges that the ancient patriarchs received all that they knew of religion for 2400 years from tradition, I showed that the patriarchs were themselves prophets, and received from God himself that religion which they communicated to their families; and thus it is evident that the Popish doctrine of tradition derives no countenance from apostles or patriarchs: and I might have added, that such traditions as the Papists plead for, were strongly condemned by Christ, in his discourses to the Pharisees, who made void the law by their traditions, just as the Papists make void the gospel by theirs.

The simple statement of what Papists mean by tradition might be enough to convince persons of common sense of the folly of depending upon it. It consists of certain doctrines and precepts, which Christ and the apostles are said to have spoken, but which were not committed to writing. These doctrines and precepts are said to have been delivered by word of mouth from one age to another, and to have come down to us as pure and uncorrupted as the written word contained in the gospels and epistles. Those who can believe this, must believe in the existence of a perpetual miracle, without any conceivable reason for miraculous interposition, seeing the object could have been accomplished by the ordinary means of writing. Dr Milner, however, not only believes this certainty of traditional communication, but he believes further, and stoutly maintains, that by this means, the knowledge of Christianity might have been preserved and propagated in the world, though there had not been a word of divine revelation committed to writing. No doubt God could have done this, had he thought fit to preserve a succession of inspired men in all ages, as he did in the ages before his word was written; but what He could have done is no rule to us;—our business is with what he has done; and we know that he has given us his word in the scriptures, with a command to receive and apply our minds to the understanding of it; that he has not commanded us to receive the traditions of men, but to beware of them; and therefore we feel upon sure ground when we rely on the written word alone.

The other arguments from scripture in favour of tradition, are Christ's command to all men to hear the apostles;—"He that *heareth you, heareth me*;" and, "if he refuse to *hear the church* let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican." Now, I have admitted that it was the duty of all men to hear what the *apostles* said to them; but this has nothing to do with what other men have said, or may yet say;—and Popish tradition consists entirely of what other men said. I deny that the apostles spoke a word of that which the Church of Rome *propounds* as apostolical tradition. This is not asserting a negative; for the church has condescended to mention what some of her traditions are,—such as the mass sacrifice, purgatory, and prayers for the dead; and as these are directly opposed to what the apostles wrote, I am sure they formed no part of their oral teachings, for they both wrote and spoke under the influence of the divine Spirit, who cannot teach contradictions. But suppose I had no such positive evidence on the subject; suppose it were all negative on that side; I am entitled to deny that of which there is no evidence. At any rate, the burden of proof rests with those who maintain the truth of tradition; and I challenge them to prove the genuineness of a single sentence ascribed to Christ and his apostles beyond what we have in the New Testament.

Aye, but, says Dr Milner, the apostles had their successors, and Christ included them when he said, "He that heareth you, heareth me;" and these words cannot be restricted to the apostles, for as they continued only for the ordinary period of human life, it was impossible that all nations, and all ages, could receive the gospel from them personally; therefore Christ must have included their successors, who are the priests of the Catholic Church, the depositaries of the faith, by whom the unwritten word of God, that is, apostolical tradition, has come down to us with infallible certainty.

These are not precisely Dr Milner's words, but they are the substance of his argument. And I reply, first, that the apostles *as such* had no successors; which I showed at length in my reply to the Catholic Vindicator: and now, secondly, I maintain, that there was no need of any successors to the apostles, or any to fill their place, after they had committed their words to writing, and gone to receive their reward. *Hearing* the apostles is not a mere acoustic operation;—it is not the mere reception of sounds into the ear. Papists indeed argue as if it were nothing else; and thus it is that they degrade and carnalize every thing that they touch. They think it impossible to hear the apostles, unless the sound of their voice shall literally be received into our ears, or the sound of the voice of some person who pretends to be one of their successors. But in the scripture sense of the expression, to hear the apostles, signifies the belief of their testimony, and submission to the ordinances which they appointed in their Master's name. Thus they are as effectually heard in their writings as they were by their living voice; and the submission of the heart and life to what they wrote, is obedience to the divine command to hear them. When the voice from the excellent

glory said, concerning Jesus himself, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him," the divine command was,—believe what he teaches, and obey what he commands; and not merely listen to the sound of his voice, which many did, who derived no benefit from it, because they would not obey his voice; and their not obeying it was the same as not hearing it. But he who really receives the truth which the apostles wrote, obeys the command to hear them; and therefore there was no need of successors, to tell us of something which they said but did not write.

With regard to the priests, who call themselves successors of the apostles, and depositaries of the faith, the world is able to judge what credit is due to their testimony in relation to what the apostles are said to have communicated by word of mouth. None of them profess to have lived so long as to have been ear-witnesses of what any of the apostles personally taught; and therefore, supposing the present race to be as honest as it is possible for men to be, there can be no certainty with regard to any thing that they say has been handed down to them from the apostolic age. This objection gathers strength from the well-known character of the great body of the priests for more than a thousand years. There is a universal tradition on this subject, both oral and written, the truth of which no man can doubt; namely, that the state of morals among the priesthood was profligate in the extreme. This was so universal, and exceptions were so rare, that it was almost a miracle to find a godly man among them. Now, suppose it were admitted that tradition contained nothing but sound doctrine for an age or two after the apostles, it must necessarily have become corrupted when taken up and transmitted by such corrupt men. They could not be the means of preserving, and the medium of communicating, holy doctrines and pure precepts, which condemned them, and must have been abhorred by them. Whatever came into contact with them must have been defiled. Water from the purest fountain will be found unsavory after passing through a dunghill.

It may be admitted that, by the increase and general diffusion of knowledge, the character of the priests of the present day is not so bad, at least in Protestant countries; yet I would not trust much to their traditions. I shall suppose Dr Milner to be one of the best of his order; yet, when I see that he asserts in his introduction, that the Bishop of St David's wrote a Catechism which taught men to "hate and persecute their elder brethren," and when I find that the said Catechism contains no such thing, I am compelled to conclude, that tradition passing through such a mind may have received a bias that makes it of no value. If a man shall mistake, and grossly misrepresent what he reads with his own eyes, I can have no confidence in the accuracy of what he professes to have received by his ears, though given only at second hand, much less when it has come through a hundred such hands; and this is the case with all that the Romish Church *propounds* to her children under the name of the "unwritten word of God."

The next branch of the argument is that which requires men to hear the church. Papists with one voice maintain that this means the Church of Rome; and that all men who will not hear and submit to her must be accursed. But she has not yet made it appear, and she never can make it appear, that she is here specially intended, any more than the Church of England or that of Scotland; for she had no existence, any more than these, when our Saviour gave that commandment. And the truth is, this command, Matt. xviii. 16. does not relate to any one church more than another, but to every particular church or congregation that may unhappily have an offending or immoral person among them. They are commanded to take certain steps to recover him from his error, and if they cannot prevail upon him, that is, if he will not *hear them;* they are commanded to consider him as a heathen and a publican; which implies no more than being excluded from the fellowship of Christians, of which he showed himself unworthy. Any person who will read the passage carefully will find that it contains no more than I have here stated; and yet these words are repeated by every Popish writer to prove the supreme authority of the Church of Rome;—"Let him *hear the church;*"—"If he refuse *to hear the church,*" &c. Under these words she claims a right to *propound* for belief, and to enjoin for practice, whatever she pleases; and all who will not obey come under the anathema of those who refuse to hear the church!

The church of Rome has been very sparing in her information with regard to the particular doctrines and ordinances which she has received from tradition. I have mentioned one or two things which have been divulged as derived from that source, though most Popish writers endeavour to find scripture for these too, which seems to intimate that mere tradition does not satisfy them. But, so far as I know, there is no publication, printed or manuscript, that contains a summary or detailed account of what the church believes under the head of tradition. It may be any thing, or it may be nothing, for what any man out of the church can tell; for the very writing of it would destroy it as a matter of *oral* tradition; and therefore Protestants can never know what it is. As for lay persons in the Church of Rome, every one must receive it from the lips of his priest. It is that which the "Catholic Church *propounds;*" and as this is too large a body to propound any thing, otherwise than by the mouth of its official organs, every

priest is the propounder of what he considers a Catholic tradition; which may be a mere whimsy of his own, and yet his people must receive it as infallibly true. Thus there may be as many whimsies as priests, all contradicting one another; for there is no authentic standard to which an appeal can be made, and by which an inquirer can satisfy himself who reports the tradition correctly.

But the "Catholic Church;" that is, the Popish priests; are not only propounders, they are also the explainers of both the written and unwritten word; and neither scripture nor tradition is to be considered the rule of faith otherwise than as propounded and *explained* by them. This power of explaining sets every thing to rights; for let the articles of tradition brought to view be ever so contradictory, the explanation of a priest can reconcile them to one another so completely, that he will, if necessary, swear that they are the very same; just as a ghostly juggler can convert the December of one year to the June of another, when such conversion is necessary to serve a purpose.

I am aware that to these common sense arguments against Popish traditions, writers of that communion adduce the promise of Christ to be with his church to the end of the world, and the promise of his Spirit to lead them into all truth. These promises they consider as belonging exclusively to the Church of Rome, and as infallibly securing the priests, "the successors of the apostles," from ever falling into error. But this is again begging the question; it is an impudent assuming of the very thing that is denied, and which she is called upon to prove, but which it is certain she never can prove. Christ promised to be with *his* church to the end of the world; that is, with those who are separated from the world which lieth in wickedness, and who are devoted in heart and life to the service of God. Christ promised to be present with such to bless them; but it is as explicitly declared that the face of God is against them that do evil. It must therefore be against the Church of Rome, which, like Ahab, has sold itself to do wickedly above all that ever pretended to be Christian. This all the world knows; and of this Dr Milner cannot be ignorant. I beg leave, therefore, to remind him of the words of the Duke of Brunswick, which he quotes with approbation, and which are indeed words of wisdom, though partly quoted from an apocryphal book:—"Secondly, I made a strong resolution, by the grace of God, to avoid sin, well knowing that wisdom will not enter into a corrupt mind, nor dwell in a body subject to sin! Wisd. i. 4." I ask Dr Milner, then, how wisdom could dwell in a so body thoroughly corrupt as he knows the Church of Rome to have been for many centuries? and how he or any man can believe that this is the church in which Christ promised to dwell by his Spirit to the end of the world? There is blasphemy in the very imagination of the thing, as it tends to represent Christ as the minister of sin, and dwelling in the temple of wickedness, while he is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and cannot look upon sin. Yet so certain is Dr Milner of the truth of those absurdities which I have been exposing, especially of the traditions propounded and explained by the church, that he tells us, at the conclusion of this branch of his argument, that if it were possible for him to be mistaken, he would lay the blame on his Maker! "Were it possible for me to err in following the Catholic method, with such a mass of evidence in its favour, methinks I would answer at the judgment-seat of Eternal Truth, with a pious writer of the middle ages: 'Lord, if I have been deceived thou art the author of my error.'" *Hugh of St Victor*, p. 116. There is no arguing with a man capable of such impieties. This reminds us of what Mr Burke said of the infidel Rousseau, that he wrote a book of Confessions, which he proposed to throw in the face of his Maker at the last day; but the infidel did not go so far as to say that he would lay the blame of his errors on his Maker; but merely to declare that he was as good a man as any who should be present at the judgment-seat.

Having noticed the principal arguments in favour of tradition, which are drawn from scripture, I shall now advert to one, which, I suppose, is founded on tradition itself:—"True it is," says Dr Milner, "that the apostles, before they separated to preach the gospel in different nations, agreed upon a short symbol or profession of faith, called the *Apostles' Creed;* but even this they did not commit to writing: and whereas they made this among other articles of it, 'I believe in the holy church,' * they made no mention at all of the holy scriptures. This circumstance confirms what their example proves, that the Christian doctrine and discipline might have been propagated and preserved by the unwritten word or tradition, joined with the authority of the church, though the scriptures had not been composed; however profitable these most certainly are for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness." *Letter* X. p. 86.

What Dr Milner here propounds under the positive assurance, that "True it is," is not an oral tradition to him, seeing he gives it on the authority of Rufinus, who had it from an earlier author, who had committed it to writing; but this author lived so long after the apostles, that he could know no more of their acts, from an authentic source, than we do. It was probably an oral tradition to him; but though it

* "The title *Catholic* was afterwards added, when heresies increased."

were more credible than it is, we are entitled to hold it as an idle tale, which can prove nothing, seeing itself requires first to be proved.

It was one of the evidences of the divine mission of the apostles, that, without concert or formal agreement on any articles of faith, they all spoke the same things, and bore testimony to the same facts of which they had been witnesses. That this was the case is evident from the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. They were not qualified to propound articles of faith till they had received the gift of the Holy Ghost; and then instantly they began to preach, and continued to preach, not in the measured terms of a previous systematic arrangement, agreed upon among themselves, but as the Holy Ghost gave them utterance. Yes; but Dr Milner says, that before they separated to preach the gospel in different nations, they "agreed upon a short symbol or profession of faith, called the *Apostles' Creed.*" Now what could be the use of this to them? The Holy Ghost continued with them, wherever they went, teaching them all to speak substantially the same things. To have made such an agreement would have indicated a jealousy of one another, or a doubt of the Spirit's remaining in them, which ought not to be supposed. It may be very well for uninspired men to arrange the truths of divine revelation in a systematic form, in order to their satisfying one another as to their understanding and agreement with regard to divine truth; but this was quite unnecessary for the apostles who knew that they all spoke by one unerring Spirit.

If it be alleged that they composed the Creed not for their own sakes, but for the use of the common people; I reply, that this work of all the twelve, if it were such, presents nothing half so useful as what may be found in the writings of any one of them who did write. I grant that this short symbol presents the leading truths of Christianity in very few words; but taken by itself, without a previous acquaintance with these truths, it must be quite unintelligible and useless. Every Papist, I suppose, can say it from memory; but he acquires no more knowledge of the true religion from it, than if he had learned to say it backwards. Its articles are stated so concisely, that it is little else than a general index of Christian doctrines; so that the profession of it cannot ascertain what a man's real sentiments are with regard to most of the things which it embraces. The truth with regard to the person of Christ is stated somewhat in detail; but of what follows no man could make any thing unless he had information from another source. "I believe in the Holy Ghost," is professing nothing, unless we know who the Holy Ghost is, and what is his part in the plan of our salvation. "I believe in the holy Church," are equally words without meaning, in the mouth of a person who does not know what is meant by the words *church* and *holy*, in the New Testament. Papists understand one thing and Protestants another, by the very same expression; but neither would understand any thing at all, if he had not previous information. And as for the "communion of saints," I suppose there are few Papists who can tell what it is. In short, it is confessed on all hands, that this Creed was inadequate as a standard of orthodoxy when disputes began to multiply. Hence it was found necessary to compose other and larger ones, such as the Nicene and Athanasian; but neither have they served the purpose of preserving unity among Christians, even in the same communion.

I conclude this Number with remarking, that if Dr Milner could prove the Creed to have been the work of the twelve apostles, I would turn it against himself, by showing that they knew nothing of a body called the *Catholic* Church, seeing that word was foisted into the composition ages after their time.

No. CXCI.

SATURDAY, March 9th, 1822.

One principal mode of defence adopted by Popish writers is, to make it appear that their opponents hold the same principles with themselves; and they think their church fully vindicated if they can show that what is charged against them is allowed by any class of Protestants. If it were so, the Protestants who agreed with them could not attack them with a good grace; but in most instances, where such agreement is alleged, there will be found a great difference of principles, with only a slight resemblance in words.

Thus on the subject of tradition, there is a sense in which Protestants use the word, and they admit the thing which it expresses, with certain modifications. What they understand by it, and the use they make of it, are very different from tradition in the Popish sense, which Dr Milner cannot but know; yet he argues as if he did not know it; and he writes as if we were as much the slaves of tradition as himself. Thus he writes:—"With all their repugnance to tradition and church authority, Protestants have found themselves absolutely obliged, in many instances, to admit of them both. It has been demonstrated above, that they are obliged to admit of tradition in order to admit of scripture itself. Without this, they can neither know that there are any writings at all dictated by God's inspiration, nor which, in particular, these writings are, nor what versions or publications of them are genuine." *Letter* XI. p. 96. He then proceeds to tell us of certain articles of faith

and practice, which, he says, we have derived from tradition, to which I shall attend by and by. But I must first dispose of his assertion, that we are "obliged to admit of tradition in order to admit of scripture itself."

The reader is requested to remember, that by tradition, Dr Milner means something handed down, through eighteen centuries, by word of mouth, independent of written testimony. Now I deny that Protestants depend upon such tradition for any thing, or admit of it for any purpose whatever. But they do not reject the tradition of written testimony. They readily avail themselves of it, as furnishing rational evidence of the genuineness of the books of scripture; that is, that they were written by the inspired men whose names they bear. I call it *rational* evidence, for it rises no higher. The belief of what this proves, is not the faith of the gospel; but it is evidence which satisfies reasonable men that there is no imposition in the matter; and that these books are really what they profess to be,—a record of facts and doctrines concerning Jesus Christ, written by men whom he commissioned to publish his doctrine to the world.

If I were writing against avowed infidels, it would be incumbent upon me to prove that the apostles were inspired; but this is admitted by Dr Milner; and therefore all that I have to show, is, how the tradition of written testimony affords rational evidence that the books which bear their names were written by them. Now of this there is the written testimony of a host of authors, both friends and enemies of Christianity, who, while differing about many things, agree in this, that there were certain books received by Christians, not of the church in Rome only, but all over the world, as undoubtedly written by the apostles. Some of these authors were contemporary with men who had been cotemporary with some of the apostles; and they have incorporated in their writings many passages which assure us, that they had the very same narratives and epistles that we have in the New Testament. We know it to be impossible that forgeries should have gained such universal credit then, because we know it to be impossible now; human nature being the same, and the laws of moral evidence the same in all ages.

About the middle of the seventeenth century, "*one* Milton,"—I use the language of a contemporary author,—"*one* Milton wrote a poem about the fall of man, which contained *some very good lines.*" This poem was published in Milton's lifetime, acknowledged by him as the author, and not claimed by any other; but it was little known for about half a century; that is, until the days of the Spectator, when Addison brought it into notice by an exposition of its excellences. Almost every critic since that time has noticed it, and made extracts from it; and no one has ever called in question the genuineness of Paradise Lost, as a writing of Milton. There is therefore a moral certainty, as great as the nature of the thing admits of; and the fact has become so identified with English literature, that, supposing our language to exist, living or dead, a thousand years hence, it will be believed then, with as much certainty as it is now, that Paradise Lost was written by *one* John Milton. No man doubts that the poems ascribed to Virgil are genuine; because the fact is identified with the literature of the Augustan age; so, while there are in the world any traces of English literature, no man can reasonably doubt the genuineness of the poem of Milton. Upon the same principle, but with stronger evidence, the apostolic writings are proved to be genuine; for they were delivered to both individuals and churches while the writers were alive. By these individuals and churches they were preserved, and became incorporated with the literature of the age immediately following, which it was impossible for forgeries to be; and thus the unanimous testimony of the writers of that age assures us of the genuineness of the apostolic writings.

This is called the tradition of written testimony; and it furnishes abundant evidence of the fact for which it is adduced;—such evidence as no man can resist, without denying the principles by which he would judge of evidence with regard to any thing else. We receive the holy scriptures, therefore, as demonstrated to be the writings of the inspired men whose names they bear, altogether independently of the authority of the Church of Rome and her traditions, because they were identified with the literature of the period before the Church of Rome was distinguished above other churches. It is impossible that writers of the next century can furnish stronger evidence of the genuineness of Paradise Lost, than that which is already on record; so it was impossible that the Church of Rome, after the fourth century, when she began to assume authority over other churches, could add to the evidence in favour of the apostolic writings which had been established beyond all dispute in the second and third centuries.

Such is the use which Protestants make of tradition; and that it is very different from that of the Papist must be evident to every child who can read the statement. I shall, however, for the sake of illustration, give an example that resembles their tradition, and that also by referring to a great poet. My readers have all, no doubt, heard of Ossian, the son of Fingal. Tradition says, that this Fingal was a great king in Scotland or Ireland, it is not certain which, somewhere between a thousand and two thousand years ago; and that his son Ossian composed many songs in Gaelic, which were handed down by word of mouth, from age to age, till about fifty years ago

when *one* Macpherson took them down in writing, from the lips of some old men and women, and translated them into English. This was genuine oral tradition, down to the date of the said writing and translation. But I suppose no man, who understands the nature of moral evidence, considers it proved, by the publication of these poems, that they were all, or any of them, written by a prince whose name they bear. Had they been written by Ossian, and received as his, without contradiction by contemporary writers, or by writers of the immediately succeeding age, the genuineness of them would have been established beyond dispute; but as the case stands, no man can entertain a rational conviction that what we have as the poems of Ossian, were, *bona fide*, composed by a great prince of that name. Much less will he consider them as containing an authentic record of historical facts. There may be many facts in them, but from the necessary uncertainty of oral tradition, and the want of corroborating testimony, no man can possibly tell what is fact, and what is fable; because, from failure of memory on the one hand, and national vanity on the other, much must be omitted, and many things exaggerated; not to speak of what poetry may have invented.

There may have been such a king as Fingal. There may have been such a prince as Ossian; and he may have been a great poet. Nay, I will go further, and admit, that there is a strong probability of these things; for I can no more believe that Macpherson fabricated these poems than that Ossian composed them all. I will even admit, that it is probable that fragments of songs composed by *one* Ossian may have been preserved for hundreds of years by oral tradition, and that we have some of these in English in Macpherson's book. Many passages there are of great beauty, pathos, and sublimity,—worthy of the son of the "mighty chief of Morven, the first of a thousand kings." But bare probability is the utmost that the evidence can produce in the mind of a serious inquirer after historical truth. And this is all that Popish oral tradition can effect; and that only with regard to things not contrary to scripture; so that no wise man will build any article of faith or ordinance of worship upon such an uncertain foundation.

We do not receive the apostolic writings upon authority so vague, as Dr Milner would insinuate; for besides their *being written* at first, which puts them out of the rank of oral traditions, the substance of them was speedily incorporated with other writings, which remain to this day as witnesses of the fact, insomuch that a modern author is said to have boasted, that though the New Testament were lost, he could almost make it up from the works of the Greek and Latin fathers. I will allow this to be a figure of speech bordering on the hyperbole; but it is founded upon the fact, that the works of the fathers of the first four centuries, whose genuineness nobody denies, are full of quotations from the very bible which we possess. I am not referring to these fathers as authorities for any doctrine, but merely as competent witnesses of the fact, that the scriptures were received by all Christians before the Church of Rome was distinguished above other churches; and therefore we do not receive them on the authority of either her or her traditions.

That faith in the word of God which constitutes a man a Christian, is founded on higher authority than even the tradition of written testimony, which produces only a rational conviction, not a divine faith. But this, I hope, will appear a sufficient answer to Dr Milner's assertion, that we are obliged to admit of tradition (in his sense of the word of course) in order to admit of scripture itself. For an illustration of the other topic, how we know the bible to be the word of God independently of human testimony, I refer the reader to No CXXXIV.

I conclude this branch of the subject with remarking, that Popish authors claim great merit on the part of their church for having kept the bible so carefully for us, for so many ages, and for giving it to the world at last; but these writers forget that the word of God was not given to the churches to be *kept up*, but to be given away and published: and it appears to me, that in using this plea of merit, the Church of Rome appears in as awkward a predicament as the "wicked and slothful servant" did, who boasted that he had hid his Lord's talent in a napkin.

I come now to consider the things which Dr Milner says Protestants have received from tradition. "The first precept in the bible," says he, "is that of sanctifying the seventh day." He proves this at length by the first institution of the Sabbath, and by the fourth commandment in the decalogue,—a thing which no Protestant requires to be proved. Then he proceeds:—"On the other hand, Christ declares that 'he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it,' Matt. v. 17. He himself observed the Sabbath; and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, Luke iv. 16. His disciples likewise observed it, after his death: they rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment, Luke xxiii. 56. Yet, with all this weight of scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath or seventh day holy, Protestants of all denominations make it a profane day, and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or Sunday. Now what authority have they for this? None whatever, except the *unwritten word*, or tradition of the Catholic Church; which declares that the apostles made the change in honour of Christ's resurrection, and

the descent of the Holy Ghost, on that day of the week." *Letter* XI. p. 96.

Dr Milner must have been thinking of the manner in which Papists keep their *holy* days, when he spoke about Protestants making the seventh day, or Saturday, a *profane* * day. It is well known that the holy days of the Church of Rome are the most wicked and profane of all the year, at least after mass, which is always celebrated early; but consistent Protestants, I mean real Christians, have no profane days; but consider themselves bound to live to the glory of God as much on one day as another; and while following their lawful business on ordinary days, they are as really obeying the commandment, as when they meet for religious worship on the Sabbath.

But while thus asserting the duty of Christians to serve God every day, I am far from denying the special obligation of the Sabbath. There was divine wisdom and goodness in the appointment of a day to recur at short intervals, when we should have the privilege of withdrawing from secular affairs, and be allowed, without the interruption of these, to apply our minds to the contemplation of heavenly things, to observe divine ordinances, and enjoy the benefit of Christian fellowship. The obligation of sanctifying such a day, or devoting it to the service of God, with a special reference to spiritual things, is not only admitted, but maintained by serious Christians of every denomination.

The proportion of time to be so consecrated, is fixed by divine authority to be one day in seven. The seventh day was originally appointed for the reason assigned at the institution of the Sabbath, and repeated in the fourth commandment. Because on that day God rested from all his works, it was a significant memorial of his rest, as well as a suitable portion of time for his creatures to rest from their labour; for it had respect not only to the spiritual exercises of rational and immortal beings, but also to the recruiting of the physical strength of man and the inferior creatures, which would soon be exhausted by hard labour, without the stated and frequent recurrence of a day of repose. But, except as a memorial of the rest after the creation of the world, there is no stress laid upon one particular day of the seven more than another. The commandment does not say, "Remember the *seventh* day;" but "Remember the *Sabbath* day to keep it holy;" that is, remember the *day of rest*, as the word signifies; then the seventh day is mentioned from its connection with the first creation, as the proper day to be observed by the church under that dispensation; and so it was observed by the Jews in all their generations, and by Christ's disciples, after his crucifixion, but *before his resurrection;* for after that event, we have no notice of them observing the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath. Thereafter, the first day of the week was that on which the disciples came together for prayer. Christ in person consecrated this day by meeting with his disciples once and again before his ascension. The day of pentecost was the first day of the week, as we learn from the appointment of that festival, which was ordained to be the day after the Sabbath, Lev. xxiii. 16. On this day the disciples were met, *before* the Holy Ghost came upon them, and therefore that day was not ordained in honour of his descent. So far as the history of the apostles goes, they continued to observe the first day of the week; and Paul in writing to the Corinthians mentions that as the day of their stated meeting. 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

It is true, there is no positive precept which enjoins the keeping of the first day instead of the seventh; but apostolic example is as good as precept. We are sure that what the apostles did, and instructed the churches to do, must have been agreeable to the will of God; for they acted, as well as spoke and wrote, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. These considerations, I hope, will be found sufficient to expose the impudence of the assertion, that we have nothing but the authority of tradition for observing the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

Dr Milner then mentions some circumstances relating to the observance of the Sabbath, in which we do not exactly follow the rule prescribed to the Jews; such as keeping it from evening to evening. "Again," says he, "it is declared in scripture to be unlawful to dress victuals on that day, Exod. xvi. 23, or even to make a fire, Exod. xxxv. 3." And then he gives us to understand, that we learn by the traditions of the church that these circumstances were only of temporary obligation. With regard to the first,—that of keeping the Sabbath from evening to evening,—this was merely prescribing an entire day according to the mode of calculating other days; and therefore it is observed by Christians when they keep a whole day according to the same rule.

Dr Milner's other remark seems intended to inform us, that there is less strictness required in the observance of the Christian, than there was of the Jewish Sabbath; and this we learn by the tradition of the church; and I grant there is a very prevalent tradition to that effect, which influences the opinion and even the practice of many Protestants. But I am not aware of any foundation for this in scripture; and therefore I must object to it as a human tradition calculated to make void the law of God. I know indeed that by the law of Moses the Sabbath-breaker was put to death; but that does not infer that more strictness

* I am aware that this word is used in the sense of *secular*, or *not sacred*, as we say, *profane* history; but I must protest against such a word coming into use in reference to any part of Christian practice.

of observance was required; for we know that conjugal infidelity was also punished with death, which certainly does not infer that Christians may be less strict in that respect than Jews were. The law of Moses ordained also that idolaters should be put to death. Happily for Papists, this is not obligatory upon Christians; and yet there is no less strictness required in keeping ourselves from idols. The truth is, there was a system of jurisprudence, or municipal law, bound up with the ordinances of worship, and the law of the ten commandments; for in Israel the nation and the church were identical. The distinction of church and state was unknown. It was not a civil establishment of religion; but a divine establishment of polity,—the head of which, both in spirituals and temporals, was Jehovah the God of Israel. It follows as a thing of course, that with the consummation of that dispensation both the ritual and municipal branches of the law terminated; and left for us under the New Testament, nothing of the nature of precept but the original law of the ten commandments, which Christ exemplified and magnified by his obedience and suffering, and delivered as the rule of conduct to all the subjects of his kingdom;—not in any respect mitigated, or requiring less strictness than before; but requiring the entire devotion of the heart and life to the service and glory of God;—not as the price of any spiritual benefit, but as an expression of love and gratitude for spiritual blessings already received by the gospel.

Now, when Christ taught his disciples that this law was much more strict than they were aware of, and that it extended to the very thoughts of the heart, is it to be supposed that he made a special exception in prejudice of the fourth commandment, "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy?" Certainly not; for the sanctification of that day is enjoined in the strictest manner, in the summary which Christ gave of the first table of the law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and mind, and strength." Christ did indeed reprove the Pharisees for their affected hypocritical strictness about the Sabbath. This was not because he was less strict than they; but because he saw that their professions were insincere and inconsistent. He told them that it was lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day, though it should require great labour, such as the lifting an ox out of a pit; that the law had always admitted of this, and other acts of humanity and mercy; and that the Jews had been in the habit of doing so without blame, when occasion required.

Those precepts about the Sabbath therefore, such as the length of a journey, and other matters, not expressed in the commandment, are not binding upon us; but the commandment itself I hold to be binding in all its extent and original strictness.

No. CXCII.

SATURDAY, March 16th, 1822.

In my last Number I replied to Dr Milner's assertion, that we had nothing but the authority of tradition for observing the Sabbath on the first, instead of the seventh day of the week; and also to what he says about the obligation of observing it, being less strict under the New Testament dispensation than it was under that of Moses. I showed, that for the observance of the first day we had the example of the apostles, and of the churches which they planted, which is of equal authority with any precept; and as for the sanctifying of the Sabbath, I endeavoured to show, that the fourth commandment remains in full force, and in all its original strictness.

In comparing the two dispensations, we find, indeed, that in this as in other respects, the law of Moses lays more stress upon things external and visible, than the New Testament does, which regards more the spirit of the thing than its outward circumstances. But this, so far from being a reason why we should pay less respect to the Sabbath, is rather an argument for greater strictness, seeing that by the greater spirituality of the new dispensation, we are brought into more intimate contact with spiritual and heavenly things. This strictness does not consist in measuring how far we may lawfully travel; or in forbearing to kindle a fire, which in some climates is as much a work of necessity as putting on one's clothes; but it consists in the abstraction of both body and mind from our ordinary worldly employments; devotion of heart to the service of God; personal attendance on the ordinances of his worship; and as much labour as we are capable of, in doing good to fellow-creatures, especially by communicating the knowledge of Christian doctrine to our families, to our neighbours, and all to whom we have access.

Serious Christians regard the service of the Sabbath not as a burden but as a privilege; and the more strictly they observe it in the spirit of it, the greater blessing they find it. This is a matter of experience and individual consciousness which will not be comprehended by those who require arguments to convince them that they may not lawfully take liberties with that holy day, or that think they need not keep it so holy as the Jews did. We are able to judge of the state of religion in any society from their observance of the Sabbath. If they are spiritually minded, they will punctually and cheerfully attend to the exercises proper for the day; but if they are carnal, they will begin to say, "What a weariness is it?" and, by and by, they will make it, in more senses than one, what Dr Milner calls, a profane day. This has been eminently the case in the Church of Rome for hundreds of years. Popish coun-

tries on the Continent, and the more Popish parts of Ireland, are notorious for Sabbath profanation; and the contagion of their example has infected Protestants who live among them, or in neighbouring states; so that what was mercifully intended for the benefit of man and beast, is turned to the injury of both, and what was appointed for the worship of God, has been turned to the service of the devil. Papists have no idea of sanctifying the Sabbath further than attending mass in the morning, and perhaps hearing a short discourse which they call Christian doctrine. After that, in countries where they are not under legal restraint, particularly in some parts of Ireland, the day is spent in gaming, drinking, and fighting; so that instead of repairing the exhaustion of the week's labour, they are more exhausted by the revelry of that day than by all the labour of the week.

It is worthy of remark here, that when our kings of the Stuart line had a hankering after Popery, and wished to put down Puritanism, they adopted the expedient of desecrating the Sabbath. Thus James I. of England affected to think it hard that his good subjects after they had been at church, should sit the remainder of the Sunday, moping at their bibles, or teaching their children their catechism. He therefore, out of his royal bounty, and great regard for their welfare, issued a proclamation, giving them liberty to spend the day, after public worship, in the noble exercises of leaping, dancing, wrestling, archery, and such like; and he commanded the ministers of all parish churches to read this proclamation, after sermon on the Sundays; which was such a burlesque of sacred things, that we should scarcely credit the fact, were not the proclamation itself extant, and were there not an ample record of the sufferings of many godly ministers who refused to read to their congregations, on the Lord's day, this book of sports, as it was called: which was revived and reinforced by Charles I. who had the same object in view; and who, though not a Papist himself so far as appeared, was under the influence of a Popish queen and a host of Jesuit priests, who did every thing in their power to banish true religion from the kingdom; and who knew well that they could not do this till they had banished the Sabbath.

I have indulged myself in a digression, which I hope will not be considered an idle one, seeing it arose out of my exposure of Dr Milner's sophistry, and the subject is of great importance.

I proceed now in my explanation of those things which Dr Milner says Protestants have received from tradition. He quotes the law with regard to eating blood, which he says was confirmed by the apostles; and by them "imposed upon the Gentiles who were converted to the faith, Acts xv. 20. Nevertheless," says he, "where is the religious Protestant who scruples to eat gravy with his meat or puddings made of blood? At the same time, if it be asked, Upon what authority do you act in direct contradiction to the express words of both the Old and New Testament? he can find no other answer than that he has learned from the tradition of the church that the prohibition was only temporary," p. 97.

I do not know any Protestant who would give such an answer to such a question; but I do know many religious Protestants who scruple to eat blood, and who consider the commandment to abstain from things strangled and from blood, as of permanent obligation. I admit there are others who think differently, but they do not rest their opinion upon any tradition of the Church of Rome. In the primitive churches there were many questions agitated about meats;—that is, about what might, and what might not be eaten. The apostle Paul told them, that the kingdom of heaven did not consist in these things; but in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, Rom. xiv. 17. and that a man might lawfully eat of any thing that he bought in the market, or what was set before him on the table of an unbelieving neighbour, unless he was informed that it was connected with the worship of some idol; in which case he was to have nothing to do with it, lest he should give countenance to idol worship, 1 Cor. x. 25—27. This was the general rule laid down for the conduct of Christians; and it seems to admit of as much latitude as any man could wish. The habits of Jews and Gentiles, however, had been so different with regard to these things, that when they became united in Christian congregations, it was necessary, for the sake of peace and edification, that they should concede something to each other. The Jews were required to concede to the Gentiles the article of circumcision, and not to insist upon subjecting them to that rite, while they were allowed to practise it among themselves, if they pleased; and the Gentiles were required to concede to the Jews abstinence from things strangled, and from blood, and from fornication, all which were connected with idol worship; and these concessions on both sides were absolutely necessary for the peace and edification of the churches. The last article being a precept of the moral law, there can be no question about the perpetual obligation of it; though from previous habits, connected with their former religion, the Gentiles were apt to think fornication scarcely, if at all, a crime; but the rest, which relates merely to an article of food, or to the manner of killing and preparing food for the table, is not so clearly a standing law of the kingdom of heaven, in which such liberty as the following is allowed:—"One believeth that he may eat *all things:* another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth

not; and let not him who eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him," Rom. xiv. 2, 3.

On the general subject of meats and days, the rule which the same apostle prescribes, is, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind;" which shows that the things are indifferent: and not matters of moral obligation or positive institution; for with regard to these no such latitude is ever allowed in the word of God. Paul himself could eat flesh without scruple; and yet he says:—"If meat cause my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I cause my brother to offend," 1 Cor. viii. 13. This was in the true spirit of Christian charity and liberality. Upon this principle, I suppose it was, that the Gentile converts were required to forbear what must have been insufferably offensive to their Jewish brethren. And yet I am not so certain that this was the *sole* reason, or that there is no speciality in the case, as to say, those persons err, who consider the precept as binding upon them.* There is no sin in forbearing to eat blood; and he who has the least doubt about the lawfulness of it, does wisely to forbear. On either side of the question we derive no more light from Dr Milner's tradition than from the man in the moon.

I am not sufficiently acquainted with the arts of killing and cooking, to know what proportion of blood may be incorporated with the gravy of a beef-steak; and I cannot allow myself to think that this is, or ever was a religious question, or a matter that should affect a man's conscience. The command, in all its strictness, certainly applied to the family of Noah, and to the children of Israel; but it does not necessarily imply more than that the blood be drained from the veins of the animal in the ordinary manner, and not suffered to incorporate with the flesh, as in the case of an animal dying of strangulation, or dying a natural death: and while I admit that the Jews are more particular in extracting the blood than we are, if that be blood which we have in the gravy of beef, I believe it impossible to extract it entirely; and therefore if this was implied in the precept, it must have been a prohibition of flesh altogether, which we are sure it was not; for the commandment to abstain from the blood was originally given with the permission to eat flesh.

Dr Milner and my other Popish readers will affect to triumph at the uncertainty which I have admitted to exist with regard to the obligation of what appears to be an apostolic injunction. They will say, where is the boasted perfection of your rule—the bible alone? and they will tell us how happy they are, seeing they have the living voice of the church, which assures them that the prohibition of blood-eating was only temporary. Now, though this living voice may produce silent submission in those who respect such authority, it does not produce conviction in the mind of any man; and therefore it is of no use. Allowing the church, that is, the priests, to be successors of the apostles, they cannot, even on their own principles, claim more authority and power in their living voice than the apostles had in theirs. Now it is a fact that the living voice of the apostles, with all the miraculous powers which they possessed, did not produce unanimity on such points as these; and they did not desire such unanimity without conviction. If submission to *mere* authority was ever imperative upon any man, it must have been on those to whom the apostles spoke. Yet we do not hear them assuming this tone of authority; or saying, You must all be of one mind about what may, and what may not be eaten. They left every one to act according to his own convictions, only requiring that he would allow his brother the same liberty: "for neither if we eat are we the better; neither, if we eat not are we the worse," 1 Cor. viii. 8. The truth is, the kingdom of heaven does not consist in these things; and to be all of one mind about them, is not more necessary than to be all of one stature.

Thus, by taking the written word alone as our rule, we are at least as much agreed in sentiment as those were who heard the living voice of the apostles, with all the advantage of repetition and oral explanation. The Church of Rome cannot do more by her living voice; and therefore her children have no advantage over those who consult the scriptures. In these we read what the apostles wrote; and it is a matter of fact, that the reading of their words produces as much unanimity now, as the literal hearing of it did when they were upon earth. All that the Church of Rome effects by her authoritative dogmatizing is submission without conviction, which is the union of slaves bound together by one chain: but the written word of God, like the preaching of the apostles, produces a union of individuals personally convinced of the truth of the gospel, and so united in affection that they can suffer every one to follow his own convictions about matters in which the kingdom of heaven does not consist. This is the union of free and rational beings; and I suppose it is as much as Christians will ever attain in this world.

I must try to get over this ground a little faster.—"I will confine myself," says Dr Milner, "to one more instance of Protestants abandoning their own rule, that of scripture

* On this side of the question I have great pleasure in recommending a Lecture on Acts xv. by Mr Ewing of Glasgow, published about twenty years ago. The reader will find that there is a difference between the sentiments above expressed, and those of my esteemed friend and pastor; and yet, I suppose, there are not two men in the world more of one mind with regard to every article of faith and ordinance of worship.

alone, to follow ours, of scripture explained by tradition. If an intelligent Pagan who had carefully perused the New Testament were asked;—Which of the ordinances mentioned in it, is most explicitly and strictly enjoined? I make no doubt but he would answer that it is, *the washing of feet.*"—After referring to John xiii. with remarks, he proceeds;—"I now ask, on what pretence can those, who profess to make scripture alone the rule of their religion, totally disregard this institution and precept? Had this ceremony been observed in the church, when Luther and the other first Protestants began to dogmatize, there is no doubt but they would have retained it: but having learned from her that it was only figurative, they acquiesced in this decision, contrary to what appears to be the plain sense of scripture," pp. 97, 98.

It is not of much importance to inquire what Luther would have done in the case supposed. It is well known that he retained a good deal of the nonsense which he learned in the Church of Rome; and it would have been very surprising if he had not, considering the firm hold that established and long venerated custom had upon his mind. But does Dr Milner not know, that this ordinance of washing feet was then, and is still, observed in the Church of Rome? He certainly does know,—for all the world knows the fact,—that on certain solemn occasions, the Pope, to show his great humility, washes the feet of twelve poor men, when they are as clean as his own fingers; but which he pretends to wash, in imitation of what Christ did to his disciples. I suppose Dr Milner, living in England, is ashamed to acknowledge the fact which presents his holy father in such a ludicrous light, and therefore he writes as if there were no such thing.

I admit that what Christ did on that occasion had a figurative meaning;—that when he said, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me," he meant something more important than the mere application of water to the feet of the disciple; but I do not admit what Dr Milner says the church teaches,—"that it was *only* figurative." I do not say that Christ appointed the washing of feet as an ordinance, as Dr Milner insinuates; but I think he did this as an example to his disciples; and that as an example it is binding upon us, and upon all Christians to the end of the world, not merely as to the specific act of washing the feet, but as to that which such an action signified; namely, hospitality and kindness to our brethren, especially to those who are going from place to place in the service of Christ, and the ministry of the gospel. In reference to this washing of feet, Christ says, "I have given you an example, that you should do as I have done to you;" that is, an example for your imitation. When instituting an ordinance, he does not say, Imitate my example, or, Do *as* I have done; but, "THIS DO in remembrance of me," in which the actions of eating bread and drinking wine are specifically appointed; and no others will be acknowledged as obedience to the ordinance. But an example admits of latitude, and may be imitated in the spirit of it by a great variety of actions.

In eastern countries, in ancient times, persons did not travel, as many do now, in stage coaches and steam-boats; but usually on foot, over scorching sands; and they had not, as our pedestrians have, the benefit of stockings and close shoes, but wore sandals, which covered only the soles of their feet, and were tied with thongs about the ankles. A person thus equipped, coming from a journey, felt that the first thing necessary for his comfort was the washing of his feet; and the performance of this service, or even the furnishing of water for this purpose, being the first kind action which one man was called upon to perform to another who was a stranger, came of course to designate all the duties of hospitality and brotherly kindness. Thus we find the apostle Paul, in his first epistle to Timothy, draws the character of one who was worthy of consideration, as having *washed the saints' feet,* that is, having been hospitable, which implies every office of kind and brotherly affection; and in this sense Christ's example of washing the feet of his disciples is as binding now as ever it was.

After attempting to prove the certainty of tradition, from the impossibility of any change taking place in the doctrine and practice of the church without opposition, Dr Milner sums up his argument in the following words:—"In a word, there is but one way of accounting for the alleged alteration in the doctrines of the church; that mentioned by the learned Dr Bailey; which is to suppose that, on some one night, all the Christians in the world went to sleep sound Protestants, and awoke the next morning rank Papists!" p. 112.

Dr Milner is welcome to claim for the Church of Rome all the Christians *of* the world, meaning, I suppose, *worldly Christians;* and I hope he will allow me to claim for the Protestant churches, all who are *not of* the world, but chosen out of it, as Christ says his disciples were. But passing this, I beg to remind the reader that a similar argument was used by my correspondent, W. D. and fully answered in page 308; in which I showed that the Church of Rome had most certainly deviated far from the right line of truth, and that it was not necessary to trace and mark every step of such deviation. Without repeating what was then said, I now observe, that Dr Milner has furnished me with an argument, that completely overthrows his own. He tells us, page 101, on the authority of a divine of the Church of England, what is pretty well known to be the fact, that the Church of Geneva has departed from the doctrine which Calvin taught: and

adopted principles very different from those so zealously maintained by their fathers. How is this possible? When did the change take place? There is only one way of accounting for it; which is, that, on some one night, the Genevese Christians went to bed sound Calvinists, and awoke the next morning rank Socinians! Dr Milner himself must allow that this supposition is as good as Dr Bailey's, and yet it is of no weight when opposed to the notorious fact, that a great change has taken place in the Church of Geneva. And this has been tacitly brought about in less than three hundred years of increasing light and knowledge, when every man was able to detect any material deviation from first principles; how much easier then must it have been for a few artful men in the Church of Rome, during more than a thousand years of gross darkness, to effect any change they pleased?

Dr Milner insinuates further, that a change like that in Geneva has taken place among Protestants in general—"Is it demonstrably evident," says he, "from *mere scripture*, that Christ is God, and to be adored as such? Most modern Protestants of eminence answer, No; and, in defence of their assertion, quote the following among other texts; 'My Father is greater than I.'" If what Dr Milner here asserts were true, I would show how it operated against his argument; but it is false, that most modern Protestants of eminence do as he says; and therefore I only remark upon it, that he, like other Popish writers, seems very willing to serve the cause of Socinianism, when he has an opportunity of throwing in a hint in its favour.

No. CXCIII.

SATURDAY, MARCH 23D, 1822

I HAVE now discussed the principal points contained in what Dr Milner calls the "True Rule of faith;" and I hope I have proved to the satisfaction of every intelligent reader, that Popish tradition is of no value, and that the bible alone is sufficient for the instruction of men in all that which is necessary to be known for their salvation, and in all which they ought to practise for the glory of God, and the benefit of fellow-creatures.

In his twelfth Letter, which is entitled, "Objections Answered," Dr Milner takes leave of this subject, and concludes the first part of his work. Here I think it worth while to give a pretty large quotation of his very words, in order to show what spirit he is of, and what high ground he assumes, as a successor of the apostles, and as a priest of the *holy* church, which has, it seems, an exclusive patent for possessing and understanding the scriptures:—

"Against the Catholic Rule it is objected," says he, "that Christ referred the Jews to the scriptures: 'Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me,' John v. 39. Again, the Jews of Berea are commended by the sacred penman, in that they 'searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so,' Acts xvii. 11.

"Before I enter on the discussion of any part of scripture, with you or your friends, I am bound, dear Sir, in conformity with my Rule of faith, as explained by the fathers, and particularly by Tertullian, to protest against your and their right to argue from scripture; and, of course, must deny that there is any necessity for my replying to any objections which you may draw from it. For I have reminded you, that 'no prophecy of scripture is of any private interpretation;' and I have proved to you, that *the whole business of the scriptures belongs to the church.* She has preserved them, she vouches for them, and she alone, by confronting the several passages with each other, and by the help of tradition, authoritatively explains them. *Hence it is impossible that the real sense of scripture should ever be against her and her doctrine;* and hence, of course, I might quash every objection which you can draw from any passage in it by this short reply:—*the church understands the passage differently from you; therefore you must mistake its meaning,*" p. 118. This is telling us in plain language, what the claims of the Church of Rome are, and what she is ready to enforce whenever she shall have acquired power. We have no right to dispute with her; she needs not descend to argue with us; she is the sole judge of the meaning of every text in the bible,—not one of which can have a meaning different from what she is pleased to impose; for "it is impossible that the real sense of scripture should ever be against her and her doctrine!" This is the short and summary argument by which Dr Milner says he "*might* quash every objection." Then, it may be asked, what is the use of reasoning at all about the matter? Why not silence every objector by the strong arm of power as formerly,—that is, by the stake and the gibbet? for if Papists are convinced that they cannot possibly be wrong, they would be great fools to put their cause to the hazard of an argument.

Such a fool, however, Dr Milner must be; seeing he has written 500 large octavo pages to prove what he says he can prove in little more than five words:—"The church understands" so and so, and that is enough; "it is impossible that the real sense of scripture should ever be against her and her doctrine." But to show that he is generous in his folly, he thus continues:—"Nevertheless, as charity beareth all things and never faileth, I will, for the better satisfying of you and your friends, *quit my vantage ground* for the present, and

answer distinctly to every text not yet answered by me, which any of your gentlemen, or which Dr Porteous himself, has brought against the Catholic method of religion," p. 119.

As a specimen of the manner in which Dr Milner answers *to* those texts of scripture which are usually adduced against his Rule, take the following :—

" By way of answering your first objection, let me ask you, whether Christ, by telling the Jews to search the scriptures, intimated that they were not to believe his *unwritten* word, which he was then preaching; nor to hear his apostles and their successors, with whom he promised to remain for ever? I ask, secondly, on what particular question Christ referred to the scripture, namely, the Old Scripture? for no part of the New was then written. Was it on any question that has been, or might be agitated among Christians? No, certainly; the sole question between him and the infidel Jews, was, whether he was, or was not the Messiah? In proof that he was the Messiah, he adduced the ordinary motives of credibility, as they have been detailed by your late worthy rector, Mr Carey, the miracles he wrought, and the prophecies of the Old Testament that were fulfilled in him, as likewise the testimony of St John the Baptist. The same is to be said of the commendations bestowed by St Luke on the Bereans; they searched the ancient prophecies to verify that the Messiah was to be born at such a time and in such a place, and that his life and his death were to be marked by such and such circumstances. We still refer Jews and other infidels to the same proofs of Christianity, without saying any thing yet to them about our Rule or Judge of controversies," pp. 119, 120.

I request the reader to look over the last paragraph again. It is the whole of Dr Milner's answer to what is alleged by Protestants against the Church of Rome, from the words " Search the scriptures," and from the divinely inspired commendation of the Bereans for searching the scriptures daily. And what is the amount of this answer? Just nothing at all. No Protestant ever imagined that what Christ said to the Jews on that occasion, intimated that they were not to believe his word, or that of his apostles; and the starting of this question is nothing but a barefaced evasion of the argument which he felt himself unable to answer.

On this subject I will give Dr Milner an advantage of which he did not know how to avail himself; for I believe he does not understand Greek, that being a branch of learning to which Popish priests have a great aversion, and they are jealous of it, lest it should disparage their infallible Latin Vulgate.* Every Greek scholar knows that what stands in our translation as a command, " Search the scriptures," (ερευνατε τας γραφας) may with equal propriety be read in the indicative, thus,— " Ye search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me; and *yet* ye will not come unto me that ye may have life." Had Dr Milner known that this is a true and consistent translation of the words, he would no doubt have availed himself of it, seeing it is not a command to search the scriptures, but merely the admission of a fact that the Jews had a practice of doing so; and we know they had many bad practices. I expect the next generation of Popish authors will improve this hint; and they will probably put their argument in this form :—Christ did not command the people to search the scriptures, but *complained* of their doing so as a gross abuse of sacred things, which did not belong to them but to the priests.

In Christ's words to the Jews, there is the statement of a fact,—they searched the scriptures; and the reason of their doing so, was, that in them they thought they had eternal life. This was a cogent reason for their doing what they did; and on this account I prefer reading the words in the indicative; for the mere thinking a certain line of conduct right is not of itself a sufficient reason for commanding persons to follow it.* But Protestants lose nothing by conceding to the Papists this advantage, which they are too illiterate to find out for themselves; for though the words are not a command to search the scriptures, they prove that the people had a right to do so, which is enough for my present purpose.

Dr Milner, supposing the words to be in the imperative,† and not knowing how to relieve the Jews from the obligation of searching the scriptures, admits the propriety of *their* doing so; because the question was merely a question among Jews, or between Christ and the Jews; and for the decision of this he admits the propriety of searching the Jewish scriptures. Then surely for the decision of questions that rise among Christians it is proper to have recourse to the Christian scriptures, or the New Testament. This, however, Dr Milner will not admit; for they have the living voice of the church, which they are commanded to hear. Well; the Jews had the living voice of prophets during most of their existence as a nation; they had just had the living voice of John the Baptist; and now they had the living voice of Christ himself, which they were com-

* From Mr Grier's Reply, p. 61, I learn that Dr Milner has somewhere avowed his imperfect acquaintance with Greek.

* See Dr Campbell on the passage.

† Since writing the above I have looked into the Douay Bible, and I find the indicative reading of the passage mentioned in a note, though the imperative is retained in the text. Still it is probable few Papists know this, as they are not very familiar even with their own version.

manded by a voice from heaven to hear; and yet they exercised their right to search the scriptures. Suppose then, for the sake of argument, that the church had a living voice of equal authority, it would not deprive Christians of the right which Christ acknowledged and confirmed, by repeatedly in his discourses referring the people to the scriptures; and which was again confirmed by the apostolic commendation of the Bereans for searching them. But the truth is, the church has no living voice that can speak agreeably to scripture; and therefore it is that she wishes to silence the oracles of God, that her own authority may remain uncontrolled.

Dr Milner's answer *to* other texts are equally unsatisfactory; and I shall not put the reader's patience to the test of going over them all.

Among Dr Milner's "Objections Answered" we read as follows:—"Against the infallibility of the church in deciding questions of faith, I am referred to various other arguments made use of by Dr Porteous; and in the first place to the following:—'Romanists themselves own that men must use their eyes to find this guide; why then must they put them out to follow him?' I answer by the following comparisons. Every prudent man makes use of his reason to find out an able physician to take care of his health, and an able lawyer to secure his property; but, having found these to his full satisfaction, does he dispute with the former about the quality of medicines, or with the latter about forms of law? Thus the Catholic makes use of his reason to observe which, among the rival communions, is the church that Christ established and promised to remain with: having ascertained that, by the plain acknowledged marks which the church bears, he trusts his soul to her unerring judgment, in preference to his own fluctuating opinion," p. 125.

Here it is virtually admitted by Dr Milner, that when men have found this guide which he speaks of, they must put out their eyes, and follow him blindfold; for he does not disavow the principle which the objection implies, but explains and defends it: and this explanation suggests some very humbling and painful reflections. It is both painful and humbling to reflect, that, in this age of knowledge and general improvement, there should exist in England a man capable of seriously maintaining such absurd and slavish principles; and that this man is not a coal-heaver, a scavenger, or doer of night-work; but a Right Reverend Bishop, a D.D. and F.S.A., and a Vicar Apostolic, having spiritual oversight of all the Papists in the midland district of England. Titled, however, and distinguished as he is among the silly sheep of his own pasture, I am persuaded there is not a shepherd to be found upon the mountains of Scotland, who would not be ashamed to say in jest what Dr Milner advances as a solemn and conclusive argument.

This argument, or rather comparison, proceeds upon the assumption that the knowledge of religion is no more a matter of personal interest, than a knowledge of law and physic; and that it is just as proper to trust a priest with the care of souls, as a physician with the health of our bodies, or a lawyer with the security of our property. He affects not to know, or, perhaps rather, he really does not know, that proficiency in physic and law is attainable by only a few, and that at the expense of much labour, time, and money; while the gospel of the grace of God, which brings salvation to the guilty and the perishing, is brought down to the level of the meanest capacity, and presented to all men for acceptance, without money and without price; and for the purpose of their immediate personal enjoyment of its benefits, without the labour and expense of long preparatory study.

In civil society it is right to encourage and respect those who devote their lives to the study and practice of any useful art or science. Providence has so ordered matters, that what is called the division of labour obtains in civilized nations, without any studied effort to produce it. He who studies physic, becomes a skilful physician; he who studies the statutes, and the fundamental principles of jurisprudence, becomes an expert expounder of the law; and those who study the necessary manual arts, become expert tailors and shoemakers. One, who has not studied any of these arts or professions, may, very properly and rationally, trust one with the clothing of his feet; another with the covering of his back; one with the drawing of a tooth; and another with the drawing of his last will;—because all these are mere matters of this world, which no man is obliged to study or practise, unless he has chosen them as his profession. But the concerns of a man's soul,—the business of his personal salvation,—is what he cannot devolve upon another. This is a matter which every man must understand for himself. There is neither salvation nor damnation by proxy. The word of God addresses men as individuals:—"If *any man* will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me; and *him* that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out,"—are the gracious words of Christ addressed to men as individuals;—and to all men without distinction. It is with God himself directly that men have to do. It is Him that we have offended by our sins; it is He who has provided the remedy by sending the Saviour to die for us; it is He who says, "*whosoever* believeth in Him shall not perish but have everlasting life;" it is to Him that we must answer, each one for *himself*, for the reception which we give to this good news; and it is according to the reception which men

give to the gospel, that they are thus personally and pointedly addressed:—"If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for *thyself:* but if thou scornest, *thou alone* shalt bear it," Prov. ix. 12.

What horrible presumption and impiety is it, therefore, in Dr Milner, to teach his poor deluded flock, that they may safely trust their souls to the unerring judgment of the Church; that is, to such men as himself, for we all know, that by the church he means the priests? This indeed he confesses in the paragraph which immediately follows:—"Most likely the Catholic peasant learns the doctrine of the church from his parish priest; but then he knows that the doctrine of this priest must be conformable to that of his bishop, and that otherwise he will soon be called to account for it: he knows also that the doctrine of the bishop himself must be conformable to that of the other bishops and the Pope; and that it is a fundamental maxim with them all, never to admit of any tenet but such as is believed by all the bishops, and was believed by their predecessors, up to the apostles themselves." P. 126. What a variety of things this peasant must know!—more indeed than any man ever knew or will be able to prove while the world stands!—and yet he is not called to trouble himself about the knowledge of any thing; but to trust his soul to the unerring judgment of the church, in preference to his own fluctuating opinion. Suppose he were to endeavour to understand what he is here said to know about what his priest teaches,—which agrees with the bishop's teaching, which agrees with that of all the bishops, and with the Pope and his predecessors, up to the apostles,—he would find himself lost in an inextricable labyrinth; for where would he find information upon all these points? The longest term of human life would not be sufficient for the purpose;—while in one hour he might learn from the gospel all that is needful for the salvation of his soul:—

> "O how unlike the complex works of man
> Heaven's easy, artless, unincumber'd plan!"

Dr Milner *propounds* his doctrine as if there were no alternative between a man's implicitly trusting in the church, and following "his own fluctuating opinion." But the Christian follows or trusts in neither the one nor the other. His trust is in the word of God, and in the teaching of his Holy Spirit, who guides into all truth,—into the knowledge of all things necessary for the present comfort and eternal salvation of those who receive the divine testimony; to whom he gives an understanding to know him who is true, and to be in him who is true; even in his Son Jesus Christ; "this is the true God and eternal life."

But it must be inquired, how the Papist by his reason finds out "the church that Christ established, and promised to remain with?" It is by certain "plain acknowledged marks which the church bears," as Dr Milner tells us. Where are these marks to be found? This is rather a troublesome question; for, in order to give an answer, Papists are constrained to refer to the bible, in which they say, there are certain marks by which Christ's true church may be distinguished. This is true enough: but if a man read the bible carefully, and take the words in their plain grammatical meaning, he will not find one mark of the Church of Rome there, except under the character of an enemy and an Antichrist. It is as if conscious of this, that the Popish priests have such an abhorrence of bible-reading. If they believed that their religion was founded on the word of God, they would invite every man to search the scriptures for himself, and satisfy himself that theirs was the true religion. This is what all Protestants do; which is a *prima facie* evidence in their favour. Whether right or wrong, this indicates an honest persuasion that the word of God is on their side. But when the Church of Rome refers to the scriptures in support of her claims, and at the same time prohibits the free and general reading of them, it shows that she does not believe her own doctrine, but is conscious that she is deceiving the people.

After all, what is the use of the Church of Rome's referring to the bible, when she tells us that she is the sole judge of what the bible teaches?—that whatever a passage may seem to express, we must certainly mistake it, unless we understand it exactly as the church does? Since the ultimate appeal must always be to her judgment, we may as well take her word at once, without going to the bible; and this is, in fact, the very point she wishes to establish; and which she has established in the minds of her dutiful children. To speak of the bible at all, then, is no better than her other impositions. In her mouth a proof from the bible is proving a thing by itself; for it is her mouth that decides its meaning; and this is no evidence at all. Or, when she speaks of the bible as the word of God, she tells us that we know this only on her authority; and then she refers us to the bible to prove that she has such authority, which involves the absurdity of proving two unproved things by each other. The Church of Rome points out the true word of God; and the word of God points out her as the true church! which is a circuitous mode of arguing of which any child ought to be ashamed. Yet this is the main bulwark of Popery; and great divines, and learned cardinals, and holy fathers, are not ashamed to argue in this manner.

Dr Milner was perfectly aware that this mode of reasoning would be objected to; and he anticipates the objection, by telling us, that all such circles are not vicious, and that

mutual testimony is admissible. Thus John Baptist bore witness to Christ, and Christ bore witness to the Baptist. Yes: but neither of them was a stranger to the people. Had the Jews not known what sort of man John was, his testimony would have been of no weight in favour of Christ; and had they not known something of Christ's character, his testimony on behalf of John would have been of no value with them. But according to the Church of Rome, we know nothing of the bible but through her; and yet she says the bible certifies her to be the only true church, which is only her own certificate at second-hand. In a long note, Dr Milner, by means of similitudes, tries a further vindication of this mode of reasoning; but it will not do. I defy the whole order of Jesuits to reconcile it to common sense; and I am sure I could not reconcile the use of such an argument with common honesty.

No. CXCIV.

SATURDAY, March 30th, 1822.

I HAVE now gone over the first part of Dr Milner's work, which professes to expose the false rules, and establish the true Rule of faith. He thinks he has proved beyond contradiction that this true Rule is scripture and tradition, as propounded and explained by the Catholic Church; that is, the Church of Rome; and that all men ought to submit to her decision, with regard to what they are to believe, and what ordinances they are to observe, under pain of being held accursed as heathens and publicans. It has been my endeavour to show that his proofs are deficient, and his assumptions inadmissible, upon any principle of scripture or common sense; and how far I have succeeded, I leave to the reader to determine.

Dr Milner enters upon the second part of his work with the confidence and assurance, that the principles laid down in the first part are demonstrated by him, and admitted hy his correspondents; particularly, that they ought to hear the church; and James Brown, Esquire, in name of himself and brethren and sisters, is introduced as inquiring, whether they may not as well hear the Church of England as that of Rome. Dr Milner has convinced them that they must give up their own private judgment; that they must not presume to think for themselves what is the import of divine revelation; but leave all to the judgment of some church. Then he congratulates them on the "advance" which they have made "towards the clear sight of the whole truth of revelation;" and tells them that, now having taken the church of God for their guide, they have but one simple inquiry to make— *Which is this church?* which, he assures them, cannot be the Church of England. So it seems, the only way to come to a *clear sight* of a thing is to shut our eyes. I think I have heard that this is the way in which some apprentice boys are initiated into the mysteries of their craft. After going through certain ceremonies, they are told to shut their eyes and they will see such and such things; which appears a strange way of acquiring knowledge, and a very foolish way of becoming wise; but unless I had read Dr Milner's work, I could not have believed that a grave doctor and apostolic vicar would have ventured to publish to the world, that this is the right way to obtain a clear sight of the truths of divine revelation.

Dr Milner however admits that we may use our own eyesight till this one question be solved—Which is the true church? After that we have no more use for it. "Hence," says he, "it is as clear as noon day light, that by solving this one question—Which is the true church?—you will at once solve every question of religious controversy that ever has been, or that ever can be agitated. You will not need to spend your life in studying the sacred scriptures in their original languages, and their authentic copies, and in confronting passages with each other, from Genesis to Revelation,— a task by no means calculated, as is evident, for the bulk of mankind:—you will only have to hear what the church teaches upon the several articles of her faith, in order to know with certainty what God hath revealed concerning them. Neither need you hearken to contending sects, and doctors of the present or past times: you will need only to hear the church, which indeed Christ commands you to hear, under pain of being treated as a heathen or a publican, Matt. xviii. 17," p. 3. Part II.

If the reader will turn to the passage in the Gospel by Matthew here referred to, he will find that the command to hear the church relates not to any article of faith or worship; but merely to a matter of personal offence which one man may have given to another; and he who attends to the nature of the thing, will see that the church spoken of must be one which a man can speak to, as well as hear. But I need not repeat what has been so often said about Papists misrepresenting the meaning of this passage. There is not a word in the New Testament that implies a command to hear the church in Dr Milner's sense; and he is guilty of the profanity of wresting Christ's words from their connection, and applying them to a purpose which he did not intend by them. This is however so common with Popish writers, that perhaps he thinks there is no evil in it; though he would be grievously offended with any man who should make so free with his words.

After all, the decision of this one question, which is to settle all other questions, is no easy matter. It is indeed a greater undertaking than any method adopted by Protes-

tants for obtaining a knowledge of the truth. We search the scriptures; and we come to know and understand the doctrines of the gospel one by one, as they are presented to the mind; but the Popish method is, to endeavour to find out where these doctrines lie concealed in a heap, and to gulp them all at once. This requires no ordinary capacity; and it must be the effect of a mightier effort than comparing passages from Genesis to Revelation. If the bulk of mankind are incapable of this, as Dr Milner says, then his method is not calculated for men at all, but for beings of superior powers.

Dr Milner's Rule for settling all controversies by merely finding out which is the true church, reminds me of Mrs ———'s* rules for making hare soup. "First," says she, "catch a hare." Now this first step happens to be the most difficult in the whole process; and to the *bulk* of cook-maids it is prescribing no less than an impossibility. In like manner Dr Milner prescribes, as the first step, what is impossible to the bulk of mankind; that is, to find out such a true church as he describes; for there never was such a church in the world. I mean a visible, organized, holy, apostolical, and universal church; that is, a *holy* church embracing a world of *sinful creatures;* not sinners saved and sanctified; but sinners under the power of their evil passions; and, according to the doctrine of the church itself, so *unholy* as to die in a state that requires purgation in another world. There is a contradiction in the terms *holy* and *universal,* as applied to the church in this world; and it is only in heaven that they will be found applicable to one body.

Dr Milner himself must have been aware of the vast difficulty of settling his first question which is to decide all other questions; for he has written 170 large octavo pages of letter press on this one subject; and I am sure it is a more grievous task to study and understand all these, than to read and understand the holy scriptures. By reading a few pages of the New Testament a man soon comes to the knowledge of the truth by which he will be saved. But supposing him to take every step of Dr Milner's laborious process; and even supposing him to be successful in finding what he sought for, namely, the true church; he has not made one step towards the understanding of the saving truth; for he finds in this church nothing but a confused heap of dogmas, traditions, legends, rites, and ceremonies, which he is commanded to believe and observe, without any regard to his understanding of them; so that, as the fruit of all his labour, he finds himself the mere slave of an authority which he is not permitted to question.

Let us now attend to Dr Milner's marks of the true church, which he *propounds* rather pedantically, and in great capitals, as follows: —UNITY, SANCTITY, CATHOLICITY, and APOSTOLICITY. It is not my intention to reply to the whole 170 pages which he has written upon these four topics, because I have already discussed them all in some part or other of my work. I broadly deny that the Church of Rome possesses any one of these characters. She is neither united, nor holy, nor catholic, nor apostolical. She is as full of divisions as all the Protestant communions together; she is as full of impiety and impurity as any nation of infidels; she is not so catholic or universal as Heathenism; she possesses no more of the apostolic character than Simon Magus, or Elymas the sorcerer, did. To lead a proof upon all these points would be to repeat what I have proved already under different heads, which the reader will easily find by consulting the table of contents. But it may be useful to give a short condensed view of some points, which I shall endeavour to do in as small a space as possible.

One of the first things,—perhaps, the very first thing,—that constitutes union in a church, is, that all the members acknowledge the same head. Now, on this first point, there is more union among the hundred sects of Protestants than there is in the one Church of Rome. Protestants of every name, with one voice, acknowledge Jesus Christ alone as the Head of his church; and they acknowledge his authority alone in spiritual matters; that is, they will submit their consciences to no other. Even such national churches as acknowledge a head on earth, limit this headship to what is called the "state ecclesiastical," in which sense the king is head of the Church of England. He presides over the temporalities of it; but in matters purely spiritual, an English Episcopalian will maintain the exclusive headship of Christ as firmly as any other Protestant. But the Church of Rome claims to have a spiritual head on earth, which head she believes infallible; and her members submit their consciences in spiritual matters to his supreme authority.

Now, it is very surprising that Papists are not, and never were, agreed as to who this head is; and therefore they are destitute of the first principle of church unity. One party says, it is the Pope; a second makes it a general council; and a third says, it is neither the one nor the other, but both united. But it must be confessed, all parties are somewhat shy in giving an explicit opinion upon the subject. Like the Pharisees of whom Christ asked about the ministry of John,—"Was it from heaven, or of men?" who, perceiving that unpleasant consequences would follow a direct answer on either side, said, they could not tell; so Dr Milner evades the question relating to

* I forget the name of the good lady; but some of my readers will recollect in which of the cookery books this *Rule* is laid down.

the infallible head of the church. "Schoolmen," says he, "discuss some such points: but let me ask his lordship, (Dr Porteous) whether he finds any Catholic who denies or doubts that a general council, with the Pope at its head, or that the Pope himself, issuing a doctrinal decision, which is received by the great body of Catholic bishops, is secure from error? Most certainly not: and hence he may gather where all Catholics agree in lodging infallibility. In like manner, with respect to our national constitution, some lawyers hold that a royal proclamation, in such and such circumstances, has the force of a law; others, that a vote of the House of Lords or of Commons, or of both Houses together, has the same strength; but all subjects acknowledge that an Act of the King, Lords, and Commons, is binding upon them; and this suffices for all practical purposes." Part I. p. 130. The Church of Rome proves herself earthly by incessantly attempting to support herself by figures of earthly things; but the legs of such lame figures are never equal; and deductions of this kind from things worldly to things spiritual and heavenly, are seldom better than parables in the mouth of fools.

So far from telling us who is the infallible head of the Church of Rome, Dr Milner lets us know that he cannot tell. The schoolmen have differed about it; and "who shall decide when doctors disagree?" Hence he puts a question to Bishop Porteous, respecting his own knowledge of what Papists believe on the subject; from which "he *may gather* where all Catholics *agree* in lodging infallibility." And this must be nowhere; for all Catholics never agreed about it. Bishop Hay tells us more honestly, that the church has never decided who her infallible head is. He says, it is not a question in which faith is concerned; and that one may believe according as the reasons on each side preponderate. *Sincere Christ.* chap. xii. Q. 31. Then the Church of Rome is, of all churches in the world, the farthest from unity, seeing she is not agreed as to who is her infallible head. This renders her agreement or disagreement about other matters of no importance whatever.

"For all practical purposes," however, I admit that the bulk of Papists believe the Pope alone to be the infallible head of the church; for they can never know whether or not his doctrinal decisions are "received by the great body of Catholic bishops;" and therefore they have only himself to look to. This brings us back to the question of his supremacy, on which I shall give place to a correspondent, who adduces an argument against the supremacy, which I am sure the Church of Rome will never answer.

TO THE PROTESTANT.

"Sir,—You will highly gratify some of your friends by giving an early publication to the following argument against the supremacy of the Pope, which, as far as I know, is perfectly new. It is one of those numerous erudite exhibitions of talent which have lately been brought forward into public notice by an eminent lecturer * on scripture criticism of our city; and it deserves most particular regard from you in this period of your work, when you are exposing the fallacy of grounding any part of our Christian belief on the traditions of the Church of Rome. The question as now stated by themselves is not, Shall we reject all traditions, or all collateral aid from cotemporary authority, when we proceed to give the true sense of scripture?—for they admit that we do not thus reject traditionary evidence and assistance; but, Shall we advance their traditions to equal or superior authority with the scriptures themselves? The Papists do not venture to impugn the authority of scripture; what they contend for is, to place it on the same level with certain traditions, of which they say that their church has always been the repository; which traditions, they maintain, afford the genuine sense of scripture, and throw light on the whole economy of the Christian revelation. This is the amount of their position: now let us see how they make it out.

It is indispensably necessary for them to make out the supremacy and infallibility of the Papal chair, the oracle which decides concerning their traditions, and all their peculiar rites and doctrines; and in order to this, to deduce this supremacy and infallibility from the apostle Peter, whom our Saviour is held to have intrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and with the charge and custody of his people. This they must do; for if there be nowhere some supreme and infallible guide, who is visible to our eyes and palpable to all our senses, their oral communications must rest precisely on their own peculiar evidence, and reach no higher estimation than their intrinsic value carries along with them. The Pope's supremacy and infallibility, accordingly, form the corner stone of their system; and it is of such vital importance to it, that if it is not supported on its high, exalted, and pre-eminent place, the system itself must fall to the ground, like the arch when its keystone is removed. Indeed, if the civil and spiritual power of the Pope were deprived of these attributes, it would crumble into nothing, and along with it bring down the whole fabric of Papal delusion. Indeed, his supremacy is so essentially important to the existence of the system, that if once set aside and abandoned, there would not be one tongue to move in defence of these abominations and absurdities that have been palmed on the world under the name of legendary traditions.

Now the argument adduced by this truly

* The Rev. Mr Leech.

eminent critic against the supremacy of the Pope, as derived from the apostle Peter, is this:—St Peter, it is allowed on all hands, suffered martyrdom under the persecution of Nero, about the year of our Lord, 66. It is enough for us at present to assume, that the Papists, from what they hold to be infallible authority, receive this to have been the time of his death. We know, moreover, and scripture testifies the fact, that the beloved apostle John, to whom our blessed Redeemer committed the charge of his mother, lived about 40 years beyond this period, having, during his banishment under Domitian to Patmos, written the Apocalypse; and probably, at or near the same time, his gospel and epistles. Whence it appears, that this eminent apostle not only survived Peter many years, but was most actively and beneficially exercised during that period in the service of the church of Christ. A question thereupon occurs, How did it come to pass that this great apostle did not succeed to the supremacy of the church at the death of Peter, in place of Clement, or Linus, or Cletus, or Anacletus?—Why, seeing his fellow-labourer, with whom he so often and so frequently exerted himself side by side, was removed from the earthly state of things, did not John take up the mantle that was dropped from him, and exercise that supremacy and infallibility on which the main stress of Christian belief was in all ages to depend? Why was he to submit to Pope Clement, and Pope Linus, and Pope Cletus, in the great articles of supremacy and infallibility? Did his high apostolic authority, derived immediately and directly from our only Lord and Saviour, indeed succumb to these orderly supreme Pontiffs, or was there during his life an eclipse of the Papal power? Whatever answer may be attempted to these questions, one thing is most evidently and prominently certain, that the apostle John was eminently qualified to have exercised the great offices attributed to the successors of Peter; and if their offices were so necessary in the church, as Papists say they are, it is wonderful, it is unaccountable, how he should not have been appointed to exercise them, now that Peter was out of the way, and he so well prepared for discharging them with equal or superior influence.

But the force of the argument is not spent here. If it was necessary for the apostle John to submit to Pope Clement, or Pope Linus, why did he not manfully defend their authority, enforce the infallibility and supremacy of the new establishment, and give efficacy and force to its dictates by his apostolic power and authority, confirming the same by miracles, and illustrating its efficacy by the accompaniment of gifts and graces, conformably to the original destination of such power and authority? Most certainly such confirmation was much wanted, if Popedom was necessary to give influence to the whole progress of Christian belief. But does the holy apostle thus lend his name or authority to the Popedom and their system of traditions? Does he in his writings, received by all of us as the dictates of inspiration, take no interest in this new yet permanent accession to the Christian church? Does this wonderful establishment, which is to bear legal sway for so many ages, derive no adequate support from his pen, either in the way of reconciling men's minds and feelings to it, or through his stating circumstances to render it congruous with the Christian scheme as already promulgated? Have Papists any tradition to account for that entire neglect of, and disrespect for, their system of supremacy and infallibility which this scheme indicates? Alas! if they could but think and feel rationally, they would hide their faces with shame; for they are not only destitute of this holy apostle's support, but have his whole authority in full array against them.

As Papists now write and reason and appeal to scripture and to common sense in their defences, I will venture to push this whole argument one step farther. The apostle John affords us not only negative but positive proof against the supremacy and infallibility of the Popedom and its traditionary legends.

In the first place, he shows that the Christian faith gives light, and life, and joy;—that its essence is spiritual, and that it is independent of all earthly and secular considerations. Our Saviour's discourses, recorded by him,—his answer to Pilate, his frequent appeals to the spirituality of his kingdom, and to the gift of the Holy Ghost, whose influences are to renew and sanctify the soul, abstractly from all external objects;—these are delicate, but, to sincere lovers of the truth, cogent and irresistible reasonings against the Papacy, in as much as they attack its vital parts, while they allow its carcass to fall to pieces by its own weight. But the apostle proceeds further to depict the grand deceit then going on, or beginning to emerge. He uses the figure of a debauched woman, which he contradistinguishes from one whose love has been purified, and gives birth to the man child who is to rule the nations;—and he at the same time informs us in so many words, that this debauched woman is the Great City which rules over the earth, thereby furnishing us with an unerring clue to distinguish at once her seat and her character. . . . . J. E."

No. CXCV.

SATURDAY, April 6th, 1822.

It is one of the arts of the Romish church to claim for herself with the greatest confidence those good qualities of which she is most notoriously destitute. By bold assertion and incessant repetition she prevails upon her own members at least, to believe that she is what she calls herself, at the expense of refusing the evidence of their own senses. This applies to the article of her unity as well as that of her sanctity or holiness; for no man, who witnesses the evil practices of Papists, can, without discrediting his own senses, believe that she is a holy church; no more can any one, who knows her present state and ancient history, believe that she possesses the quality of union. This Dr Milner lays down as the first mark of the true church, and he challenges the possession of it for his church alone. Now, union by itself is no mark of a true church, for many confederacies of wicked men are very firmly united; for instance, the insurgents in Ireland seem to have but one heart and soul in carrying on their work of massacre and plunder. But, I admit that a church destitute of union is not a true church, at least not a church in a Christian-like state; and this applies to the Church of Rome above all other churches; for, as I showed in my last Number, she is not united in the acknowledgment of one head; and as for the members, they are no more united in sentiment or affection than any other portion of the human race, whether Heathen or Mahomedan.

A degree of union pervades all Protestant churches; I mean union in the acknowledgment of divine truth, and the observance of divine ordinances. This union is not dependent on the organization and connection of any number of congregations in one representative assembly, or under one Patriarch or Pope. In the New Testament we read of many churches which were not *so* united; and yet they were united in the sense in which church union ought always to exist. There was throughout them all, but one Lord, one faith, one baptism; and this is the case in most Protestant churches at this day;—I should say, in all who have any right to the name of Protestant: and this union appears not merely in their public creeds and formularies,—though it does appear there,—but in what I consider far more important, namely, the union of many thousands of individuals to Jesus Christ and to one another, as members of his body, by the belief of the gospel which is preached among them. Perhaps this cannot be credibly affirmed of all the members of any Protestant church; but among all the churches, "the Lord knoweth them that are his," and who are thus united to himself and to one another; and it is only union in this sense that is of any real permanent value.

In the churches planted by the apostles, I suppose the proportion of members so united to one another and to their common head, was much greater than it has ever been since in any church; and indeed, so far as appears, none were received, or allowed to continue members, who did not give credible evidence of being such; or if in some cases it was otherwise, the churches themselves were subjected to apostolic rebuke. This perhaps accounts for the fact, that these churches, though quite distinct assemblies, were all of one communion; and thus they were more united than Protestant churches are. This was because they were more united in love of the truth, and in affection to one another; not because they were all of one opinion in every thing that they could think and speak about; not because they all practised the very same things, for the Jews observed circumcision and other rites which the Gentiles did not.

If I shall be asked, why Protestant churches are not all of one communion, as the primitive churches were? I answer, without hesitation,—it is because there is a fault somewhere among them; and perhaps it is a fault that pervades them all. I am not like Papists obliged to defend my sect as infallible, at all hazards, and "against all *deadly*." It is one of the privileges arising out of the Reformation that no man is obliged to approve of all things even in the Reformation itself; but every man is at liberty to express his mind, and to point out errors and mistakes in his own brethren, without giving just cause of offence. I believe the principal reason why Protestants are not all of one communion is, because they have not followed out their own fundamental principle, of the bible, and the bible alone, as the religion of Protestants. When they have all done this, they will be all of one communion, as Christians were at first, without the necessity of being all of one mind about every thing, or all observing precisely the same things, any more than the primitive churches were; and yet they may aproach more nearly to union even in these things than the primitive Christians did, when things indifferent are left as the apostles left those things in which the kingdom of heaven does not consist. The best way to attain union on these points, is, to let their comparative unimportance be on all hands admitted. People will then cease to dispute about them; and controversies among serious Christians will cease from want of matter to dispute about.

But, without being yet all of one communion, it is a fact, that Protestants are more united in their confession of Christian doctrine than Papists are. In other words, there is more variety and contrariety in the doctrines maintained by different orders within the

Church of Rome, than there is among all Protestant sects. For the truth of this assertion I have only to refer to the furious controversies between the Dominicans and Franciscans;—the Jesuits and the Jansenists. I need not go into particulars; for the fact is known to every reader of church history; and surely it is more unseemly for the church that professes to be one holy and united body, to have such feuds within its bosom, than for Protestant churches to have controversies while they do not pretend to be so united.

I have adverted to the fact, that, in their creeds and public formularies, Protestant churches are agreed in the leading articles of Christian doctrine; so much so, that a work has been published, and is extant in two thick volumes, containing a collection of Confessions, in which it is proved by the documents themselves, that the faith of the reformed churches, in different nations, is fundamentally and substantially the same, so far as relates to the Christian doctrine, or the way by which a sinner is saved, and taught to live to the glory of God, with the hope of happiness in his presence for ever. This is the sum and substance of Christian knowledge. In this Protestants are agreed. There is therefore more unity in their different communions, than there is in the Church of Rome in her one communion; for on these fundamental points, the canons of councils and decrees of Popes are so discordant, that the poor people do not know whether they are to be saved wholly by Christ, or partly by themselves, and by the merits of saints; and whether Christ has satisfied divine justice for them, or whether they must not satisfy for themselves, either in this world or in purgatory. Now she teaches one thing, and then another; and after all, it turns out that she teaches nothing that can be depended upon; for every man is bound to receive all doctrines from the lips of his priest, though he should know him to be a man neither wiser nor better than himself.

I shall be told that the creeds and formularies of churches are not a criterion by which we can ascertain the present state of religious belief; because in some instances a change has tacitly been effected, like that in the Church of Geneva, as I mentioned in a late Number. This is true as regards individuals in some Protestant churches; but I believe there is, notwithstanding this fact, as much agreement among Protestants as ever there was;—I mean among Protestants who read the scriptures, who think for themselves, and who have received the love of the truth; and it is only the agreement of such that is worthy of the name of Christian union. For the truth of this I have only one humble document to refer to; and perhaps the evidence of it is the stronger, that it never pretended to be, and was never understood by any man to be, an exhibition of the religious belief of any one sect of Protestants;—I mean this same work entitled, THE PROTESTANT. To my certain knowledge it is read and approved of by not a few of the established church in England and Ireland, including some of the hierarchy; and by many more of the Church of Scotland. Among Presbyterian dissenters of all denominations it is generally read and approved; and Independents and Baptists of various classes regard me as a friend, and approve of my sentiments upon the whole, though I have made no account of their distinctive peculiarities. I have not pleaded the cause of any one of these sects; and I do not suppose that every sentiment which I have expressed is approved by all or any of them; but so far as I know, I have not written a sentence which any of them regard as fundamentally erroneous, or inconsistent with the doctrine that Christ and his apostles taught.* Nay, from individuals of all these communions I have letters positively expressing approbation of the principles which I have been maintaining throughout my work; which proves the fact, that thinking religious Protestants are more united in religious belief than they know themselves to be; and the fact leads me to infer, that if serious Christians of all denominations were to meet on the neutral ground of the bible alone, they would find that there was scarcely any difference of sentiment among them.

And I strongly suspect they will ere long find it necessary to meet on this common ground, for mutual defence against the common enemy. Popery is making more rapid strides towards ascendency than most people are aware of. Witness the laborious efforts of the Jesuits in France, under the name of Missionaries, for they have assumed this as a more popular designation, and less liable to excite suspicion than the odious, and, for a time, proscribed, name of Jesuit. Witness also the present Popish rebellion in the south of Ireland. I call it Popish, for not a single Protestant has appeared active in the horrid transactions of the last six months. The Dublin newspaper, "The Antidote," lately published a challenge to the world to name one Protestant who had been implicated, and they have heard of not so much as one. This rebellion will no doubt be put down. The empire is too powerful, and happily too much united to suffer the enemy to prevail; but when it is put down, Catholic emancipation will be again brought forward, and urged as

* It is right to mention here, that I have two correspondents who complain that I have erred exceedingly:—one, because I deny the right of the civil magistrate to punish idolatry; the other, because I admit the lawfulness of eating blood and things strangled, at least have shown a leaning to that side of the question;—but I do not know to what sect either of my correspondents belongs. This, so far as I know, is the sum total of my delinquencies in the esteem of Protestants.

the most effectual means of preventing the recurrence of such outrages. If we may form an opinion from what we hear drop from gentlemen in many companies, and from what is boldly advanced by some of the most popular conductors of the public press, the bait will take. To please the Papists, seeing nothing else will please them, we must break down every barrier that prevents them from acquiring ascendency in Ireland at least: and so, just from a fear of being murdered by them, we will admit them to such power in the state, that it will be at their own discretion whether death, or banishment, or conversion, shall be the lot of all the Protestants in the kingdom.

With such things in prospect,—and what man who studies the signs of the times will say there is not a prospect of such things?—every Protestant ought to be ready to unite with every other, for common defence. I am not recommending an armament for the purpose of defence in a military conflict; but the union of all sound Protestants for the defence of the truth in opposition to error, by prayer to God, by propagating the gospel, by education, and circulating every kind of useful knowledge. These are weapons by which the reign of darkness must fall;—by which men will by degrees be withdrawn from the ranks of Popery; and by means of which the system will ultimately be overthrown.

On this subject I am happy to have the concurrence of an author of the first eminence, namely, Dr Owen, in a small tract, republished in the present year, by the Bishop of St David's, and by him dedicated to Mr Wilberforce, and strongly recommended to the attention of that eminent philanthropist, whose great and amiable mind is strangely warped on the subject of Catholic emancipation. This tract was written a short time before the Revolution, when there was a great tendency towards Popery; and the following is suggested as one of the means for preserving the Protestant religion:—"It is also necessary hereunto, that all those who sincerely own this religion, and make it the rule of their living unto God, in hopes of the eternal enjoyment of him in another world, do depose the consideration of the lesser differences amongst themselves, and *unite in one common design and interest to oppose the entrances and growth of Popery among us.* And it is an hard thing to persuade rational men, that they are in earnest for its opposition and exclusion, who are not willing so to do." *A Brief and Impartial Account of the Nature of the Protestant Religion, its present State in the world, its Strength and Weakness,* &c. *By John Owen, D. D.*

Having had the vanity or presumption, call it what you will, to adduce my own work as an evidence of union of sentiment among Protestants, I shall, by way of balancing accounts, adduce the work of my great opponent, as an evidence of the disunion and discord that exist among Papists. I began to write upon my own sole responsibility; and it would not have been surprising if, instead of being generally approved by all sects of Protestants, I had provoked the hostility of all; for this has happened to some authors of great zeal and acuteness, in consequence of their confining their views to some narrow sectarian point. But Mr Andrews, the Catholic Vindicator, was chosen and deputed by persons of his own body, as one qualified to advocate the cause of Popery, and to write down THE PROTESTANT. They had good reason for their choice, for he was highly commended by Dr Milner, whose patronage he seemed to enjoy, and who certifies the orthodoxy and general excellence of some of his writings, particularly his school book. Surely then it might have been expected that all Papists would approve the sentiments of such a writer. But what was the fact? Bishop Cameron declared upon oath, that his writings were not approved by the more respectable of his brethren in Scotland; and as for the bishop's own opinion, he declares he approved "of nothing from that man." He declares also his conviction that Mr Scott did not approve of his writings; and yet it is proved on oath that he exhorted his people in his chapel to buy them. Next, Mr Andrews is introduced as deponing that Mr Scott, as he was informed, first approved and afterwards disapproved of his work; and further that it "*was* approved by respectable English Catholics," but not "encouraged, as it did not succeed." See *Jury Trial,* &c. Among other sects there would be no importance attached to these differences of opinion about any human writings; but in the Church of Rome they are of importance as showing that she does not possess the union to which she pretends. There the faith of one is declared to be the faith of all; and Dr Milner challenges us to go to the Royal Exchange in London, and examine Catholics from the four points of the compass, assuring us that they will all confess the same things,—so perfectly is the Church of Rome agreed about every article of faith. But from the instance which I have given, it is certain that at home they are not agreed; and they cannot get out of this dilemma, as they usually do in such cases, by asserting that the controversy was not about articles of faith; for such indeed it was; and Mr Andrews wrote at great length about Transubstantiation and other articles equally important.

The above facts, trifling as they appear, cut deep into Dr Milner's system; for he tells us that the common people receive their religion from their parish priest, knowing that his doctrine must agree with that of his bishop, which must agree with that of all the other bishops. But here incidently we have Bishop Cameron,

diocesan of the lowlands of Scotland, and Bishop Milner, vicar apostolic of the midland district of England, directly pitted against each other in reference to another work. Bishop Milner approves, and strongly recommends, the system of religious instruction contained in Mr Andrews' school book, and Bishop Cameron swears that he approves of NOTHING *from that man.* Then certainly these two bishops are not agreed; most probably the priests under them are also divided; indeed they must be so, seeing every priest is accountable to his bishop for the doctrine he teaches; and what are the poor people to do all this while? How can they know which is the true doctrine of the church? The fact is, they do not, and cannot know any of the matter from the teaching of such guides. The blind lead the blind, and both must fall into the ditch.

But, leaving these local and petty squabbles to be settled between our Scottish and English bishops at their leisure, I remark that the Church of Rome, viewed as a whole, so far from being the most united, is the most schismatical church on the face of the earth. Schism is not the separation of one church from the communion of another, but the creation and maintaining of parties in the same church. The most schismatical church mentioned in the New Testament, was that in Corinth. There was nothing there that in modern language would be called dissent or separation; but Paul tells them that there were divisions (*σχισματα*, that is, schisms) among them. Now these schisms consisted in this;—One said, I am of Paul; another, I of Apollos; another, I of Cephas; and another, I of Christ, 1 Cor. i. 11, 12. The last party was as bad as any, for it was making Christ the head of a party *among Christians,* and in opposition to his own faithful apostles. Now, the practice which the apostle condemns in the Corinthian church has prevailed in the Church of Rome for many centuries, with the concurrence of Popes and councils, and it continues in full operation to this day:—One says, I am of Benedict; another, I am of Francis; another, I am of Dominick; and another, I am of Jesus;—and the last is the most wicked of the whole, that is, the Jesuits. These holy fraternities vilify and condemn one another; and when the medicants of different orders used to meet on a begging expedition, they would hold a pitched battle, like as many wild Irishmen on a holiday, of which some edifying examples are to be found, I think in Godwin's Life of Chaucer. This is an example of schism in the true sense of the word; and as nothing like this exists in Protestant churches, we are entitled to call the Church of Rome the only schismatical church in the western world. I challenge Dr Milner to reply to this statement.

But I have a still heavier charge against the Church of Rome on account of her many divisions. The very head has often been divided against itself. There have been Popes and Anti-popes; and in one age there were three living and reigning at one time, presiding over "Catholic unity;" and at the same time cursing, excommunicating, and actually levying war against one another. One schism of this sort lasted no less than fifty years. The rival Popes each created cardinals, and performed all the other functions, which, according to the doctrine of their own church, could be done by only one man,—the successor of St Peter. One of these Popes must necessarily have been a usurper, and every spiritual function conferred by him must have been null and void. All the bishops and priests consecrated and ordained by his authority were mere laymen; and all that they and their successors have ordained down to the present day are no more; for Dr Milner himself will allow that no man can canonically and validly communicate spiritual faculties which he has not himself canonically received from the real head of the church. Now, it has never yet been ascertained which of the rival Popes under each schism was the genuine vicar of Christ; and therefore no priest living can be sure that his faculties are good, and lawfully come by. It is ten to one, that Pius VII. himself is come of some false line; and if so, all the Popish clergy in the world are reduced to the rank of mere laymen. I defy any one of them to prove that his ordination is legitimate. I hold it therefore demonstrated, that by the schism of her rival Popes, according to her own doctrine, the Church of Rome was guilty of suicide. Since that event she has been only the ghost of a united church; and it requires no ordinary portion of impudence in such men as Bossuet and Dr Milner to accuse Protestants of divisions and variations, when their own church, still boasting of infallibility, is riven from head to foot, exhibiting nothing but a confused chaos of rude materials, none of which can be proved ever to have been connected with an undoubted successor of saint Peter.

No. CXCVI.

SATURDAY, APRIL 13TH, 1822.

DR MILNER'S second mark of the true church is sanctity or holiness. The only dispute I have with him on this point is, that, instead of the *second,* I would call it the *first* and the *last,* and the *only decisive* mark of a true church. He cites the words of Paul to the Ephesians in support of his proposition; and I cite the same words in support of mine:—"Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water by the word; that

he might present it to himself, a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish," chap. v. verses 25—27. If Dr Milner could show that this is descriptive of the Church of Rome, the controversy would be at an end; and it would be the duty of all men to join themselves to her. But he does not so much as attempt to show that she is the church here described. He takes it for granted, indeed; and does not seem to think it requires any proof. He never knew or heard of any other true church. He has had his mind preoccupied from infancy with only one idea of the word, "church;" that is, of a worldly, visible society, owning spiritual subjection to his lord, the Pope of Rome. Higher than this his mind cannot rise; beyond this it cannot expand; and it is just as impervious to spiritual illumination on the subject, as the eyeballs of the blind are to the light of the sun. I have heard of a blind man who said he understood the colour of scarlet to be like the sound of a trumpet. If this had got possession of his mind, it would be impossible for all the colour makers and opticians in the world to convey to him a more correct idea of scarlet colour; so he whose mind is preoccupied by the Popish notion of the church, cannot comprehend what is meant by the apostle in the passage above quoted.

This church consists of all the redeemed from among men, of every kindred, nation, and language;—of all who have died in the faith of Christ, who are described as the spirits of just men made perfect; and of all who are now living in the same faith, and are followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. This church is holy;—the former branch of it perfectly so;—the latter only in part,—but following on towards perfection. This heavenly united society has a representation, but a very imperfect one, in a visible Christian church in which God's word is preached and believed, and his commandments obeyed; and wherever I find such a society, I call it *a* church of Christ, not THE church, for the definite article has nothing to do in this connection, except as distinguishing between a church in one place, and one in another place, —as the church in Jerusalem, the church in Antioch, &c.

Every such church is, or ought to be, holy; not merely as respects the belief of sound doctrine, though I hold this to be indispensable; but also in the religious and moral character of its members. This I take to be the only decisive mark of a true church;—that its members be holy men; that is, men who, believing the gospel, are taught under its influence, to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in the present world. Without this, a church may have a creed as orthodox as the twelve apostles could make it, and yet be no better than a synagogue of Satan. What is true of individuals, is also true of communities: —"If *any man* have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" from which the inference is unavoidable, that a church composed of men who have not the Spirit of Christ, cannot be a church of his; and this, as I shall show by and by, cuts off the Church of Rome from all pretension to be *a* church; much more from being *the* only church of Christ.

Churches in old times were addressed as saints and faithful in Christ Jesus; and that this was not the language of compliment, but really descriptive of their character, is certain from its being written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost. These churches were composed of men and women who had been unbelieving Jews or idolatrous heathens, and addicted to many wicked practices; but when they received the gospel, they forsook their sins, and became holy persons, that is, saints. Paul addressing the Christians in Corinth, gives a description of very great sinners; and adds, "Such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God," 1 Cor. vi. 9—11. The best of them were but imperfectly sanctified, for perfection in this sense is reserved for the next world, and one at least turned out so very wicked, that they were commanded to put him away; but upon the whole their prevailing character was that of "sanctified in Christ Jesus, and called to be saints," 1 Cor. i. 2. And surely no man will deny that churches ought to be so still. It is only in so far as they are so, that they are obedient to the will of God, and so far as they are otherwise, they approach towards Antichrist.

It was a very wicked fancy that began early to prevail, that the word "saint" applied only to great and distinguished individuals in the churches, such as apostles and evangelists. This idea soon became universal, and all the churches experienced the evil influence of it; for it was no longer reckoned necessary that all the members of churches should be holy men, or give credible evidence of being such. Multitudes were received into fellowship who had not abandoned their heathen principles or wicked practices. Then it became necessary to accommodate both the worship and the language of Christians to the taste of such persons, and unnecessary that all Christians should be holy men; it was enough that they had a saint or two in a century, such as *saint* Cyprian, *saint* Jerome, and *saint* Augustin; and it is a fact, that Dr Milner does not so much as attempt to prove the holiness of the Church of Rome from the character of its members as a body; but only from her having such saints as the above to boast of, along with her holy creeds, and her holy sacraments.

This is the sum total of the sanctity that the "holy Catholic Church" pretends to. In her vocabulary such words as these have no meaning;—"Without holiness," that is, without being a *saint*, "NO MAN shall see the Lord." And this also condemns the impiety of those nominal Protestants with whom the word saint is a term of reproach.

But it is time to attend to Dr Milner's own statement:

"The comparison," says he, "which I am going to institute between the Catholic Church and the leading Protestant societies in the article of sanctity or holiness, will be made on these four heads: first, the *doctrine* of holiness; secondly, the *means* of holiness; thirdly, the *fruits* of holiness; and lastly, the *divine testimony* of holiness." Then he proceeds as follows, to show how unholy Protestant churches are in respect of doctrine; and I am sure no Protestant church in the world will recognize its own faith in the representation. "To consider, first, the doctrine of the chief Protestant communions: this is well known to have been originally grounded in the pernicious and impious principles, that God is the author and necessitating cause, as well as the everlasting punisher, of sin;—that man has no free will to avoid sin; and that justification and salvation are the effects of an enthusiastic *persuasion* under the name of *faith*, that the person is actually justified and saved without any real belief in the revealed truths; without hope, charity, repentance for sin, benevolence to our fellow-creatures, loyalty to our king and country, or any other virtues; all which were censured by the first Reformers, as they are by the strict Methodists still, under the name of works, and by many of them declared to be even hurtful to salvation." *Letter XIX.*

The reader will probably pause here with astonishment, and inquire within himself, what sort of monsters are these which he is reading about? and, looking back to the beginning of the extract, he will find that they are "the chief Protestant communions;" namely, the churches of England and Scotland, the Lutherans of Germany, and the Calvinists of France and Geneva; and he will find himself constrained to exclaim, that such a piece of barefaced literary villany was never imposed upon the world. Dr Milner himself is not such a dolt as not to know that the above representation is false throughout, and therefore though he could prove that all the rest of his church were as holy as the virgin Mary, the leaven of his wilful misrepresentation and falsehood would contaminate the whole mass, unless he were immediately excommunicated. Truly that must be *a holy* church that requires for her defence such wicked and abominable artifice!

The means which he has taken to establish the truth of his shocking accusation, are no less absurd and impudent than the accusation itself. The charge is laid against the chief Protestant *communions*, or churches. Does he then go to the Confessions, Articles, and public Formularies of these communions to show what they really professed to believe? No such thing. I have gone over all his quotations and references, to the number of about thirty, and there is not the least allusion to the Confession of any Reformed church except one general reference to some of the articles of the Church of England; but he takes care not to give the words, lest the reader should see that they do not bear him out in his charges, and thus detect the imposition. He satisfies himself with detached and distorted scraps, or parts of sentences, from the writings of individuals, such as Luther and Calvin, for which no church is responsible; and which therefore it is not worth while to analyze. It was the misfortune of Luther that he began to write books before his own mind was much enlightened upon some abstruse points; and it is no wonder that in such circumstances he often expressed himself foolishly and rashly. Yet I have no doubt, if the shreds of sentences which Dr Milner has quoted with so much triumph, were restored to their places in the original works and read in their connection, much of that which is revolting in them would disappear.

Calvin wrote with more consideration and precision than Luther; and though I am no more interested in defending him than the other, I shall show by one instance how he is abused by a garbled quotation. "Calvin says," says Dr Milner, "Calvin says, 'God requires nothing of us but faith; he asks nothing of us but that we believe,' Calv. in Joan. vi. Rom. i. Gal. ii." I have not Calvin's works at hand, and though I had, I would not think it worth while to turn to the passages; for I am very sure that he must be speaking of justification; and that in order to this, God requires nothing but faith, which is the bible doctrine, let Papists say what they will. But Dr Milner, by giving these words detached from their connection, wishes his readers to understand, that Calvin teaches, that God requires no other obedience whatever but believing, which I am persuaded this reformer never taught, though I do not profess to be intimately acquainted with his ponderous and multifarious writings.

Dr Milner's object in these mutilated extracts from Luther, Calvin, and others, is to make it appear, that they were enemies of good works, and wrote against them; and thence he infers the unholy character of the Protestant religion. If these writers had been enemies of good works, their error would not have attached to churches or individuals, who never professed to believe in them, and who never wished to be called by their names.

But in point of fact, both Luther and Calvin maintained the necessity of good works, more strongly than any Papist can do upon his principles; and of this Dr Milner himself furnishes abundant evidence, by quoting the words of these reformers, in which they deplore in the most feeling manner the sins which they knew to be practised by many who professed to be reformed from Popery; which does not indicate that they were lovers of sin and enemies of righteousness. The fact is, neither Luther, nor Calvin, nor any other author whom Protestants acknowledge, will be found to write against good works, except as entering into the ground or meritorious cause of our justification. In this view it is admitted, that all works but the work of Christ, are condemned by consistent Protestants; and they were also condemned by Christ's own ambassadors, when they declared, that, by the works of the law no flesh could be justified. There were never more strenuous advocates for the necessity of good works than they were; but they would not put them in the place of the Saviour. It was the same with Luther, and Calvin, and other reformers; and this is the head and front of their offence. They knocked on the head, and exposed to the scorn of the world, the Popish doctrine of the merit of works; and under the shame of this exposure, the Church of Rome has no resource but to make them appear the enemies of good works; just as the Pharisees of old could find nothing against Christ, but by inferring from the fact of his being the friend of publicans and sinners, that he must have been a sinner.

Dr Milner is charitable enough to admit, that modern Protestants have in general abandoned the impious doctrines taught by the Reformers; and that a "tacit reformation," like that in Geneva, has taken place in most or all of the Protestant churches. Then he should withdraw his accusation of the unholiness of their doctrines. But instead of this, he will have it to be unholy still. He will have us to be believers in an unholy creed, though he represents us all as Socinians, who are as far removed as himself from what he calls the impious doctrine of justification by faith. "After all," says he, "the first and most sacred branch of holy doctrine consists in those articles which God has been pleased to reveal concerning his own divine nature and operations, namely, the articles of the unity and trinity of the Deity, and of the incarnation, death, and atonement of the consubstantial Son of God. It is admitted that these mysteries have been abandoned by the Protestants of Geneva, Holland, and Germany. With respect to Scotland, a well informed writer says,—'It is certain that Scotland, like Geneva, has run from high Calvinism, to almost as high Arianism or Socinianism; the exceptions, especially in the cities, are few.' It will be gathered from many passages, which I have cited in my former letters, how widely extended, throughout the established church, is that *tacit reform*, which a learned professor of its theology signifies to be the same thing with Socinianism. A judgment may also be formed of the prevalence of this system, by the Act of July twenty-first, 1813, exempting the professors of it from the penalties to which they were before subject." *Letter XIX.* p. 42.

Though not directly bearing upon the present subject, I remark in passing, that the repeal of the act that made it a crime against the state to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, is understood by Dr Milner as indicating a general leaning towards Socinianism, which consists in the denial of that doctrine, and such other doctrines as are dependent upon it. The inference is very absurd as well as untrue; for seeing the Socinians, with all their errors and absurdities, do not own subjection of any kind to a foreign power, the most orthodox statesman could consent to the repeal of a statute against them, without compromising his own religious principles, or endangering the peace of the country. But it is of importance here to notice in what light Papists view things, especially such a distinguished pillar of the Romish church as Dr Milner doubtless is. It seems the repeal of the statute against the Socinians, indicates a general tendency of the people towards Socinianism. Then it follows, that the late repeal of the penal statutes against Popery indicates a tendency towards Popery; and if the statutes which remain, and which exclude Papists from political power, shall be repealed, then it will prove, not merely a tendency, but that the nation is very far gone towards Popery. I leave the advocates of "Catholic Emancipation" to make the best of this disclosure. When "Emancipation" shall be conceded, it will be considered by Papists as a proof that the nation has become Popish; for they feel within themselves that they would not make such a concession upon any other principle than conversion, or a prospect of conversion to the faith of Rome; and therefore, they can have no idea of concession being made to them, but upon the supposition that we are about to adopt their religion. When this shall take place, how much will their zeal for making proselytes be increased! They will then go into every cabin and cottage, and tell the poor people, that the king and parliament are about to avow their conversion to Popery; and this information, connected with what will then be the notorious fact, that Papists are going into parliament and other places of power, will make more converts than either the arts or the eloquence of the priests could ever make.

What Dr Milner has quoted from a "*well informed writer*," whose name however he conceals, respecting the Socinianism of the

Church of Scotland, reminds me of the assertion of a late French traveller, who passed through this country,—who has made a book of his travels, and who gravely tells his readers, that in Scotland the *ladies* generally go without stockings and shoes. Every man who trusts his own eyes knows it to be an impudent falsehood; but it is not more impudent than the assertion of Dr Milner's "well informed" writer, that our clergy or even our people have run into Socinianism, and that the "exceptions, especially in the cities, are few." I believe there is no country in what is called Christendom more free of this leaven than Scotland is. Within my own recollection there have been only two ministers of the Church of Scotland who publicly avowed Socinian sentiments. One of them, on the remonstrances of his brethren, and perhaps in order to retain his living, made a public recantation, such as it was. The other, being less notorious, and being understood to be in a state of dotage, was not called upon to recant, though he outlived his younger colleague many years. With him died the Socinianism of the Church of Scotland, so far as appears from the acknowledged writings of any of its ministers; and but for the inroads of two or three zealots, chiefly from England, who call themselves rational dissenters, the name would scarcely have been remembered in this part of the world. For any thing I know, there may be individuals, and even ministers in the Church of Scotland, who privately hold Socinian sentiments, and who even preach them in a covert way, where there is no danger of detection; but I am persuaded the proportion of such among our respectable ministers will not be found greater than the proportion of our *ladies* who do not wear shoes and stockings. The people of Scotland with shame must admit the fact, that elegant young females, with all the signs of ladyship that dress can give, from the head to the ancles, are sometimes seen upon our public roads walking "barefoot." They are not *ladies*, however, in the received meaning of the term; and would not, with their *nudity of understandings*, be received into the company of ladies. No more would an avowed Socinian, if such were to appear among us, be acknowledged a true minister of the Church of Scotland, or hailed as a brother by truly respectable sons.

Amidst the charges which Dr Milner brings against Protestants on account of unholy doctrine, he does not, so far as I recollect, accuse the Reformers of being more wicked in their own conduct than their neighbours were. Most Popish writers have done so; and all such have been detected in falsehood. Dr Milner, no doubt aware of this, forbears direct assertion, and has recourse to sly insinuation. Thus, when speaking of Luther and his friends, he usually throws in a qualifying expression, calculated to make them appear gay men of the world; that is, *good livers*, not in the Christian, but in the libertine sense of the words. "Luther and his *bottle companion* Amsdorf," are favourite expressions of his; but he has not adduced a particle of evidence, or stated a single circumstance by which it appears that these persons were given to excess in any respect whatever. He refers indeed to another work of his, in which, he says, he has described the wicked lives of the Reformers. But this work I have not seen; and if I had, I suppose I would find no more in it than what the Catholic Vindicator and Amicus Veritatis have written, the falsehood of which I have already exposed.

No. CXCVII.

SATURDAY, APRIL 20TH, 1822.

DR MILNER, having occupied a number of pages in describing the *unholiness* of the Protestant doctrine, comes at last to describe the holiness of the doctrine of his church; which he does as follows:—"If this was once *holy*, namely, in the apostolic age, it is holy still; because the church never changes her doctrine, nor suffers any person in her communion to change it, or to question any part of it. Hence the adorable mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, &c. taught by Christ and his apostles, and defined by the four first general councils, are now as firmly believed by every real Catholic, throughout her whole communion, as they were when those councils were held. Concerning the article of man's justification, so far from holding the impious and absurd doctrines imputed to her by her unnatural children, (who sought for a pretext to desert from her) she rejects, she condemns she anathematizes them! It is then false, and notoriously false, that Catholics believe, or in any age did believe, that they could justify themselves by their own proper merits;—or that they can do the least good, in the order of salvation, without the grace of God, merited for them by Jesus Christ; or that we can deserve this grace, by any thing we have the power of doing;—or that leave to commit sin, or even the pardon of any sin, which has been committed, can be purchased by any person whomsoever;—or that the essence of religion and our hopes of salvation consist in forms and ceremonies, or in any other exterior things." *Letter XIX.* p. 43.

The above is Dr Milner's exposition of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as opposed to that of Protestant churches. She holds, it seems, "the adorable mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, *et cetera*;" and he wishes his readers to understand that Protestants do not

hold these mysteries; for no other reason can be given why he presents them by way of contrast with the Protestant doctrine. This is another instance of barefaced imposition, as he knows very well. On the subject of justification he labours hard to express himself as much in the style of Protestants as he possibly can, in order to make it appear that Papists do not trust in their own merits; and to make the difference between his doctrine and that of Protestants, upon a fundamental point, appear very trifling. But the idiom of Ashdod is distinctly perceived in his feeble attempt to speak the language of Canaan. He seems as if he would renounce the error of justification by works; but his mode of expression is so perplexed and equivocal, that it may convey to the mind of a Papist the very thing which he professes to renounce; indeed, he himself must understand the words in a sense which admits of justification by works, else he runs into what he calls the pernicious and impious error of justification by faith, or justification by some other medium which he does not name. I take it for granted, however, that there are only two methods by which men expect to be justified; namely, faith and works. The former was maintained by Luther and Calvin, and all the reformed churches; and it is condemned by Dr Milner as a most impious doctrine, and hostile to all good works. Then he must hold the other doctrine, that justification or salvation is, in some sense, by works, or by men's own merits, which is the doctrine of the Church of Rome; and his attempt to deny it by a few equivocal expressions, is only another instance of Jesuitical trickery, intended to deceive the simple.

After all their abuse of the Protestant doctrine, we sometimes find Popish writers labouring to make it appear that there is no great difference between their faith and ours. This is the case with Dr Milner. He states *as Protestant doctrines* certain absurdities which he knows we do not believe; and having, as he thinks, refuted these, he gives what he takes to be Protestant doctrine as correctly as *he* can express it; and then he tells us that this is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and that she condemns and anathematizes the contrary. This is indeed one of the arts by means of which Popish priests are continually endeavouring to make proselytes; and those who are ignorant of all religion, are easily imposed upon by a few equivocal expressions, to believe that the Protestant and Popish belief are nearly, if not precisely, the same. I do not know a better answer to such a misrepresentation, than that which was made by a French peasant, a late convert from Popery, in consequence of his reading the scriptures, as related by a French gentleman at a public meeting here. "Why did you change your religion?" said a Papist to the young convert, "there is no great difference between the Catholic and the Protestant." "Only this difference," said the other, "you worship the God that the priest makes,—we worship the God that made the priest."

Dr Milner however shows, that he cannot state either the Protestant faith or his own, without grossly blundering. He speaks of the grace of God as *merited* for us by Jesus Christ, which is a great and fundamental error, as I suppose the more intelligent divines of his own church, if there be any more intelligent among them, will condemn as well as any Protestant. To say that the grace of God was *merited* for us even by Jesus Christ, is to be guilty of the impiety of denying that God is in himself gracious. It is to represent God the Father as all austerity and rigour, and requiring the interposition of the Son to move him to grace and compassion. Now we know from scripture, that the Father is in himself infinitely gracious and merciful. He needed no intercession to make him so; but because he was full of mercy, He provided a Saviour for us. It was He who said, "Deliver from going down to the pit, for I have found a ransom." "God *so* loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Christ's work of obedience and suffering is called the work which the Father gave him to do: and the apostles teach us to ascribe our salvation to the free unmerited love of God the Father;—"Herein is love; not that we loved God; but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John iv. 10. Christ therefore did not procure, or in any sense merit the grace of God for us; but by his atoning sacrifice of himself he removed that which stood in the way of its exercise. Holiness and justice are as essential attributes of Deity as mercy. These required the punishment of sin. Christ voluntarily took this upon himself; and by suffering the penalty of transgression in his own person, he made it consistent with the righteousness of God to pardon sin; that is, to exercise mercy in the salvation of the guilty. Hence he is both just, and at the same time, the justifier of the ungodly who believe in the name of Christ.

This is the Protestant doctrine; and as it vindicates the holiness of God, and magnifies his law, it is also holy in its tendency: not considered merely as a part of an orthodox creed; for in this sense it may be held without producing any holiness of conduct; but as it is received as a living, divine principle of holiness, implanted by the Holy Spirit in the heart of them that believe in Christ. But Dr Milner speaks of the holy doctrines of his church as persons speak of articles of dress, the fashion of which does not change. If her doctrine "was once holy," "it is holy still; because

the church never changes her doctrine, nor suffers any persons in her communion to change it, or to question any part of it." This may be true enough, while yet it signifies nothing; seeing it relates merely to what the church has in her creed; but not written in the hearts of her members; and which even in her creed is rendered inoperative by its association with error.

I need not follow Dr Milner through his long-winded description of the *means* of sanctity, which are, of course, his seven sacraments, and the public service of his church, including the sacrifice of the mass, because I have under the different heads of Penance, Transubstantiation, Extreme Unction, &c. exposed the absurdity and impiety of most of these things. I pass on therefore, to what he calls the fruits of sanctity which have been produced in the Church of Rome.

These, as I said in my last Number, are certain individuals, called saints, about the average of two or three in a century, whom he names,—such as St Dunstan, St Augustin of Canterbury, St Chad, St Swithin, St Dominic, St Bonaventure, &c.; and because the Church of Rome produced such men, she is the *holy*, and must be the only true church! He gives indeed a general view of her holiness in the following terms:—"It is certain that the supernatural virtues, and heroical sanctity of a countless number of holy personages of different countries, ranks, professions, and sexes, have illustrated the Catholic Church in every age, with an effulgence which cannot be disputed or withstood." Part II. p. 63. St Dominic, for instance, he should have told us, *illustrated* the church by the *effulgence* of the flames which he kindled for burning heretics to death, and by establishing the *holy* Inquisition in order to keep the flame continually alive.

But to come nearer home, Dr Milner challanges the following comparison between the saints of his church and the sinners of the Reformation, not doubting that the holiness will be found on the side of the saints, as doubtless it ought to be. "Let them, from the very accounts of Protestant historians, compare, as to religion and morality, Archbishop Cranmer with his rival, Bishop Fisher; Protector Seymour with Chancellor More; Ann Bulleyn with Catherine of Arragon; Martin Luther and Calvin with Francis Xavierius and Cardinal Pole; Beza with St Francis Sales; Queen Elizabeth with Mary Queen of Scots: these contrasted characters having more or less relation with each other. From such a comparison I have no sort of doubt, what the decision of your friends will be concerning them in point of their respective holiness." P. 64. It is difficult to believe a man not in jest, who institutes a comparison between the two queens last mentioned, on the point of *holiness* of character, especially when he means to maintain that Mary was the *holiest* of the two. But he is perfectly in earnest; though one can scarcely help thinking that he attaches a meaning of his own to the word holiness; or perhaps he proceeds upon the principle, avowed in private, by the flatterers of public men, who ascribe all the virtues most profusely to those whom they know to be most destitute, and who therefore have most need of them.

I have no doubt, that upon Dr Milner's own data, it could easily be shown, that the advantage, in point of holiness, is on the side of the Protestants whom he is pleased to contrast with the great men of Rome, at least among those who professed to be religious Protestants, such as Luther, Calvin, and Beza; and as for the Protestant Queen and Protector, on the one hand, and the Popish Queen and Chancellor, on the other, it is of no importance to which of them we ascribe most of that which none of them possessed. But it must be a miserable church that can produce no better evidence of its holiness than two or three individuals in an age, and even these not better than the average of mere men of the world. An inspired apostle condemns such comparisons of men among themselves; and therefore I shall let this alone. I shall not even attempt to prove that Protestant churches are holier than that of Rome, for we have nothing to boast of; but seeing the Church of Rome is incessantly boasting of her holiness, I shall endeavour to humble her a little for her own benefit.

At the time of the Reformation, and for ages before, the corruption of manners in the Church of Rome was so great and so universal, that any man who possessed the least regard for decency of character was quite shocked by it. The writers of those days have left on record the most ample testimony to this effect; not writers of the Reformation only,—but also men of great note who lived and died in the Church of Rome, have left their testimony against her monstrous and abominable wickedness. I could fill volumes with extracts on this subject, from the writings of men high in rank and office in the church, which would overwhelm our modern Papists with confusion, if they were not hardened beyond all feeling of shame. If it be asked, why I bring the guilt of past ages to the view of the present age, as if I meant to make the children responsible for the deeds of their fathers? I answer, because they maintain that their church never was at any time otherwise than a holy church; and because if it be admitted that she does not now present features of such horrible wickedness and bloody cruelty, it is because the light of the Reformation has shamed her out of much which she formerly practised without a blush: and I might add, because her charac-

ter at the period of the Reformation was such as to justify every honest man in separating from a body, with which he could not continue united without being polluted, and hazarding the salvation of his soul.

Some time before the Reformation the Cardinal of Cambray wrote as follows:—"That although they are great evils which we see, yet unless the church be speedily reformed, we shall in a short time see unspeakably greater; after those horrible thunders we have already heard, we shall presently hear others that are more horrible." After reciting the complaints of St Bernard of the corrupt state of the church in his time, the Cardinal proceeds:—"If these things were spoken by blessed Bernard, they may now much more be said; because since his time the church hath proceeded from bad to worse; and in the whole state, as well spiritual as secular, virtue being abandoned, it hath fallen into the shame and filthiness of vice." For this and the other quotations which follow, in this Number, I am indebted to the first discourse in the Preservative against Popery, entitled "The Reformation Vindicated on account of the necessity of it," in which the most particular references are given, and usually the very words of the original Latin in the margin.

Nicholas de Clemangis writes:—"That wicked persons did so much abound in all professions of men, that scarce one among a thousand was to be found, who did sincerely live answerably to their professions; and if there was any one who was honest, chaste, and frugal, and did not follow this lewd kind of life, he was made a laughing stock to others, and was presently called either an insolent and singular madman, or else a hypocrite." The Cardinal of Lorrain, in the Council of Trent, in a speech on the subject, attributes all the calamities which had befallen France to the gross and general corruption of manners.

But Dr Milner will excuse himself, and justify his church, by telling the world, that these descriptions refer to laymen only; and that the Church of Rome never professed to make them too holy in this world, for then there would have been no need of priestly absolution, or purgatorial fire; and there would have been no more use for priests than there was for hangmen in the days of King Alfred. Let us see then how it was with the priests themselves,—those *holy* men who could save the most unholy by means of holy oil, and a few Latin words. Cardinal Julien, in his epistle to Pope Eugenius IV. tells him:—"That the people were above measure incensed against the ecclesiastical state, by the dissolute lives of the clergy, for which," says he, "it is greatly to be feared, unless they mend their manners, lest the laymen, after the example of the Hussites, fall foul upon the whole clergy. And in truth, this deformity administers great boldness to the Bohemians, and gives a fair colour to their errors, who especially inveigh against the filthiness of the clergy." The Suffragan Bishop of Saltzburg, in the words of Catherine of Sienna, gives the following character of the common clergy, at the beginning of the Reformation:—"The modern and unhappy clergy addict themselves to temporal things, being destitute of divine light; they love themselves, neglect the love of God and their neighbour; they are worse than worldly men, whom they destroy together with themselves. They are addicted to pleasures and infamous practices, and neglect the salvation of the souls of Christ's faithful people. By the lives of such wicked clergymen, the seculars come to be disobedient and irreverent towards the church; they are seduced by blind guides, who, O shame! are ignorant idiots, proud, covetous, hypocrites, simoniacal, luxurious, envious, slow to good works, prone to evil, &c. Where at this day can be found that continence in gesture, diet, apparel, and laughter, that becomes the clergy? At banquets, taverns, plays, and theatres, they are more frequently found, than in places dedicated to God. How hugely pernicious to the universal church, the scurrility, ignorance, fornication, simony, and other crimes are, with which almost the whole clergy is infected, there is no man doubts." And Nicholas de Clemangis, who was himself an archdeacon in the Church of Rome, represents her clergy as the dregs and scum of mankind, as persons who abandoned themselves to the most loathsome vices. My author gives the passage without a translation, thinking it, I suppose, too bad to be expressed in modern English. I shall give only the concluding sentence:—"Crapulati vero et inebriati pugnant, clamant, tumultuantur, nomen Dei et sanctorum suorum pollutissimis labiis execrantur, sicque tandem compositi ex meretricum suarum amplexibus, ad Divinum altare veniunt."

Let us ascend the scale of ecclesiastical rank, and see if we find the state of moral any better; and I request the reader to remember that I am not citing the authority of *lying* Protestants;—I am quoting the very words of great authors of the Church of Rome, who surely would not represent their holy mother in a light more depraved than she really was. "The bishops," says the above-mentioned Bishop of Saltzburg, "serve their own tables instead of the altar; they are unwise in divine things, while they love the wisdom of the world; they are more employed in the offices of the exchequer than in the work of Christ; they adorn their bodies with gold, they defile their souls with impurity; they account it a shame to employ themselves in spiritual matters, and their glory is to meddle with those things that are scurrilous. Hence it is said by Catharine of Sienna—they, as men that

are blinded, reckon that to be their honour, that is truly their shame; contrary to the canons, they keep about themselves, pimps, bawds, flatterers, and buffoons; such as give themselves wholly to vanity, instead of men that are learned and of good report."—"The bishops neglect due hospitality, by neglecting the poor of Christ, by making themselves fat, by feeding dogs and other beasts, and so one beast feeds another, as if they chose to be of the number of those, against whom the Lord will pronounce that just sentence,—I was poor and ye received me not, therefore depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire. There are few bishops who are not covetous, they take by violence other men's goods, and wastefully spend the goods of the church; they bestow the revenues of the church not to pious uses, but upon their kindred, upon stageplayers, flatterers, huntsmen, whores, and such like persons; they rather make provision for the wickedness of men, than for the necessities of nature."

This was a complaint against the bishops by one of their own body, who must have known them well, in the year 1519, when the Reformation by Luther had just begun; and, supposing the representation to be exaggerated tenfold, it exhibits enough to justify Luther and all the others who abandoned the communion of a church so immersed in vice and abominable filthiness, that it was scarcely possible to avoid pollution, or to have any communion with it but a fellowship in iniquity. That matters were little better forty years after, appears by the speech of the Duke of Bavaria's ambassador to the Council of Trent; in which he tells the Council, that the cause of the evils that were risen among them, was the bad life of the clergy, whose wickedness was so great, that he could not relate it, without offending the chaste ears of his auditory.

The cardinals were still worse than the bishops. "If any man would make an image of pride," says Clemangis, "he can no way do it more to the life, than by representing a cardinal to the eyes of the beholders." "The whole world complained of the pride and luxury of the cardinals." And can any man think there was not just cause for this complaint, who will but consider what vast revenues were spent upon their lusts? "For not two, or three, or ten, or twenty, benefices would suffice; but a hundred or two hundred; yea, sometimes four, or five hundred, or more, were usurped by one cardinal; and those not of the poorer sort, but the fattest and richest of all. And well had it been for the inferior clergy, had they been content with that prodigious number, but the great mischief was, that nothing could satisfy them; but how great soever they had, they still more vehemently coveted more."

I should now ascend to the Pope, and describe the *holiness* of him who impiously assumes to be HOLINESS itself; but as it would not be consistent with due reverence, to thrust the "head of Catholic unity" into the tail of one of my schismatical PROTESTANTS, I must let "His Holiness" wait till next week.

No. CXCVIII.

SATURDAY, APRIL 27TH, 1822.

DR MILNER asserts that the Church of Rome is distinguished by the "Fruits of holiness;" that is, by the number of holy persons which she has produced; and therefore, he concludes that she is the only true church. Though we were to grant his premises, the conclusion does not necessarily follow; for though he could prove that she produced ever so many millions of saints in former ages, if she be not producing saints at present, she is not a true, but an apostate church. There were, no doubt, many holy persons at one time in the seven churches in Asia; but when these churches embraced error in doctrine, and suffered immorality in practice among their members, the apostle John was divinely instructed to warn them that unless they repented they would be cast off. When this judgment came upon them, they were no longer true churches. They might continue to exist for ages under the name of Christian; but when Christ had removed his candlestick, and withdrawn his Spirit from them, they were no better than the dead skeleton of a once living body. That this is the present state of the Church of Rome may be inferred from her own account of herself. She does not know, at least cannot be certain, that she has a single saint at this day in her communion; for no man or woman can be admitted into the rank of saints till a hundred years after death; * and it will depend upon the Pope of a distant period, whether any of the present day shall be canonized, that is, put among the saints. This law, by which the *saint*-fication of her members is delayed for a hundred years, is one of the wisest and most modest things the Church of Rome ever did; for she knows very well that if she were to call the average, or even the best of her members, saints while alive, the world would laugh at both her and them.

But the reader must be aware that I am taking a too favourable view of the Church of Rome, when I speak only of her present state, and as if I admitted her holiness up to a late period; for she has been notoriously unholy for many hundred years. She is not the mere skeleton of a once living body,—she is

* I am not sure but there may be some alteration in this respect since the restoration of the Pope, after his late humiliation.

not like a collection of dry inoffensive bones; she is a putrid carcase, presenting to the moral sense all that is loathsome and abominable. This I established in my last Number, by the testimony of her own authors, who wrote previous to, and about the period of, the Reformation, who tell us plainly that all ranks and degrees among them were corrupt beyond expression, especially the clergy, from the lowest curate up to the greatest cardinal. It remains now that I show what sort of men the Popes were; and as these claimed to be the head and centre of all power, spiritual and temporal, they had usually concentrated in their own persons all the vices of the inferior members.

Papists have a saying among themselves, that Gregory the Great was the last of the good, and the first of the bad Popes; by which they acknowledge that they have not had a good Pope for twelve hundred years, which, I suppose, is the truth. We need not look back to the dark ages, in which their own historians tell us, they were "monsters and prodigies;" (*Hæc monstra, hæc portenta. Plat. in Vita Benedicti IV.*) "and so void of piety, as neither to regard the person they sustained, nor the place they were in." (Sabellic. Ennead. 9. l. i.) Let us rather see what was their character about the time of the Reformation, when it might have been expected that a regard for their own interest would have induced them at least to assume the appearance of virtue.

"When after the death of Innocent VIII. Lionel, Bishop of Concordia, in an oration to the cardinals, pressed them with the most rousing arguments, to choose a good man whose life was without scandal; (Raynald, an. 1492.) what was the effect? Alexander VI. was chosen, a man, if he may be so called, who was the reproach of human nature; who, before he was chosen Pope, was a prodigy of lust and other vices, and continued to be so to the last; when, by the just judgment of God, he was poisoned, by a mistake in drinking that cup himself which he had prepared to despatch others." See *Preservative against Popery*, Tit. I. p. 32. with the authorities.

"Paul III. lived not long enough to let the world know what he would prove, for he died within six and twenty days after his election." *Ibid.*

"Julius II. who succeeded him, was guilty of crimes so notorious as to be a scandal to the whole church. He filled Italy with rapine, war, and blood; to which he was so addicted, that contrary to the law of nations, he commanded the procurator of the Duke of Savoy to be tortured because he endeavoured to persuade him to peace. So monstrous were his acts, that Richerius says he must be wholly made of steel who can read them without horror." *See as before.*

"Pope Leo X. in whose time the Reformation began, was a civil, debonnair gentleman; but so little concerned for religion that he cared not to know what it meant. When he admitted discourses of that nature, it was for the sake of diversion, and to make himself sport. His soul, he thought, was no longer lived than his body, and therefore he gave himself up to sensual gratifications; and it was but reason, that he, who supposed he should die like a beast, should live like an epicure." *Ibid.*

"Clement VII. as he got the Popedom by simony, so he administered it by as ill arts as he got it. His prime virtue was dissimulation. He made no conscience of his word or oath, but broke his covenants as oft as he made them." *Ibid.*

"Paul III. and Julius III. followed next. The characters given of them by many of the Romish writers are so foul and loathsome, that if I had the face to write them, no modest man would read them without blushing." *Ibid.*

Such was the monstrous wickedness of the *holy* church, in the head and all her members, about this time, that the world itself, depraved as it is, could bear it no longer, but cried for deliverance. The court of Rome was beset by complaints and remonstrances by the emperor and other sovereign princes, in which they demanded a correction of those abuses which they and their subjects felt to be intolerable. In short, they called for reformation, which the Pope was extremely unwilling to grant; but which he durst not peremptorily refuse, lest the nations and their princes should reform themselves, as some of them had already done. His *holiness* promised, and shuffled, and temporised for many years; but at last consented to the calling of a council at Trent, the professed object of which was to satisfy those who were demanding reformation: but which, instead of reforming abuses, rather confirmed them, and established by law many errors, which had been only tacitly admitted before. Before the Pope would consent to call such a council, he tried many expedients to silence the universal clamour that was raised against the corruptions of the church. He once and again made a feint as if he would set seriously about reformation himself; and Paul III. went so far as to appoint four cardinals and five other prelates to draw up a catalogue of grievances and abuses which needed reformation, to make the world believe that he was going to reform. These prelates drew up a paper under the title of "The Advice given to Pope Paul III. by four Cardinals and five other Prelates, whose names are underwritten, in order to the Amendment of the State of the Church." Among the names subscribed to this document, we find Cardinal John Peter Caraffa, afterwards Pope Paul IV. and Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England, men who were not likely to give an exaggerated representation of the evil state of their own church. Of the document itself Dr

Clagget gave a translation, which may be seen in the "Preservative against Popery," Vol. i. Tit. I. It occupies six large folio pages closely printed; and it makes such a disclosure of notorious corruption, and worse than heathen abomination, prevailing through the whole church from the head down to the lowest members, that it is astonishing that any man who has any respect for his own character, should acknowledge his connection with it, and that he should not with indignation renounce the communion and the name of a church which pollutes the very earth more than the cities did, which God destroyed by fire and brimstone from heaven.

The principal abuses which are here brought to the view of "His Holiness" exhibit the greatest degree of wickedness of which human nature is capable; that is, selling and bartering the souls of men for livings to the priests. "Another abuse," say the advisers, "of a most grievous nature, is the collation of ecclesiastical benefices, especially with cure of souls, and above all, of bishopricks; the manner having been, that *good provision is made for those having the benefices; but for the flock of Christ and the church, none at all.*"—"There is another abuse also in the changing of benefices, upon contracts that are all of them *simoniacal*, in which *no regard is had to any thing but gain*:"—And so on throughout the whole paper, the Church of Rome stands confessed, the antichrist, that makes merchandise of men's souls; for that which so many of her own dignitaries, including one who was afterwards Pope, have so solemnly declared to be true, may be considered as virtually the admission of the church herself. By this document alone the Reformation is fully vindicated; and I am surprised that it has not been oftener published, and more generally known; for as a defence of the Reformation it renders any other publication unnecessary.

What, for instance, can be a more complete vindication of Henry VIIIth's suppression of monasteries, and John Knox's preaching them down, than the following:—"In the orders of the *Religious*, there is another abuse to be corrected, that many of them are so degenerate, that they are grown scandalous, and their examples pernicious to the *seculars*. We think the conventual orders are (*i. e.* ought) to be abolished, not by doing any man that injury of dispossessing him, but by forbidding them to admit any more. For thus, without wronging any one, they would soon be worn out, and good *Religious* might be substituted instead of them; but at present it were best, that all children who are not yet professed, should be taken from the monasteries." They did not wish to abolish the *Religious* or monastic life altogether; but their words plainly imply that the monasteries, as they then were, ought to be suppressed. Again, say these advisers of His Holiness:—"Christian people are disturbed by another abuse, which concerns *Nuns* that are under the care of conventual *Friars*; where, in most monasteries, public sacrileges are committed, to the intolerable scandal of the citizens." Here, under the modest expression, *sacrilege*, the illicit intercourse between the friars and nuns is explicitly admitted, "to the intolerable scandal of the citizens."

I shall quote a few sentences from the conclusion of this official paper, in order to show that the Pope's advisers were perfectly acquainted with the state of morals, as well as of discipline, in their *holy* church:—"Thus, according to our capacity, having summarily described all those things which belong to the duty of a supreme bishop of the Catholic church, it remains that we say something of that which belongs to the *Roman* bishop. This city of Rome is both the *mother* of the church, and the *mistress* of other churches; wherefore the worship of God and purity of manners should flourish there most of all: But yet, Holy Father, all strangers are scandalized when they go into St Peter's church, and see what slovenly ignorant priests say mass there, so habited and clothed, that they could not appear cleanly in a nasty house. This is so mighty an offence to all, that the most reverend the archpresbyter and the penitentiary are to take care of this thing, and remove the scandal: and the like order is to be taken in other churches.

"Nay, in this city, whores walk about as if they were goodly matrons; or they ride upon mules, and are at noonday followed up and down by men of the best account in the families of cardinals, and by clergymen. We see no such degeneracy in any other city, but in this which is to be an example to all others. These whores live in splendid houses: 'Tis a filthy abuse, and ought to be mended."—

"Now these are the things, most Holy Father, which we for the present have brought together, as our capacity would permit, that as to us it seems needful, they may be corrected. But you, in your goodness and wisdom, will make a more perfect judgment of every thing. We indeed, though we have not answered the greatness of the concern, which is too hard for us, yet at least have satisfied our own consciences, and cannot but conceive great hope, that under your government we may see the Church of God purged, fair as a dove, at harmony with itself, and united into one body, to the never dying honour of your name. You have taken to yourself the name of Paul; we hope you will imitate the charity of Paul, who was a chosen vessel to carry the name of Christ among the Gentiles. We hope that you are chosen to restore the name of Christ, forgotten by the nations, *and even by us the clergy*, that hereafter it may live in our hearts, and appear in our actions, to heal our diseases, to reduce the flock of Christ to one

sheepfold, to remove from us that indignation and vengeance of God, which we deserve, which is now ready to fall upon us, which now hangs over our heads."

It did not occur to these great prelates that they were hurting their own cause when they called the city of Rome the mother of the church; for if they mean Christian Rome, it is making the church her own mother, or admitting that Christianity existed before the Church of Rome, which would be to deny her primacy. If they mean Pagan Rome, they concede to Protestants the heathen origin of their church; and then we need not be surprised to find the daughter so like the mother, or that she has greatly surpassed her in wickedness, as often happens.

The proposed reformation came to nothing. As Dr Clagget says in his preface:—"The trick was to make the Christian princes believe, that he that required, and they who gave this advice, were in good earnest: And so it was sent into Germany, where it produced quite other effects than were hoped for; for all men's mouths were opened against the court (of Rome) more than they were before: And the court soon showed, that this solemn advice was but mere artifice and collusion to amuse the world, and keep off the much-dreaded council as long as it was possible;" and when Cardinal Caraffa came to be Pope, eighteen years after, he showed no disposition to make one step in that reform which he had joined in recommending to his predecessor. All this tended to convince the Reformers, that it was vain to expect the Church of Rome would ever mend her manners; and that they had done right in endeavouring to reform themselves.

I request the reader again to remember, that all my proofs of the unholiness of the boasted and boasting "*holy* Catholic church," both in the head and the members, are drawn from writers high in authority in that very church. Out of the mouth of her own children she stands condemned; and surely these children knew her well. Protestant writers cannot say a word on this subject but they are accused of misrepresenting and calumniating the "Catholic church." To this incessantly reiterated charge, Dr Sherlock has furnished a sufficient answer, part of which I shall here present to the reader. I quote as I find it prefixed to the Bishop of St David's Protestant Catechism:—

"As to the probability of this charge. (Misrepresenting) Now, 1. Ask them whether the first Reformers charged the Church of Rome with such doctrines and practices as they were not guilty of? We have not, that I know of, increased our charge against the Church of Rome in this age; if there has been any difference, we have rather been more favourable and candid in our censures of some of their doctrines, than the first Reformers were. Now, is it likely that the first Reformers should charge the Church of Rome wrongfully? No man can be a misrepresenter, but either out of ignorance or design: which of these can we, with any probability, charge the Reformers with?

"As for ignorance, is it a probable thing, that Luther, Melancthon, Œcolampadius, Zuinglius, Bucer, Calvin, or, to come to our own English Reformers, that Archbishop Cranmer, and others, who had all been Papists themselves, should be ignorant what was taught and practised in the Church of Rome? It is now thought in this very cause a very considerable proof, that Protestants do misrepresent Papists, because some Papists deny such doctrines and practices as Protestants charge them with; and, say they, can you think that Papists do not understand their own religion better than Protestants do? Now, though this may be made a question, (and I am very apt to think, that, compare the learned and unlearned Protestants and Papists together, there are more Protestants than Papists who understand Popery; and not only experience verifies this, but there is a plain reason why it should be so; because it is the principle of Protestants, that they must neither believe nor disbelieve any thing without understanding it; but an implicit faith in the church governs the unlearned Papists, and many of those who should be learned too; but let that be as it will,) this argument signifies nothing to our first Reformers: for if Papists may be presumed to understand their own religion, the first Reformers, who were all educated in Popery, might be as well presumed to understand what Popery then was; and therefore there can be no reason to suspect that they misrepresented Popery out of ignorance.

"Nor is it more probable that they should misrepresent Popery out of interest and design: for if they were conscious to themselves, that Popery was not so bad as they represent it to be, why should they themselves have set up for Reformers? and what hope could they have, that at that time, when Popery was so well known, they should persuade the world to believe their misrepresntations?

"Was it so desirable a thing for men to bring all the powers of the Church of Rome upon themselves, merely to gratify misrepresenting humour? Do these men remember what our Reformers suffered for opposing Popery? The loss of their estates, their liberties, their lives, all the vengeance of a blind and enraged zeal. And did they undergo all this with such constancy and Christian patience, only for the sake of telling lies, and raising scandalous reports of the Church of Rome? We think it a very good argument, that the apostles and first preachers of Christianity were honest men, and had no design to cheat the world, because they served no worldly

interest by it; but cheerfully exposed themselves to all manner of sufferings in preaching the gospel; and why does not the same argument prove our first Reformers to be honest men, and then they could not be wilful misrepresenters?

"Nay, if we will but allow them to have been cunning men, (and it is evident they did not want wit,) they would never have undertaken so hopeless a design, as to run down Popery merely by misrepresenting it; when, had their exceptions against Popery been only misrepresentations of their own, all the world could have confuted them: had the first Reformers been only misrepresenters, can we think that they could have imposed upon such vast numbers of men, learned and unlearned, who knew and saw what Popery was? They were no fools themselves, and therefore could not hope to impose such a cheat upon the world.

"2. Ask them again, how old this complaint is, of Protestants misrepresenting Popery? how long it has been discovered that Popery is thus abused and misrepresented? Were the first Reformers charged with these misrepresentations by their adversaries in those days?" &c., &c.

The learned author proceeds to put a series of interrogatories, to which the only answer, consistent with truth, must be, that the first Reformers were not so accused of misrepresenting. They knew from personal observation and experience the truth of their accusations of the Church of Rome; the Church of Rome herself knew the truth of them, and all the world knew it. The church did not then affect to deny them, or to accuse the Reformers of misrepresenting; she rather admitted, and defended, or at least palliated, what was laid to her charge.

This reasoning is cogent and unanswerable, as a defence of the Reformers against the charge of misrepresenting and calumniating the Church of Rome. But, with regard to the point in hand, we have little use for such arguments; for, as I have said again and again, the monstrous corruptions of this church are admitted, asserted, dilated upon, and deplored by her own authors in language more strong than that which the Reformers used. We might therefore lay aside the writings of the latter altogether, and, by those of the former alone, we can demonstrate that the Church of Rome does not possess those fruits of holiness of which Dr Milner boasts; and that, therefore, she does not possess this mark of the true church.

No. CXCIX.

SATURDAY, MAY 4TH, 1822

I AM now arrived at what Dr Milner calls the "Divine attestation" of the "sanctity" of the Church of Rome. By this we are to understand the miracles which in all ages have been performed by the saints, and which are as illustrious in the present age as they were in that of the apostles. Not that there are any living saints remarkable for miraculous powers, for he does not venture to tell us where so much as one is to be found alive who can do the slightest miracle; but he gives us very pompous descriptions of miraculous cures performed by St Wenefride at her holy well in Wales, within the last twenty years; and one case of an incurable disease having been cured by a touch of the hand of a priest who was hanged in the reign of Charles I. one of whose hands, it seems, is preserved in Lancashire, for the purpose of working miracles; and if we can believe Dr Milner, this dead hand is more powerful than a thousand living ones.

We have a great deal of unnecessary discussion about the miracles performed by Christ and his apostles. I say unnecessary discussion; because Protestants do not call in question the reality of divinely-attested miracles, in either the Old or the New Testament. Dr Milner, however, argues for the reality of the miracles performed by the apostles, apparently for no other purpose than to make it appear that the Church of Rome has the power of working miracles; and, of course, he wishes us to believe that the apostles were clergymen and saints of the Romish Church. I believe some authors have conceded a great deal too much with regard to the miraculous powers alleged to have been possessed by some distinguished Christians after the apostolic age. For my part I am determined to keep by my fundamental principle of the bible alone. I do not say that no miracles were ever performed but what are recorded in the Bible; but I do say, that I do not believe in any which are not recorded there; and I acknowledge no authority that requires me to believe in any other.

Through many tiresome pages, Dr Milner connects a chain of miracles, from the first century down to the Reformation, in which chain, one St Bernard appears a link of great magnitude and lustre. After the Reformation a saint arose who outstripped all who had gone before him. Of this saint Dr Milner thus writes:—

"The miracles of St Francis Xaverius, the apostle of India, who was contemporary with Luther, in number, splendour, and publicity, may vie with St Bernard's. They consisted in foretelling future events, speaking unknown languages, calming tempests at sea, curing various maladies, and raising the dead to life;

and though they took place in remote countries, yet they were verified in the same, soon after the saint's death, by virtue of a commission from John III. King of Portugal, and were generally acknowledged, not only by Europeans of different religions in India, but also by the native Mahomedans and Pagans." *Letter XXIII.* pp. 80, 81.

"It is painful to think," says Mr Grier, "that in the present enlightened age, a gentleman like Dr Milner, who displays learning in almost every department of science; who possesses experience, intelligence, and taste; who writes well and who reasons acutely—should be so besotted, as not only to believe himself, but to attempt to induce others to believe, all the stupid legends of the dark ages, and the modern fabrications of the same stamp. Such fatuity would be a miracle in itself, were it not known how superstition debases the reason, when it has gained the ascendant over the mind." *Reply to Dr Milner's End of Controversy*, p. 361.

"As to Xavier," says the same writer, "it might have been expected that the doctor would have been more reserved in ascribing miraculous powers to one, who lived so much nearer our own times, than to those of more distant ages; because, the means of detecting imposture is more within our reach, in the former than in the latter case; and because, if he found that recourse had been had to fabrication with respect to accounts of modern date, it sinks into disrepute those of earlier origin.

"Of Xavier's miracles, which, Dr Milner says, 'consisted in foretelling future events, speaking unknown languages, calming tempests at sea, and *raising the dead to life*,' Acosta, a contemporary writer, a Jesuit, and a missionary also, makes no mention. But had these singular occurrences taken place, he must have noticed them. And, with respect to the gift of tongues, which is ascribed to him in a supernatural degree, it is certain that he himself deeply lamented, in one of his letters, his deficiency in this very particular! Now, where he wanted a requisite which would have been so essential to the cause of proselytism among the Pagans, it is highly improbable that his saintship would have been invested with any other. Indeed, his simple acknowledgment on this one point throws discredit on the other miraculous stories told of him. But Dr Milner adds, that Xavier's miracles 'were *verified* soon after the saint's death by virtue of a commission from John III. King of Portugal.' Here again the silence of Acosta about those alleged miracles meets him; and not only this, but the express assertion of this writer that *no* miracles whatever were performed in India. And, as Acosta's account was not published for nearly forty years after Xavier's death, it is evident that that space of time at least elapsed before his miracles were thought of. This is Bishop Douglas' opinion on the subject;* and though Dr Milner attempts to invalidate it by a reference to Acosta's work, yet the very place† referred to establishes its correctness. That writer barely says that 'great *signs were reported* of Xavier by numerous and credible witnesses. But Dr Milner goes farther, since he says that they not only 'vie in number, splendour, and publicity with the miracles of St Bernard;' but appear to equal those of our Saviour himself!!" *Reply*, &c. pp. 367—369.

About a year or two ago, I read as much of St Francis Xavier's life and miracles as disgust and contempt would allow me. I shall give one miracle as a sample of the whole. I write from memory, as I am not now in possession of the book:—The holy saint had a consecrated crucifix which he valued above all things in the world. On a sea voyage, one day, he lost it overboard; and was quite inconsolable. After landing at the country whither he went, and walking on the sea shore, he saw his favourite image coming towards him, elevated above the surface of the water. Gazing with astonishment and delight, and going to the water's edge, it was most reverently laid down at his feet, by a crab, who had borne it in its claws through the ocean, to the very spot where the saint was miraculously brought at the time to receive it.

This is gravely related as one of the miracles of St Francis Xavier, the apostle of the Indies. But it appears to me that he had no hand in it whatever; and did not so much as expect any thing of the kind to happen. The crab is entitled to the whole credit of this miracle; and I would have advised the Pope, at his next diet of canonization, to have put this animal among the saints, had he not been anticipated by the heathen Egyptians, or Chaldeans, who gave him a place among the constellations, where, under his Latin name, Cancer, he has the honour of making the extremity of the sun's northern declination.

But the gross wickedness of such a story as the above consists chiefly in the idolatry that

---

* "See CRITERION of Miracles, p. 84. Dr Buchanan tells us of his having observed to the Archbishop of Goa, that 'Xavier was an eminently great man; but that what others have written *for him* and *of him*, tarnished his fame by making him the inventor of fables. To which the chief Inquisitor candidly signified his assent.' *See Christian Researches*, p. 162. This anecdote is the more valuable, both as it records the admission of a Popish ecclesiastic of high rank, resident on the very theatre of Xavier's ministry, and consequently acquainted with every act of his; and as it exhibits the hollow pretensions set up for this saint by Dr Milner, on the score of miraculous agency."

† . . . "'quod miraculorum *nulla* facultas sit, quæ apostoli plurima perpetrarunt.'—*De Procur.*, &c. l. ii. cap. 8. Here Acosta *denies* that the missionaries had ANY power; but Dr Milner's gloss is, 'that they only had not the *same facility* as the apostles.' FACULTAS—*facility*, secundum Milner! *See Letter* XXIV."

it implies and cherishes. It is evidently meant to be inculcated that there was a divinity in the holy image which the saint worshipped, that could inspire the crab with the thought of its preservation, and restoration to its devout worshipper: and those who believe the story are confirmed in their idolatrous practices; for that Papists, even those who live among us, do worship such things is beyond all doubt, though they deny, or wish to conceal it. Of this I have the evidence of one of their own communion, who lately called on me, being introduced by a friend, for the purpose of becoming acquainted with one who had made himself so notorious by his opposition to the "Catholic Church." He had read part at least of my work with great care, and had many passages marked, which he wished to converse with me about. I talked fully an hour with him; and showed him several Popish books which he had never seen, and some sentiments in them which surprised him, of which he requested, and obtained, written extracts. Turning over Dr Milner's work, I pointed to the crucifix, or figure of the crucifixion, at the root of his apostolical tree, and asked him to tell me candidly,—"Do you really worship a thing like that?"—"*They do it*," said he, "but *I* always feel an aversion to it."

With regard to home, and more recent miracles, Dr Milner thus addresses his correspondents:—"Methinks I hear some of your society thus asking me: 'Do you then pretend that your church possesses the miraculous powers at the present day?' I answer that the church never possessed miraculous powers in the sense of most Protestant writers, so as to be able to effect cures or other supernatural events at her mere pleasure: for even the apostles could not do this; as we learn from the history of the lunatic child, Matt. xvii. 16. But this I say, that the Catholic Church, being always the beloved Spouse of Christ, Rev. xxi. 9. and continuing at all times to bring forth children of heroical sanctity, God fails not in this, any more than in past ages, to illustrate her and them by unquestionable miracles. Accordingly, in those processes which are constantly going on, at the apostolic see, for the canonization of new saints, fresh miracles of a recent date continue to be proved with the highest degree of evidence, as I can testify from having perused, on the spot, the official printed account of some of them. For the further satisfaction of your friends, I will inform them that I had satisfactory proof, that the astonishing catastrophe of Louis XVI. and his Queen, in being beheaded on a scaffold, was foretold by a nun of Fougeres, Sœur Nativité, twenty years before it happened; and that the banishment of the French clergy from their country, long before it happened, was predicted by the holy French pilgrim, Benedict Labre, whose miracles caused the conversion of the late Rev. Mr Thayer, an American clergyman, who, being at Rome, witnessed several of them. With respect to miraculous cures of a late date, I have the most respectable attestation of several of them, and I am well acquainted with four or five persons who have experienced them. The following facts are respectively attested, but at much greater length, by the Rev. Thomas Sadler, of Trafford, near Manchester, and the Rev. J. Crathorne, of Garswood, near Wigan:—Joseph Lamb, of Eccles, near Manchester, now 28 years of age, on the 12th of August, 1814, fell from a hay-rick, four yards and a half high, by which accident it was conceived the spine of his back was broken. Certain it is, he could neither walk nor stand without crutches, down to the 2nd of October, and that he described himself as feeling the most exquisite pain in the back. On that day, having prevailed with much difficulty upon his father, who was then a Protestant, to take him in a cart, with his wife and two friends, Thomas Cutler and Eliz. Dooley, to Garswood, near Wigan, where the hand of F. Arrowsmith,* one of the Catholic priests who suffered death at Lancaster, for the exercise of his religion, in the reign of Charles I., is preserved, and has often caused wonderful cures; he got himself conveyed to the altar rails of the chapel, and there to be signed, on his back, with the sign of the cross, by that hand; when feeling a particular sensation and total change in himself, as he expressed it, he exclaimed to his wife—Mary, I can walk! This he did, without any help whatever, walking first into an adjoining room, and thence to the cart which conveyed him home. With his debility his pains also left him, and his back has continued well ever since. (August 6th, 1817.) These particulars the above named persons, all still living, are ready, as they were respectively witnesses of them, to declare upon oath. I have attestations of incurable cancers and other disorders being suddenly remedied by the same instrument of God's bounty; but it would be a tedious work to transcribe them, or the other attestations in my possession of a similar nature." *Letter XXIII.* pp. 87—89.

I have inserted this story at full length, though it occupies more space than it deserves, in order to show with what a face of brass Papists can gravely relate their "lying wonders;" and how they impose upon the poor credulous dupes of their deceit and cunning.

I need not say that I disbelieve this story; for I suppose none but a Papist can believe it to be any thing but a gross imposition. It has not so much as a feature of credibility in it; and the only thing wonderful about it, is, that it should be believed by any person capable of distinguishing his right hand from his left.

* I cannot find any account of this *saint* and *martyr*, in either the Protestant or Popish historians of that period, to which I have access; from which we may infer that his saintship was not then acknowledged.

This Joseph Lamb fell from a hay-rick, "by which accident it *was conceived* the spine of his back was broken;" but no means were used, so far as appears, to ascertain the fact. There was no surgeon called to certify the fracture, or the state of the body before or after the alleged cure. There are no witnesses of either the disease or the remedy, but persons interested in propagating a belief in the virtue of the wonderworking dead hand, except the father of Lamb, who was then a Protestant, but whose conversion to Popery was the consequence of the supposed miracle. This lets us into the secret of the matter. It was easy for the son to feign both the disease and the cure, for such a good purpose as the conversion of his father; and the priests, no doubt in the secret, knew how to do the work with becoming solemnity. Such tricks have been so common in the church of Rome, that they would have lost all interest and effect long ago, but for the besotted ignorance and stupidity of the people who submit both conscience and understanding to their ghostly guides. I request the reader to turn to page 224, and he will find an account of a young man, trained almost from his infancy, to counterfeit blindness, for the express purpose of making him the subject of a miracle at some convenient time; which must have been a much more difficult affair than that of Lamb feigning himself lame only from August till October.

Dr Milner gives us the particulars of two other cases of miraculous cures performed by St Wenefride, at her holy well. One of them is narrated in a letter to himself, dated Nov. 19th, 1809, by a Miss Maria Hornyold. Some writers have endeavoured to account for these cures from the effects of the cold bath; but I see no necessity of accounting for them at all; for I believe they are nothing more than the effects of deceiving and being deceived. There are impostors among beggars who can assume the appearance of almost any disease; and the wily priests know well how to make use of this art for impressing the belief of miraculous cures.

When the apostles of Christ went preaching the gospel, God was pleased to confirm their testimony, by "signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost." But when the truth of their testimony was confirmed, and received by the churches, in the apostolic writings, the truth was then left to make its way by its own evidence with the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, which Christ promised should remain with his disciples for ever: and to suppose that miracles are still necessary, is to say that the truth of the gospel is not yet sufficiently confirmed. What is it that Papists propose to establish by their miracles? Is it that Jesus is the Christ? This was the design of Christ's own miracles. Is it to prove that the apostles of Christ were his messengers, and spoke by his authority? This was the design of their miracles; this is what was established by them; and having this established, we have no more to ask for,—we have nothing to do but to receive their testimony, and obey what they commanded. This renders further miraculous interference quite unnecessary: and as God does nothing in vain, miracles must of course have ceased when the canon of divine revelation was closed: and persons who understand and believe what is written, will not look for new miracles, any more than for a new revelation.

But I return to the question, What is it that Papists propose to establish by their miracles? It is what we know from the word of God to be erroneous, superstitious, and idolatrous; such as, that there is a divine virtue in certain images,—in the relics of certain saints, as in the withered hand of Father Arrowsmith, and in the holy water of St Wenefride's well; and all this for the purpose of cherishing devotion, and religious worship to saints and images. This we know to be contrary to the word of God; we are sure no real miracle can be wrought to establish such impiety; and therefore what is pretended must be false; and we ought not to believe such things even though supported by what has the appearance of a miracle. The children of Israel were instructed by Moses that false prophets would arise among them; but they were commanded to beware of them; and not to believe any man who would tempt them to idolatry, though they did miraculous things, or what appeared to be such. See Deut. xiii. 1—18. In reference to this, the apostle Peter gives us warning of what should take place in the last days: "But there were false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you."—"And through covetousness shall they make merchandise of you." 2 Ep. ii. 1—3. This prediction, and the history of the Church of Rome, will be found to agree in every particular. The mystery of iniquity, as described by the apostle Paul, was to come, "after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness," 2 Thess. ii. 8—10. And the Church of Rome has proved herself to be this mystery of iniquity, by her thousands of pretended miracles, by which she deceives the world.

After all, Dr Milner, in narrating what he calls miracles, intends to prove merely that his church is *holy*. He calls them the divine attestations of her sanctity. Now I do not recollect that any of the miracles recorded in scripture were wrought for such a purpose. If persons, or churches, are really holy, they can make this appear without a miracle; and I would most seriously suspect the character of any church that told me, it required a miracle to prove that they were holy. Genuine holiness, like the sun in the firmament, makes

itself manifest by its own light. All men can observe and mark those who are humble, and self-denied, and benevolent; and who are living soberly and righteously in the world. It requires no miracle to prove that these are holy persons; but Dr Milner, perfectly aware that his church cannot bear to be tried by this standard, pleads to have her holiness proved by miracles!

I conclude this Number, and this subject, with the following curious statement by Dr Milner, by which the reader will see that there is an office in Rome, for recording and trying miracles, like our Sasine office for recording infeftments and dispositions:—"In the first place, then, a judicial examination of each reported miracle must be made in the place where it is said to have happened, and the depositions of the several witnesses must be given upon oath; this examination is generally repeated two or three different times at intervals. In the next place, the examiners at Rome are unquestionably men of character, talents, and learning, who, nevertheless, are not permitted to pronounce upon any cure or other effect in nature, till they have received a regular report of physicians and other naturalists upon it. So far from being precipitate, it employs them whole years to come to a decision, on a few cases, respecting each saint; this is printed and handed about among indifferent persons, previously to its being laid before the Pope. In short, so strict is the examination, that, according to an Italian proverb, —'it is next to a miracle to get a miracle proved at Rome.' It is reported by F. Daubenton, that an English Protestant gentleman meeting, in that city, with a process of forty miracles, which had been laid before the congregation of rites, to which the examination of them belonged, was so well satisfied with the respective proofs of them, as to express a wish that Rome would never allow of any miracles but such as were as strongly proved as these appeared to be; when, to his great surprise, he was informed that every one of these had been rejected by Rome as not sufficiently proved." *Letter XXIV.* p. 92.

No. CC.

SATURDAY, MAY 11TH, 1822.

DR MILNER introduces the subject of his third mark of the true church, that is, CATHOLICITY, in the following whining and canting manner:—"In treating of this third mark of the true church, as expressed in our common creed, I feel my spirits sink within me, and I am almost tempted to throw away my pen, in despair. For what chance is there of opening the eyes of candid Protestants to the other marks of the church, if they are capable of keeping them shut to this? Every time that each of them addresses the God of truth, either in solemn worship or in private devotion, he fails not to repeat;—*I believe in* THE CATHOLIC CHURCH: and yet if I ask him the question:—*Are you a* CATHOLIC? he is sure to answer me:—*No, I am a* PROTESTANT!—Was there ever a more glaring instance of inconsistency and self-condemnation among rational beings?" *Letter XXV.* p. 103.

I have often remarked that Popish authors make use of the strongest words when their facts and arguments are the weakest. Here Dr Milner expresses his unutterable astonishment at our Protestant stupidity; and almost throws himself into a fit of hysterics, and his pen into the fire, because, while we profess to believe in the Catholic church, we do not believe it to be the Church of Rome. This is all Jesuitical artifice, intended to confirm the men of his own communion in their blind adherence to their bigoted superstition; for he knows very well, that when we use the word *Catholic*, we do it in a sense quite consistent with our being Protestants; and that so far from conceding the word to the Church of Rome as exclusively hers, we positively deny that she has any title to it. This he must know, if he has read any of the standard works in defence of the Reformation; and yet he writes as if he did not know it.

The word CATHOLIC is very harmless, as understood by Protestants, of the church of the first-born who are written in heaven, of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations. But as it is nowhere in scripture used to designate the true church on earth, I think the Protestant cause would suffer no loss by having it expunged from both our creed and our vocabulary. Dr Milner himself admits the fact, which every theologian and church historian knows, that this word was not originally in that short summary of belief, called the Apostles' Creed, but foisted in afterwards to serve a purpose. But though it were otherwise, I would reckon it of no importance, seeing it has not the sanction of any of those who wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; and this being the case, be the meaning of the word what it may, it can be of no use in ascertaining which is the true church. Dr Milner's third MARK, therefore, is no mark at all.

In different parts of my work, however, I have condescended to argue as if it were; and have shown that it does not, and never did belong to the Church of Rome. I need not again discuss the general question; but shall confine myself now to a few remarks on what Dr Milner has advanced under it.

He finds, it seems, that a Protestant cannot perform an act of devotion public or private, without repeating his belief in the Catholic Church, which indicates the most deplorable

ignorance of Protestant worship; and it, at the same time, gives us to understand what Papists understand religious worship to be; that is, a mere mechanical process, or repetition of the Apostles' Creed, with perhaps the ten commandments. Now I believe there are thousands of Protestants, who do not question an article of the creed; but who yet never think of it in their devotions. It is enough for them to believe the divine record concerning Jesus Christ as the Way, and the Truth, and the Life, by whom alone they can come to the Father; to be convinced of their own necessities; and of the grace of God ready to supply them for Christ's sake; and therefore, in his name, to come to the throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy and find grace to help them. This, together with thanksgiving for mercy received, constitutes the devotion of a true Protestant; and it has no connection at all with the public or private recitation of a creed: but I suppose a Papist cannot understand this.

The following is a sort of crowning argument, intended to prove that the Church of Rome is Catholic, and therefore the true church:—"If any stranger in London, Edinburgh, or Amsterdam, were to ask his way to the *Catholic chapel*, I would risk my life for it, that no sober Protestant inhabitant would direct him to any other place of worship than ours." *Letter XXV.* p. 106. I am not accustomed to risk my life for such a trifle, but I will venture to assure Dr Milner, that if any stranger in Glasgow, or even London, were to ask his way to the *Popish* chapel, he would be directed to no other place of worship than his, or that of his Romish brethren, from which it *is demonstrated* that their religion is Popery, and nothing else. Nay, I will descend a great deal lower, and tell Dr Milner, that if any stranger in Glasgow were to ask for Mr Scott's chapel, he would be shown to no other than his, by which it is demonstrated that the *Scottish* is the only true church. I do not mean the Church of *Scotland* but the church of *Scott*, which is thus clearly proved, according to Dr Milner's logic, to be *the church* in preference of every other!

Speaking of the Church of England, he says, "With respect to this very church, nothing would be more inconsistent than to ascribe the greater part of the population of our islands to it. For if the Irish Catholics, the Scotch Presbyterians, the English Methodists, and other dissenters, together with the vast population who neither are, nor profess to be, of any religion at all, are subtracted, to what a comparatively small number would the Church of England be reduced! And how utterly absurd would it be for her to pretend to be the Catholic Church! Nor are these the only subtractions to be made from her number, and indeed from those of all other Christian societies, divided from the true church; since, there being but *one baptism*, all the young children who have been baptized in them, and all invincibly ignorant Christians, who exteriorly adhere to them, really belong to the Catholic church, as I have shown above." *Letter XXV.* p. 112.

I have quoted this merely to show that Dr Milner claims for the Church of Rome all the dissenters' children in the three kingdoms, except those of my Baptist friends, who, if the claim were to be sustained, would have a greater advantage from their being *unchristened*, than their parents are aware of; that is, the advantage of not being claimed by the Church of Rome, which is no small one, to those who consider that church as the Babylon that is to be destroyed. As for all the invincibly *ignorant Christians*, who are also claimed by Dr Milner as members of his church, he is perfectly welcome to them. Let him take them, and make the most he can of them. In their separation, the Protestant churches will obtain a great deliverance.

Let us attend to one argument more which Dr Milner adduces to prove the CATHOLICITY of his church:—"That the church in communion with the see of Rome is the original, as well as the most numerous church, is evident in several points of view. The stone cries out of the wall, as the prophet expresses it (Hab. ii. 11.) in testimony of this. I mean that our venerable cathedrals and other stone churches, built by Catholic hands and for Catholic worship, so as to resist, in some sort, that which is now performed in them, proclaim that ours is the ancient and original church." *Ibid.* p. 114. Dr Milner does not know, I suppose, that this argument would have much more weight in the mouth of a heathen. The Pagan temples in different parts of the world, for instance the Pantheon at Rome, are much older than any Popish cathedral. The stones of their walls cry that theirs is the most ancient religion; and I leave Dr Milner to answer them if he can.

As for the Popish cathedrals in Scotland, I believe there is just one remaining entire,—that of Glasgow; and I can assure Dr Milner, that, so far from resisting the Protestant doctrine, or lifting up its voice in favour of Popery, there is not a church, or meeting-house, or conventicle-house, of any name, in the three kingdoms, in which, during the memory of man, the genuine Protestant doctrine has been more faithfully preached; and, so far as I can learn, the stones of the wall, chill and damp as they are, never gave the preacher any disturbance. And, though the ashes of St Kentigern, and I do not know how many Popish saints, are lying there, not one of them has moved a tongue or a finger, "to resist," in any sort, "that which is now performed" by the Protestant worshippers. I believe, however,

none of these saints were hanged for treasonable practices; they were not in this sense martyrs for their religion, and, therefore, it may be, that their relics cannot perform such wonders as the withered hand of Father Arrowsmith, as recorded in my last Number.

Dr Milner next proceeds to prove the Church of Rome to be the true church from her APOSTOLICITY. My readers will perhaps not understand the meaning of this word; and I question if they will find it in any English dictionary. It is, however, so nearly allied to *apostolical*, that it either does, or ought to mean, that the church which pretends to this character, ought to be, in every respect, such a church as the apostles planted in Jerusalem, and in other places. Jerusalem, we all know, was the mother church. In her was fulfilled the ancient prophecy, "The law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Let us see what sort of a church this was, and then let us inquire whether the Church of Rome be like it. It consisted of a hundred and twenty men and women, including eleven apostles, or twelve after they had supplied the place of Judas, at the first meeting, after Christ's ascension, of which we have any detailed account. They were all genuine disciples of Christ; at least so far as was known to one another. I think this is clearly implied in the account which the inspired writer gives of them, Acts i. 14. "They all continued with *one accord* in prayer and supplication;" and we may easily judge what *discord* one known unbeliever would have made among them, considering the well known temper of the unbelievers of that day; for there was no such thing then as paying decent respect to Christian worship, as a compliment to public opinion, as is done by many unbelievers of the present day. On the day of Pentecost, that is, about ten days after Christ had ascended into heaven, the Holy Ghost came upon the disciples, as described in the second chapter of the Acts, when, by the preaching of the apostles, especially of Peter, the small original church received an addition of three thousand members. These had been among the betrayers and murderers of the Lord of glory; for Peter told them plainly,—"God hath made that same Jesus whom *ye* crucified, both Lord and Christ." They had joined with the rest of their countrymen in that horrid imprecation;—"His blood be on us and on our children!" "Away with him! crucify him!"—and that blood did come upon them in a way that they had never thought of or expected:—it came upon them for the salvation of their souls; for such was the generosity and clemency of the divine Saviour, that he instructed his apostles to begin their ministry at Jerusalem, that his very murderers might be the first to hear of his exaltation as a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins. Accordingly, on that great festival, when many thousands were assembled at the place of public resort, the apostles began to preach. The people in general were astonished, and deeply affected by what they heard; and three thousand were pricked to the heart. They were deeply convinced of their guilt in general, and of this great crime in particular; and found themselves worthy of everlasting perdition. But when Peter told them of the mercy of God, as displayed in the gift of that very Saviour whom they had crucified; and had called them to repent and be baptized in the name of Christ, for the remission of their sins, they believed the glad tidings, for such it was to them. They gladly received the word, and were baptized, and were added to the church; and they adorned their new connection by a new character. The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul;—and great grace was upon them all. Many more than these may have been also pricked to the heart, and filled with remorse and confusion, who yet refused the proffered salvation, and would go away contradicting and blaspheming, as was the case with the great body of that nation, though the gospel was preached to them; but the church in Jerusalem appear as a grateful company of saved sinners, whose great concern was to live to the glory of their Saviour.

This was the parent stock; and the first branches possessed the same character. These were the churches in Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria; who not only endured the fire of persecution, but when they obtained rest, (which is perhaps more trying to the faith of Christians,) after the conversion of Paul, it is testified of them, that "they were edified, and, walking in the fear of God, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied," Acts ix. 31. Throughout the remainder of the New Testament, we find the churches uniformly described as consisting of men who were separated from the world, which lieth in wickedness, and different from the men of the world in their spirit, and conduct, and whole conversation. The distinction between Jew and Gentile was never more prominently marked in the time of Israel's greatest prosperity, than that between Christians and the men of the world is marked by the apostles in all their writings. "We are of God, little children," says the apostle John. A presumptuous and arrogant assumption, some would say; and so it was, had it not been true. But the truth of the statement is undeniable from its being written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and it is repeated with the addition of what will be still more offensive to the carnal mind of the merely nominal Christian:—"We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness;" (1 John v. 19.) that is, the whole human race, who had not embraced the gospel of Christ, were lying in wickedness, or in obedi-

ence to the wicked one, namely, the devil. Now it was only those who were of God, and who were distinguished from the world, lying in subjection to the wicked one, that composed the apostolic churches. It is a fact that false brethren did occasionally creep in unawares,—that hypocrites, for wicked and selfish purposes, found admission into churches. But the guilt of this rested with themselves. The churches were not to blame, unless they consented to, or connived at, their continuing in church fellowship, after their hypocrisy was detected.

I find that these apostolic churches had bishops or pastors set over them, for their spiritual instruction and edification; and deacons ordained to be among them, for the purpose of ministering to the wants of the poor, out of the churches' bounty. We have the qualifications of these bishops and deacons very particularly described; for the divine wisdom foresaw, that according as their character might be, such would be also that of the churches over which they were placed. Let us see then what sort of persons bishops were to be. "A bishop then must be blameless, *the husband of one wife*, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre, but patient; not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his *own house, having his children* in subjection with all gravity; (for if he know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of them who are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil!" 1 Tim. iii. 2—7. The character and qualifications of deacons are described, in the same chapter, with equal minuteness, and in language so plain as not to be mistaken. Now, there can be no doubt, that, when the apostles superintended the churches, the character of the bishops, deacons, and also the body of the people, would be such as is above described. I enter not at all into the inquiry, what was the *form* of their church government? This, though by no means a matter of indifference, I hold to be of very inferior importance. The point which I wish to establish, is, that the apostolic churches were composed of men and women, who professed the faith of Christ, and proved the genuineness of their faith by holiness of life; and that, as members of his body, they held fellowship with one another, under the pastoral oversight of men of like character with themselves, but distinguished by a greater degree of gifts and graces, suitable to the importance and responsibility of their office. It was no very difficult matter, and it required no complicated machinery, to govern churches which were of one heart and soul,—walking in the fear of God, and the comfort of the Holy Ghost; yet even for such there was a government necessary; and one was ordained. Pastors were appointed to teach, and to rule in the fear of God; and the people were required to submit to them that had the rule over them. But while the apostles' doctrine was held fast, and their authority alone regarded as the rule, the people would fall as naturally into the right form of church government, as the battalions of a well disciplined army fall into order at the sound of the trumpet. "The law was not made for righteous men," as an apostle tells us, "but for the lawless and disobedient." 1 Tim. i. 9. So *modern* systems of church government, I fear, call them by what name you will, were not made for such churches as the apostles planted; but for carnal and worldly-minded men, that they might be made the subjects of a sort of Christian restraint, though not converted to Christ, and separated from the world.

I am quite aware that great corruptions in doctrine and practice appeared in some of the apostolic churches, especially in that at Corinth, and in those of Galatia, and in some of the seven churches in Asia; and from this circumstance the Head of the church took occasion to instruct his people how they should conduct themselves when such corruptions arose. They were commanded to keep themselves pure, and to put away from among them every member who had departed from the faith, or from holy practice; knowing that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, they were instructed to purge out the old leaven; that is, to separate whatever had a tendency to withdraw their minds from the spiritual simplicity of Christ's gospel, or their practice from conformity with his law. And the fact of corruption appearing in a church did not infer the condemnation of that church, if they did not consent to it, or suffer it to remain uncorrected. Erring and immoral church members had all to bear their own burden, when the church, on being unable to reclaim them, put them away; but if the church did not reclaim, or put away such members, she was justly doomed to bear her part of the burden. Then it became the duty of those among them, who loved and wished to obey the Saviour in all things, to attend to what was necessary for their own purity. They were commanded to withdraw from *every brother* who walked disorderly, and who refused to be reclaimed; which necessarily implies the duty of withdrawing from *any number of brethren*,—even from *a whole church*, when found disorderly and irreclaimable: so that the Reformers were guilty of no schism, but were only obeying a divine command, when they separated from the Church of Rome.

It is time now to apply these evidently scriptural principles to the Church of Rome. She boasts above all others, to be the holy, Catholic, APOSTOLICAL church; that is, if the words have

any meaning, such a church as the apostles planted and watered by their personal ministry. Are her members then, in general, such as were the members of the churches in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria,—"walking in the fear of God?" I suspect that if the best of them were tried by this rule, they would be deplorably deficient; and as for thousands of them in Ireland, and not a few nearer home, they seem to live in the fear of nothing but the priest and the gallows; and a great number manifest no great fear even of these, at least of the latter, as is evident from the great proportion of Papists who appear in our criminal calendar. Dr Milner claims for the Church of Rome all *invincibly ignorant Christians*, as we have seen above, because they do not belong to any Protestant church; and by the same rule, he will claim as his beloved children in the faith, all *incorrigibly wicked Christians*. He is indeed very welcome to them; and no one will deny that such form a large proportion of the Church of Rome, if it be lawful to profane the word Christian by such a use of it; but this proves her to be the very reverse of an apostolical church. For illustration and proof of this point, I refer to my 197th Number, in which the deplorable wickedness of all ranks and classes in the "*holy* Catholic church," is described at length by approved authors of her own communion.

No. CCI.

SATURDAY, MAY 18TH, 1822.

The Reader is requested to connect the following with the conclusion of the last Number.

BUT when Papists speak of the Church they mean particularly the clergy. I have shown, then, what sort of men the apostolic bishops were, which applies equally to the elders, or priests, (priest being merely a contraction of the Greek word presbyter.) Let us now try the Apostolicity of the Popish clergy by this rule. "A bishop then must be *blameless*." The clergy, says Nicholas Clemangis, are the dregs and scum of mankind, persons who abandon themselves to the most loathsome vices. See much more to the same purpose, certified by great Popish authors, in No. 197. A bishop, and of course likewise a priest or elder, must be the husband of one wife. I do not think this means that he must necessarily be a married man, though the words literally express this, as plainly as those on which the Church of Rome found their transubstantiation express that dogma. From the lax morality of both Jews and Gentiles on the subject of marriage, it is presumable that some of the Christian converts had a plurality of wives; an evil which could not well be remedied, without injustice to one party at least, until death should operate a cure; but the apostolic injunction required that no man in that unseemly and unchristian-like state, should be called to fill any office in the churches. But nothing can be more evident than that the words admit the lawfulness of bishops being married; they even take it for granted that they have families of children. But how stands it with the Church of Rome? she makes it absolutely unlawful for her priests to marry; and if the apostle Peter himself were to appear among them, though the Popes pretend to derive all their authority from him, the first act of their authority towards him would be to make him put away his wife. Their opposition to the apostolic churches here would not be so glaring, if they lived chastely in their unmarried state. But the fact is notoriously the reverse, for which I refer again to Number 197, and to those Numbers which treat of clerical celibacy. The fact is, the Popish priests no more resemble the apostolical bishops, in this respect, than the idol of impurity resembles Joseph. There may be individual exceptions; but I speak of their prevailing character; and from ecclesitical historians of their own, we learn that, instead of ruling their own houses well in the fear of God, the great concern of those who were wealthy, was to make handsome provision for their bastards.

The apostle Peter was an example of what a pastor ought to be; and he gave a very plain description for the guidance of the churches in all ages. "The elders who are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock," 1 Epist. v. 1—3. Try the Apostolicity of the Church of Rome according to the rule here laid down, by him whom she professes to regard as her founder, and the opposition will be found as great as that between God and Baal. Instead of not seeking filthy lucre, it would seem as if the clergy sought nothing else but that, and the sensual gratifications which it can procure; and if they are not lords over God's heritage, it is because this inheritance has withdrawn from their lordship; but over those who do submit to their authority, they lord it more than any despot on the face of the earth.

It is equally easy to show, that in point of doctrine the Church of Rome is the very opposite of the apostolic churches. I might confine myself to the discourses and epistles of Peter, whom they claim as their founder; and by these it could be shown that his pretended successors have departed from the faith; that,

in short, these would-be successors of his, are the very false teachers, against whom he enters his caveat, in the second chapter of his second epistle. Let the reader attentively compare what is written there, with the characters of Popery, and of Popish priests, as they have been exhibited in different parts of my work, from their own writers, and he will be struck with the resemblance.

The Church of Rome has had the credit of maintaining the orthodox doctrine, after many other churches had embraced great errors; such, for instance, as the Arian heresy, which afterwards merged itself in the Socinian; denying the divinity and atonement of Christ. It is true, the Church of Rome made a bold stand for a time, in defence of the truth in these points; but eventually she fell into the same errors, in a more subtile form; which were therefore the more insinuating and dangerous. It was too much, even upon the verge of the dark ages, to persuade Christians in general, that their Saviour, whom they had been taught to worship, was a mere creature, and that he did not make atonement for the sins of his people; but the same satanic object was effected by persuading men to worship mere creatures, and to trust in the merits of creatures, and in their own penances. This I believe was a work of the devil's planning; for the leading men in the church had not foresight enough to perceive the result of certain early, and apparently slight, aberrations from the truth, which issued in the grand apostasy, which the Church of Rome has exhibited for many centuries; that is, the antichrist, of which the apostle John said, it shall come, and even now it is in the world; and, "He is antichrist who denieth the Father and the Son," 1 Epist. ii. 22. The apostle Peter spoke of the same thing, when he said of the false teachers, they "shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them," 2 Epist. ii. 1. The leading character of this antichrist is,—denying the divinity and the atonement of Christ. This was done in two ways; first, by bringing him down to the level of a mere creature: this was for the learned and philosophical professors of Christianity; but there was something too shocking and violent in this, for the bulk of the people. The second method served the purpose much better; that was to bring up certain creatures to the rank and place of the Saviour. Some of these creatures were saints and martyrs,—whose memory was held in great veneration; and persons who would have shuddered at the thought of degrading Christ, experienced no such feeling when his friends and martyrs were exalted,—when they were held as entitled to a sort of relative honour,—when they were considered as intercessors in heaven, and had prayers addressed to them as such. This had not the revolting appearance of directly robbing Christ of his glory, as the Arian and Socinian doctrine had; and of course, it gained ground more extensively. It was, however, the very same antichrist; for Christ is as much dishonoured by the presumption of raising a creature to his level, as by the impiety of bringing him down to the level of a creature.

These are the leading features of the antichrist, who makes such a prominent figure in the apocalyptic parts of scripture. The one is the opposition of science and worldly wisdom; the other is the opposition of bloated ignorance and superstition. Each has a multitude of ramifications; and they seem in many points to be directly opposed to each other; but both agree in creature-worship, and creature-merit; and thus they are both alike subversive of genuine Christianity; and as far as possible removed from the character of Apostolicity. My present business is with the Church of Rome only; but if I can prove, as I think I can, that she symbolizes with Socinianism, this will go a great way to prove, to the conviction of many readers, that she is not an apostolical church.

It will be recollected that Dr Milner shows a disposition to magnify Socinianism, by insinuating that the churches of England and Scotland have almost universally gone into it; and by asserting that most Protestants of eminence deny that the divinity of Christ can be proved from scripture alone. (See PROT. No. 192.) Popish writers lay great stress upon the concessions of Protestants; and thus Dr Milner does what he can to serve the Socinian cause; which leads me to devote a few pages to the subject of the Socinianism of Popery, in which I have little more to do than to give a few extracts translated from a very curious and scarce work, which, I believe, was never translated into English. It is entitled, "*Roma Racoviana, et Racovia Romana*: That is, the full and exact Agreement of Papists and Socinians, in many of the points of their religion, and those the most important. In which the soul and marrow of both religions is clearly shown to be one and the same: and that one and the same spirit reigns in each apostasy," &c. by William Jamieson, Edinburgh, 1702.

In his epistle dedicatory he informs us, that the Papists and Socinians, to whom, he says, all other sects may be reduced, or classed under, have generally been considered as diametrically opposite; but that it is his intention in this treatise to demonstrate their firm unity and concord; and that their principles, spirit, end, and scope, are the same; and that therefore, they are but two branches of that great apostasy, which was predicted in the holy scriptures: and that this Babylonian apostasy is the universal gangrene, the poison of all former heresies, the mother of abominations, and the turbulent sea by which the Lord's

field is inundated. He then pays a high tribute to the memory of King William, for his delivering the nation from Popery; which I mention here because it has become fashionable in certain circles, to speak slightingly of this truly great and liberal-minded prince, and to look upon those who profess to respect his memory as illiberal bigots. It is, however, no small testimony, on his behalf, that his glory appeared most bright to those who stood near it;—that the deliverance which he effected was most appreciated by those who were personally the subjects of that deliverance; and that he is lightly thought of only by persons who live at a distance, and who know only by report the grievous thraldom from which he emancipated the subjects of these kingdoms.

"Thus," says our author, "the Romanists deny the holy scriptures to be the last judge of controversy. The Socinians in words condemn this; but who does not see that they agree in fact?—they make a derision of innumerable passages of scripture, clearer than the meridian sun. Again, the Socinians deny Christ's divinity; the Papists expressly assert it; but they most impudently affirm that this doctrine cannot be proved from scripture; and affirm positively that the primitive fathers were infected with Arianism, or left nothing against it;—and they also overthrow the doctrine by allowing divine worship to creatures; thus they make common cause with the Socinians, and agree with them in practice, though they cry out against them. And as the Socinians worship Christ, whom they yet denominate a mere creature, so also the Papists worship the Virgin Mary, and the Pope; and I hope to show their agreement to the satisfaction of the candid reader." Sect. I. What he says here about worshipping Christ, believing him to be a mere creature, applies to the older Socinians. The modern ones, of the Priestleian school, more consistently deny all worship to Christ; and it is well known, that for such *consistency* Socinus himself persecuted Davides one of his own brethren.

Section second. Of the scripture we read as follows:—I. "The word of God is verbally acknowledged, and even at times honoured, by both Papists and Socinians. Cornelius A. Lapide, Justinian, and other Popish commentators on Tim. iii. 15.—the Council of Trent, Sess. I. and Bellarmine, de Verbo Dei, lib. I. cap. ii. There is nothing, says he, more certain, or better known than the sacred scriptures, contained in the prophetic and apostolic writings, so that it must be the most egregious folly to deny that faith is to be had in them. That they are well known the whole Christian world is witness; and the consent of all nations, where for many ages they have attained the chief authority; they are also most true and certain, and contain, not human inventions, but divine oracles, of which the first testimony is the truth of the prophecies, &c. Socinus himself, in more than one of his published works, owns the authority of holy scripture. The Racovian Catechism, cap. i. Valkelius de Vera Religione, lib. V. cap. v. Slightingius, in 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

"II. But both parties cry out that the originals, the Hebrew and Greek, are corrupted. Bellarmine, de Verbo Dei, lib. II. cap. ii. Palavicino, Hist. con. Trid. part. I. lib. VI. cap. xvii. num. 3. 'They are so ambiguous, and so corrupt, that almost no sense can be drawn out of them.' And 'the Hebrew originals have been corrupted by the Jews our enemies; and the Greek, by Grecian heretics and schismatics.' So Canus, Sixtus, Senensis, &c. 'Among the Hebrews there are innumerable ambiguous words which have been the cause of much contention.' Bale, the Jesuit, Catech. Tract. I. Quest. 4. 'The original is lying.'

"To the Papists agree the Socinians. Thus the Racovian Catechism;—'There seems to exist a corruption of the scripture in things of lesser moment.' Socinus, vol. I. p. 270. 'Now respecting the corruption of the holy scriptures,—if any man will say that it is most likely, that in the space of so many ages, when so many copies have been wrote out, that in many places they are changed, truly I will not deny it.' Another of their writers, in his disputation against the Jews,—'There are many traces of corruption and depravation by the fault of the writers, exist in the New Testament.' Also, Quest. 24. p. 115.—'When the Old Testament has received so many wounds, either through the carelessness or ignorance of librarians, it need not be wondered if the same have happened to the New Testament.

"III. The Papists maintain that 'the apostles and evangelists, having received no command, wrote as occasion or circumstances required,' Bale, Tract. I. Quest. 2. Bellar. De Verbo Dei, lib. IV. cap. iv.—Socinus, vol. I. p. 267. 'The oppositions or diversities, either true or apparent, which are in things of small moment, belong to history.' Valk. de Vera Rel. lib. V. cap. v. 'There is a real diversity in the scriptures, though in things of no, or at any rate of small, moment to a happy life.' And Grotius, as cited by Hornbeck, Socin. Conf. Trin. i. p. 6. 'All the books in the Hebrew canon were not dictated by the Holy Spirit.' And, 'if Luke had written by divine inspiration, he would have claimed authority from thence, as the prophets did, and not from the witnesses he had been informed by.'

"IV. Bellarmine, de Verbo Dei, lib. IV. cap. iv. and Bale, Tract. I. Quest. 3. affirm, that many of the canonical books have perished. The same is the opinion of Socinus and Valkelius, de Vera Religione, lib. V. cap. v. 'It is understood that many of the books of the Old Testament have perished.'

"V. Pope worshippers deny that inferences may be deduced from scripture. Veronius,

cap. iii. Arnoux, Art. V. Bale, Tract. I. Quest. 9. 'Where is it plainly written that there are three persons in the Trinity? Where is the Holy Spirit said to proceed from the Father and the Son, as is determined by the councils?' A careless reader would be apt to suppose that Bale meant to decry the councils; but a closer acquaintance with the genius of Popery would convince him of the reverse. His object is to show that we are indebted to the councils, not to scripture, for the definition of Catholic doctrine.

"Bellarmine contends that 'we are in no wise justified by the imputed righteousness of Christ.' De Justif. lib. II. cap. vii. And Bale, Tract. IV. Quest. 10. 'The scriptures nowhere use these words, Faith alone justifies.' In this the Socinians are willing disciples of the Papists;—'Whatever is necessary to salvation must be fully and literally written out in holy writ.' Smalcius, p. 1. And again, 'How can that be said to be necessary to salvation, which is only drawn by consequence from holy scripture?' p. 70. Crellius, de Uno Deo Patre, lib. I. sect. 3. cap. i. uses this argument against the deity of the Holy Ghost,—'The Holy Spirit is nowhere in holy writ plainly called God.'

"VI. The Papists believe with the Socinians that all that is necessary to be believed or performed is not to be found in scripture. See Bellarmine de Verbo Dei, lib. IV. cap. iv. and Bale, Tract. I. Quest. 9. The Socinians worship their Christ, a mere man, with divine worship. Valkel. lib. V. cap. xxix. 'It follows that we oppose that most pestilent opinion that Christ is not to be worshipped.' Yet he denies this worship to be commanded in scripture, lib. IV. cap. ix.

"VII. The Papists deny the necessity of the assistance of the Holy Spirit for understanding the scriptures savingly. Becanus, lib. III. cap. x. Bale, Tract. I. Quest. 17. The same is affirmed by the Socinians,"—of which abundant evidence is adduced.

I find it would be endless to extract all that the author has collected on this subject. Papists and old Socinians seem evidently to have regarded the word of God with equal contempt; and as for the modern ones, I think Dr Milner is fairly entitled to be classed with Dr Priestley. The latter gentleman accused the apostles of reasoning "inconclusively," and Moses of giving a "lame account" of the creation; which is only a more honest way of expressing his contempt for the inspired writings, than Dr Milner's affected respect for them, while he contemns them for being an insufficient Rule of faith.

This Mr Jamieson, (who he was I do not know,) fills a small quarto volume with quotations from Popish and Socinian writers, which prove not only the similarity, but the identity of the two systems, in relation to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; such as, the trinity; the state of man, and his fall; providence; grace, and free will; of the law; of Christ; of justification; of the church and the sacraments; and of the frauds, and desperate cause of the two sects. I might fill several Numbers with extracts on these subjects; but I am afraid my readers would think them extremely dry. If I have shown that the systems are the same in their contempt of the holy scriptures, it will be understood as comprising every subject of divine revelation, according to the well-known geometrical axiom,—the whole must comprehend all its parts. It is worth while, however, to add a few modern examples to those ancient ones which Mr Jamieson has collected with so much industry.

I take Dr Milner to be the oracle of living Papists; and he tells us in his eighth letter;—"If Christ had intended that all mankind should learn his religion from a book, namely, the New Testament, he himself would have written that book,"&c. Now as we know Christ did not write the New Testament with his own hand, Dr Milner's inference unavoidably is, that we are not to receive our religion from it, and that it is not to be depended upon. Again,—"It does not even appear that he gave his apostles any command to write the gospel." See as above. Then it follows that the apostolic writings were unauthorized, and of course without authority. Such indeed is the scope of the whole of Dr Milner's 8th letter, of which a more particular account will be found in my 193d Number. Let us see now how modern Socinians treat the sacred volume. Dr Priestley, speaking of reverence for it, says,—"Not that I consider the books of scripture as *inspired*, and on that account entitled to this high degree of respect, but as authentic records of the the dispensations of God to mankind, with every particular of which we cannot be too well acquainted."—"The writers of the books of scripture were *men*, and therefore *fallible*; but all that we have to do with them is in the character of historians and witnesses of what they heard and saw."—"Like all other historians, they were liable to mistakes, with respect to things of small moment, because they might not give sufficient attention to them; and with respect to their *reasoning* we are at full liberty to judge of it as well as that of other men, by a due consideration of the propositions they advance, and the arguments they allege. For it by no means follows, because a man has had communications with the deity for certain purposes, and he may be depended upon with respect to his account of those communications, that he is in other respects more wise and knowing than other men." *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever, part II. preface, page xiii. also Letter V.* In his *Letters to the Philosophers and Politicians of France*, Dr. Priestley says: "That the books of scripture were written by particular divine inspiration,

is a thing to which the writers themselves make no pretensions. It is a notion destitute of all proof, and that has done great injury to the evidence of Christianity," p. 38.

The Monthly Review, a well known organ of this sect, lays down the Socinian doctrine relating to the scriptures thus:—"The nature and design of the scriptures is not to settle disputed theories, nor to decide upon speculative controverted questions, even *in religion and morality*.—The scriptures, if we understand any thing of them, are not intended so much to make us wiser, as to make us better; not to solve the doubts, but rather to make us *obey the dictates of our consciences*." March 1793, p. 357. See this subject discussed in a masterly manner, in Letter XII. of Fuller's Systems Compared, one of the ablest controversial works in the English language. It was well said by one of the Reviewers, when this work appeared, that the great philosopher, (Priestley) in the hands of the plain Baptist minister, whose education extended little beyond common English, was no more than a dwarf in the hands of a giant.

No. CCII.

SATURDAY, MAY 25TH, 1822.

THE reader must not suppose from what I have said of Socinianism, that I intend to make war against any sect of Protestants. This would very ill become THE PROTESTANT, who has received such countenance from all denominations to whom the name belongs. But Socinianism does not belong to Protestantism. It is as far removed from it as Popery itself. The deity and atonement of Christ are as essential to the Protestant religion, as is freedom from the tyranny of Rome. This I suppose will not be denied by any Socinian, and of course those of that persuasion cannot properly call themselves Protestants. There may be individuals of Socinian principles in communion with Protestant churches, just as concealed Papists may be,—to the shame of both be it said; but to call any Protestant church Socinian, would be as unjust as to call it Popish.

Popery and Socinianism decidedly agree in this:—that there is an authority among men superior to the scriptures, by which the scriptures are to be tried, and have their meaning determined. This may be called the nucleus of the two systems. Here they unite in a common centre; and this establishes their identity, notwithstanding the fact that they diverge from it in many different directions. The authority which Papists set over the scriptures, is the church and tradition; that which the Socinians set over it, is reason and conscience. "I have proved to you," says Dr Milner, "that the whole business of the scriptures belongs to the church. She has preserved them, she vouches for them, and she alone, by confronting the several passages with each other, and by the *help of tradition, authoritatively* explains them." *Letter XII.* See the whole passage in PROT. No. 193. Compare this with the doctrine of the Socinian Reviewer quoted in last Number:—"The scriptures were intended —not to solve the doubts,—but rather to make us obey the dictates of our conscience.' Here conscience is put where Papists put the church. Its authority is supreme. It receives not information from scripture as to what is right or wrong, true or false; for this must be the meaning of not being intended to solve doubts, else there is no meaning in the words; but conscience itself determines what is right, and what ought to be done; and scripture is brought in only as an auxiliary to enforce obedience to this supreme authority, this idol Socinians exalt above the word of God, as Papists do the church.

The two systems are only different modifications of the one apostasy, which originated in man's departure from God, at the fall. They are both the religion of corrupt human nature, which refuses to submit to the will, and wisdom, and righteousness of God; and which would exalt the creature above all that is called God, and that is worshipped. But they are calculated for very different states of society. Popery suits a state of besotted ignorance, vice, and superstition; and when the devil held what was called Christendom in bondage by these, he found little use for his other instrument; and, therefore, what we call Socinianism, was little heard of during the dark ages. But when the adversary found that the Reformation had given so much light to the world, that he could not hope to rule much longer by means of ignorance, he laid hold of the other branch of the system, by means of which he tried to maintain his dominion over the souls of men. The revival of the old error, which took the name of Socinus, was almost coeval with Luther's reformation; and by this the carnal, inquisitive, philosophical mind was fascinated, and diverted from the simplicity of Christ's gospel, and of course from Christ's salvation, as really as the gross and superstitious mind had been diverted from it, by means of tradition, holy water, and lying wonders.

Let the reader observe, that my aim in this and last Number, is to show the identity of *Popery* and *Socinianism*. I am not speaking of *Papists* and *Socinians*, personally; or by any means intending to insinuate, much less to assert, that the prevailing character of the two bodies is the same. Where ignorance is held to be the mother of devotion, and where the great aim of public *teachers* is to keep the people in ignorance, the state of taste, morals, and every thing must be very low. But the Soci-

nians do not cultivate ignorance upon principle. In respect of literature, and all the decencies of enlightened society, they are not behind their Protestant neighbours. They acknowledge no foreign power, civil or religious; they do not profess that it is lawful to propagate their principles by force, or to punish men for heresy; and therefore they ought not to be regarded as dangerous neighbours, or in any respect incapable of being good subjects and useful members of society, in any department which they are qualified to occupy.

I have thus endeavoured to show, that in point of doctrine, as well as in the prevailing character of her members, the Church of Rome is the reverse of apostolical. I have not gone into a detail of doctrinal errors, with which I might have filled a few Numbers; but have rather fixed on one great prominent heresy, which contains in its bosom every thing that is opposed to the gospel of Christ; and having shown that the Church of Rome identifies itself with this heresy, by setting human authority over the word of God, it is not necessary that I should descend to a minute analysis of her subordinate errors.

But it is time to attend to what Dr Milner means by the *Apostolicity* of his church. This is neither evangelical doctrine nor holy life. It is something which he describes as "succession" from the apostles. It is something like the carnal descent of a noble or royal family: according to which, if a man can prove his propinquity, he claims the estates and the honours of some ancient family. Thus Dr Milner lays down the noble, or rather sacerdotal, succession of himself and his brethren, down to the lowest parish priest, in the most ignorant part of the world:—"Thus, my dear Sir, every Catholic pastor is authorised and enabled to address his flock as follows:—'The word of God which I announce to you, and the holy sacraments which I dispense to you, I am QUALIFIED to announce and dispense by such a Catholic bishop, who was consecrated by such another Catholic bishop, and so on, in a series which reaches to the apostles themselves: and I am AUTHORIZED to preach and minister to you by such a prelate, who received authority, for this purpose, from the successor of St Peter, in the apostolic see of Rome.'" *Letter XXIX.* p. 139. In reading such contemptible nonsense, one's mind is unavoidably brought into contact with childish things. The reader must therefore bear with me when I say, that this account of Popish succession forcibly reminded me of "the house that Jack built."

This article of apostolical succession is one of the most absurd figments that even Popery itself can produce; for though it were possible for modern priests to prove that they have come in an unbroken line of succession from the apostles, it would be of no use to them, unless they brought also the doctrine of the apostles; and even then it would be of no use to them; for their bringing of the apostles' doctrine, and exhibiting the holy life which it produces, would serve every purpose of an evangelical ministry, without the succession. But this succession they cannot possibly prove; and therefore upon the principle of its being a mark of the true church, they must stand condemned, because they are found wanting. In a late Number I stated the fact, that there had been many great schisms in the Church of Rome, some of them continuing for many years, during which period rival Popes excommunicated each other, while each created cardinals, and performed all the functions competent to the head of the church. One at least of these heads (for there were three at one time) must necessarily have been false: all the spiritual functions derived from the false head must have been false likewise; the priests who derived their powers from such a source were no priests; the bishops consecrated in virtue of such authority were no bishops; and all their ordinations were null and void; and no bishop or priest of the present day can prove that he is come of the right line; therefore all that they build upon the notion of their apostolical succession falls to the ground.

Let us see how Dr Milner attempts to get over this difficulty:—"I grant, Sir, that, from the various commotions and accidents to which all sublunary things are subject, there have been several vacancies, or interregnums in the Papacy; but none of them have been of such a lengthened duration, as to present a moral continuation of the Popedom, or to hinder the execution of the important offices annexed to it. I grant also, that there have been rival Popes and unhappy schisms in the church, particularly one great schism at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century: still the true Pope was always clearly discernible at the times we are speaking of, and in the end was acknowledged even by his opponents."—When and by whom was this discerned; and when was this acknowledgment made by opposing pontiffs? This is a mere assertion of the doctor's own, without so much as an attempt to adduce evidence in support of it: and supposing his assertion were true as to the opposing Popes themselves, what became of the many thousands of bishops and priests who derived spiritual faculties from them? Were they turned back to the rank of mere laymen upon the degradation of the Popes that made them? No such thing. This is not so much as pretended; and those who received ordination and consecration from the false Pope, and those who received the same from them and their successors, cannot now be distinguished from those who derived these faculties from the true Pope; so that there is not a priest in the world who can prove his apostolical pedigree.

But Dr Milner continues :—"Lastly, I grant that a few of the Popes, perhaps a tenth of the whole number, [nine tenths would have been nearer the truth] swerving from the example of the rest, have, by their *personal vices*, disgraced their holy station : but even these Popes always fulfilled their *public duties* to the church, by maintaining the *apostolical doctrine*, moral as well as speculative, the *apostolical orders*, and the *apostolical mission*." *Letter XXX.* p. 154. Here we have something that seems to border on the miraculous ; and I hope Dr Milner will thank me for pointing it out to the world, as it may tend to his canonization a hundred years after his death ;—it is, that Popes, who by their personal vices *disgraced their holy station*, yet *always fulfilled their public duties to the church*. We Protestants, in our simplicity, have been accustomed to think that the first *public duty* which a pastor owes to the church, is, to give them an example of personal purity. —Keep THYSELF pure, was a charge which Paul gave to Timothy, obedience to which was essential to his profiting others by his ministry ; but Dr Milner does most miraculously reconcile personal vices, which disgraced the holy station of the Popes, with perfection of public duty, in those whose duty it was to be examples to the flock, "in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity." 1 Tim. iv. 12. I entreat Dr Milner to publish a satisfactory account of the process by which the *holy fathers* of Rome, who disgrace their holy station by their personal vices, are yet able always to fulfil their public duties to the church. If he can give a satisfactory explanation of this mystery, I shall never ask him to perform another miracle.

But that the whole matter of apostolic succession is a mere figment, and a very absurd one, will, I hope, appear from what follows :— In the first place, the apostles themselves never laid any stress upon it ; and never so much as mentioned it as a mark of the true church. Paul in his epistles to both Timothy and Titus, gives a very particular description of the qualifications necessary for bishops and deacons ; but he says not a word of the necessity of their apostolical succession ; — that is, that they should be ordained by the apostles or by men who had received ordination at second or third hand from the apostles ; much less from the thousandth hand, as it must be now, or at some period of the world, if such a thing were necessary. Nay, supposing a man to have received ordination from all the twelve apostles together, if this man should afterwards have departed from the faith, his ordination would have availed nothing to himself, and he would have possessed nothing that he could convey to another man. I am not speaking against the necessity of regular and proper ordination to the Christian ministry ; but what I meen is, that all that is valuable in it, to any individual or church over which he may be placed, is connected with his holding the truth as it is in Jesus. Distinct from this truth he has nothing in himself that can be useful in a spiritual sense ; and he has nothing that he can communicate to others by the imposition of his hands.

There was one man who received apostolical ordination to the deacon's office, who, if ancient ecclesiastical writers say the truth, became the head of an immoral sect, which is condemned in the strongest terms by Christ himself. This was Nicolas, one of the seven, mentioned, Acts vi. 5. who is said to have been the leader of the sect of the Nicolaitanes, see Rev. ii. 6. I confess I have seen nothing that fully convinces me that this sect took its name from the same Nicolas ; or, supposing that certain wicked men assumed his name, I have seen nothing that convinces me that he was the author of their heresy. Wicked men in all ages have chosen to call themselves by respectable names ; and the most wicked of all sects have had the impiety to call themselves by that name at which, it is said, every knee shall bow. But Papists, who believe in tradition, have no right to take advantage of my doubts. They, I suppose, believe most firmly that Nicolas the deacon was the father of the Nicolaitanes. Do they then believe, that after these heretics had departed from the faith of Christ so far as to incur this condemnation ;—"This thou hast that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which I also hate :" Again :—"So hast thou them who hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate :"—Do they, I say, believe that after Nicolas had become such an apostate, his apostolical ordination was of any use to him ; or that he had still the power of conferring orders upon others ? Can one confer upon another the power of preaching sound doctrine from which he himself has departed ? or can the apostolic ordination of a man to preach the truth empower that man to ordain others to preach falsehood and error ? I presume that even Dr Milner will not answer this question in the affirmative ; and if he cannot, he must allow the whole *mystery* of apostolic succession to go for nothing.

I am aware that deacons are not understood to have the power of ordaining ; but Dr Milner knows that many bishops embraced heresy at an early period, to whom what I have said of Nicolas applies. If they had apostolical ordination, it was ordination to teach and defend the truth ; and it imparted no power to ordain others for an opposite purpose. So far from laying any stress upon apostolical ordination, the apostle Paul, who received his commission from Christ, declares that even this divine ordination would become void, if he departed from the faith, and became a preacher of error :—"Though *we*, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel than that

which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Gal. i. 8. The Church of Rome, therefore, like every other church, must be tried by her doctrine, and the lives of her members, not by the apostolic succession of her clergy.

But, secondly, we have a plain rule laid down, by which we are to recognise true Christian teachers; and in this rule there is not a word about apostolical succession. "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. *If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed;* for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds;" 2 John 7—11. Here then the question is not whether a professed teacher of Christianity has regular ordination, and apostolical succession, but what doctrine does he bring? Again:—"Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that Spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already it is in the world;" 1 John iv. 1—3. Here Christians are called to occupy the high ground of judges of what men, professing to be teachers, say to them. A Popish priest tells his people,—"The word of God which I announce to you, and the holy sacraments which I dispense to you, I am qualified to announce and dispense by such a Catholic bishop, who was consecrated by such another Catholic bishop," &c. Thus he assumes an air of authority, which sets the judgment of the people completely at defiance. He comes to them as their lord and master, and he treats them as his slaves; but the really Christian teacher comes as a servant to his fellow-creatures:—"We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake;" and every such faithful preacher desires to find his Christian brethren an intelligent people, and able to bring his preaching to the test of the divine record. This would never do in the Church of Rome. Her members must receive every thing upon the authority of the priests, who have received a certain mysterious communication from the apostles, to teach what no man has a right to try, as the apostle John commanded to try the spirits; from which it is evident that Papists are not the sort of persons whom the apostle addressed. In all his address there is no account made of apostolical succession. The spirits, that is, the teachers, might have this, or they might not; the thing which all who listened to their teaching were called to judge of, was the doctrine which they taught.

This was summarily comprehended in the question, whether or not Jesus Christ was come in the flesh? Those who denied this were the antichrist of the day. But such a general proposition must be taken as including all that it necessarily implies. Thus, when Christ himself was on earth, the great question was, whether he was the Christ or not? Those who believed the affirmative, submitted to him as the Christ and the Saviour of the world; and this implied the recognition of him in his whole character, as set forth in the scriptures. In like manner, the acknowledgment that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh implies his pre-existence; for who would say of a mere creature born into the world, he is *come* in the flesh? And it implies an acknowledgment of the design and purpose of his coming into the world; that is, to make an atonement, or put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Now, the antichrist whom the apostle John describes was one who denied these things; and whether this was Arius, a mere Presbyter, who denied the divinity and atonement of Christ, and his host of followers; or the bishops of Rome, who, while professing to believe in the divinity and atonement of Christ, equally subverted the truth with regard to both, by raising mere creatures to the rank of intercessors and objects of divine worship; and by teaching the necessity of the sacrifice of the mass, to give efficacy to Christ's sacrifice,—the antichrist is equally manifest: and had it been possible for apostles themselves to have brought such doctrine they would have been justly rejected; how much more a host of immoral and heretical priests, who rest their claim to ecclesiastical authority upon a pretended descent in a right line from the apostles.

I grant that the apostle John's antichrist seems at first view to have more of the Socinian than the Popish character. It is a denying, or not having the Father and the Son; that is, not acknowledging the Christian doctrine of Him who sent, and of Him who was sent into the world. But as I have shown, the two systems unite in effecting the same thing, only the Popish method is less open and direct than the Socinian. Christ either made satisfaction, or atonement for sin, or he did not. The Socinian says at once, that he did not; the Papist says that he did; but then he immediately unsays this, by teaching that every man must yet satisfy divine justice for himself, less or more; and that the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for sin; which implies as plainly as a thing can be expressed by implication, that Christ's sacrifice was not sufficient; and there-

fore did not make atonement for sin. Besides, to say that the work which Christ finished on the cross is imperfect, which it must be if it require the addition of any human work, or any sacrifice by human hands, is to deny that Christ is God, for all God's works are perfect. Thus Popery is the very antichrist that denies the Lord who redeemed his church by his own blood.

No. CCIII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 1ST, 1822.

I BEGIN to feel, as I believe many of my readers have felt for some weeks, that it is time to have done with Dr Milner. I have touched upon the most prominent parts of his work; and have even descended to notice some of its trifling and subordinate parts; and there is just one thing more in his second part which I think worthy of particular notice. Suspecting, I suppose, that his arguments would fail to convince the *reason* of his readers, that the Church of Rome is an apostolical church, he has made an attempt, by means of a copperplate, to satisfy their *eyes*, that she is at least a most *flourishing* church. He gives us a figure of her under what he calls, "*The Apostolical Tree;*" and a most noble tree it is; but it reminds me of some rhymes which children at school are accustomed to repeat over the figure of the Glasgow arms, which they have in the front of their catechisms;—"This is the tree that never grew," &c.

The following is the title of this sublimographic representation:—"THE APOSTOLICAL TREE, showing the Uninterrupted Succession of the Catholic Church from the apostles of Jesus Christ down to the present time; likewise the chief Heretics and Schismatics, who have in different ages been cut off from her communion." Over the root is inscribed these words, "I am the Vine," &c. This is surmounted by a naked human figure, meant to represent the Saviour as crucified,—his hands nailed to two branches, and his feet nailed together to the trunk, having under them a bunch of rich grapes. The first living branch on the right hand of the figure is the blessed Virgin; then comes St Joseph; then the holy Innocents. The first branch on the left hand is Jerusalem and Syria, then St Mary Magdalene, then St John the Baptist; but why he is brought in so late is not explained. The branches as we ascend are marked by the names of apostles, evangelists, and minor saints; and of nations which were converted to the faith, at the periods indicated by the insertion of the branches into the trunk, like the degrees of latitude in the margin of a map. Thus every century is marked on the trunk of the tree, up to the beginning of the nineteenth, where Pius VIIth stands at a very giddy height, and in much more danger of a fall than St Peter, who stands at the bottom of the list immediately over the head of the crucified figure, on which he might seem to press with all the weight which his name signifies, but for a bunch of grapes which intervenes. The trunk itself is one of the greatest natural curiosities (if it were natural) that ever was seen; for though it is of amazing height, there is no tapering in it. The diameter of the top is as great as that near the bottom; but what is perhaps still more singular,—on each side there are many branches which have been lopped off, and which are supended in mid air. These have all names of great notoriety;—the first on the right is Ebion; on the left, Simon Magus; and of the later ones, at the top, we have on the one hand, Wesley, Whitefield, Swedenborg, and Lebon; and on the other, Rousseau, Voltaire, Zinzendorf, Brienne, Robespierre, and Condorcet: and in defiance of the principle of gravitation, while they seem to be falling from an immense height, they have all their points, or light leafy parts towards the earth, and their solid heavy timber towards the sky; which, I suppose, Dr Milner has done on purpose, in order to show that heretics are such rebels against all law, that they will not submit even to the law of gravity; and thus they are more hardened than the very stones.

Above the tree there is a view of what is meant for heaven. In the centre there is a triangle, within which is the sacred name in Hebrew characters, and around it there are rays of glory. This is meant to represent the trinity. On both sides there are companies of priests and nuns in their canonical robes, looking towards the triangle. The foremost on one side seems to be the Pope, who has a small figure of the cross stuck into his skull, like a pin in a pincushion; and his hands are half lifted, and stretched out, as if he were warming his fingers at the bright rays which surround the figure in the centre. Above are little figures twittering like so many sparrows, which, I suppose, are meant for angels.

It is impossible to treat such a picture with seriousness, and yet it is not a proper subject of ridicule. Though there was nothing else objectionable in Dr Milner's work, this would convict him, and all who believe in him, of gross and abominable idolatry; nay, of representing heaven itself as an idol's temple; for there he exhibits the church triumphant as worshipping a material figure of three equal sides. This is an image of the Deity which Dr Milner sets up to be adored, which is idolatry of a much grosser kind than that of the ancient heathen who worshipped the sun, moon, and stars; for these are the God's work, and they display his glory; while Dr Milner teaches men to worship an image drawn by his own pen, or by the stylus of the engraver. The worship of reptiles, of which some heathens

are guilty, degrading as it is, is more noble than this; for there is more of God in any thing that has life, than there is in the greatest works of man. I cannot allow myself to believe that Dr Milner seriously thinks the Deity is like a triangle; and therefore I suspect he has introduced the figure to serve the cause of his friends the Socinians; for, independently of the horrible impiety of forming any visible representation of the Divine Being, which He has most peremptorily forbidden, the Socinians could not desire a greater concession on the subject of the trinity than the use of such an image, even for illustration; for as one side is not a triangle, if the Deity were like this, no one of the sacred three in whose name we are baptized, would be God; and thus Popery and Socinianism combine to lead men to atheism, which is indeed the natural tendency of every system by which Deity is degraded to the rank of a creature, or by which an image of him is formed either by the hand or by the mind of man.

Dr Milner, however, appears to be quite serious in his graphic representation of the church in both earth and heaven. Of the latter indeed he says little or nothing but what appears in the picture; but of the former, that is, the church on earth, he thus boasts:— "Again you behold, in this tree, the continuation of the apostolical work, the conversion of nations; which, as it was committed by Christ to the Catholic church, so it has never been blessed by him with success in any hand but hers. This exclusive miracle, in the order of grace, like those in the order of nature, which I treated of in a former letter, is itself a divine attestation on her behalf." *Letter XXIX.* p. 137. It is scarcely worth while to inquire what he means by miracles "in the order of nature;" for all who understand the meaning of the words know, that things in the order of nature, that is, things *natural*, however strange and surprising, are quite different from things miraculous; but it is one great vice prevalent among Popish writers, that their language wants precision; and they use words in so vague a manner, that they can easily be made to mean any thing, or nothing, as may suit the purpose of the writers or their friends at a subsequent period, when they are called to account for what has been written by them.

But if any meaning can be attached to the above extract, I take it to be, that Christ has never honoured any but the Church of Rome to be instrumental in converting nations to the Christian faith; and that when she is honoured to perform this work, it is a miraculous "attestation on her behalf;" and I am by no means disposed to deny, that if so corrupt a church were to convert a nation, or even an individual to the holy faith of the gospel, it would look like a miracle. Such a miracle, I believe, has not been performed within her pale for a thousand years. I do not deny that many individuals in her communion may have been converted within this period; not by means of her influence and authority as a church, but because she had always some who had access to the word of God, and who thence, in spite of the malign influence of the church, received the truth to the salvation of their own souls.

Conversion is a strange wholesale sort of work in the opinion of Dr Milner; and in his apostolical tree he gives a large branch here and there, showing when, and under what Pope, such and such nations were converted; and in many instances their conversion turns out to be the same thing as their subjugation by the sword of an invading enemy. Such was the conversion of the Indians in South America by the Spanish missionaries, who accompanied the barbarous hordes of ruffians who invaded and conquered that effeminate people. They were mercifully allowed the alternative of worshipping the crucifix or being put to death; and though savages, they must have been convinced in their own consciences, that it was more noble to worship the sun than two cross sticks, yet we cannot imagine that many of them had the hardihood to stand out long against such pointed and solid arguments as bayonets and bullets. It was no wonder then that they became converts to the faith of Rome; but the consequence was, that they had only exchanged idols, and continued heathens under the name of Christian. The same remark applies to the many thousands whom St Francis Xavier and other missionaries are said to have converted in the East; though I do not say that similar violence was usually practised by them, though the Portuguese are blamed for converting men there at the point of the sword. The arts of deception were enough to produce all the effects that are reported to have taken place in these quarters, under the direction of Jesuit missionaries, among another simple and effeminate race of men, of whom nothing was required but to submit to the sprinkling of a little water, and conformity to a few other rites equally easy and inoffensive, while they were not required to forsake sin, or to have their affections in the least changed from sin to holiness. I recollect having read somewhere of St Austin of Canterbury, or of one of his companions, to whom such crowds of our Saxon ancestors came for baptism, at one time, that, finding it impossible to baptize them all individually, he consecrated all the water in a river, and took an instrument such as bleachers use to throw water over a field covered with linen, and thus he made the whole multitude converts by throwing the water among them. I do not vouch for the literal truth of this story; for I do not recollect where I read it, or on whose authority it is related. But it exhibits a fair specimen of the manner of making converts by Popish missionaries; and the tens of thousands whom Dr

Milner boasts of as having been baptized, in the East Indies and China, by certain missionaries, in a short space of time, can be accounted for only in some such way as this; for allowing that they were all baptized one by one, the missionary could have no more knowledge of their personal characters, than if he had baptized them by thousands at a time, by water thrown from a fire engine.

This, however, is what Dr Milner means by conversion. It is to get men to submit to the external rite of baptism by missionaries who have apostolical succession; and when such missionaries follow in the train of conquering armies, nations are easily converted. Thus the Vandals received Christianity, such as was presented to them, at the point of the sword, from the Teutonic knights of Charlemagne. "Thus Clovis and his Franks, Rollo and his Normans, were converted in a day, not from Satan to God, but from *barefaced* paganism to *paganized* Christianity." Of nothing greater than this has Rome to boast; and yet Dr Milner does boast of it, as a work which Christ has never blessed in the hands of any but Romish apostolical missionaries. But this is an achievement for which no Protestant—no real Christian—will envy them. It is such a process of conversion as Christ never approved; and the consequence is, that such converts are made more the children of the devil than they were before. The humble Christian missionary who is honoured to be the instrument of converting one soul to God, though he did no more in his whole life, has more blessings upon his labour, than if he had converted the empire of China to Popery, or to merely nominal Christianity under any name; and though Dr Milner treats with great derision and contempt the Moravians, Methodists, Baptists, and other Protestant missionaries, I have no doubt some of them will be honoured at the great day with, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord," when those who have deceived the nations by false miracles and a spurious Christianity will be covered with shame and everlasting contempt.

The third part of Dr Milner's work consists of a formal defence of those articles of the Creed of Rome, by which she is chiefly distinguished from other churches; or rather, those articles which the Reformers rejected and condemned. These are,—the Invocation of Saints and Angels; the Worshipping of Relics, or what he calls Religious Memorials. He concludes his defence of this in the following words: "It is a point agreed upon among Catholic doctors and divines, that the memorials of religion (*i. e.* images and relics) form no essential part of it. Hence if you should become a Catholic, as I pray God you may, I will never ask you, if you have a pious picture or relic, or so much as a crucifix in your possession: but then I trust, after the declarations I have made, that you will not account me an idolater, should you see such things in my oratory or study, or should you observe how tenacious I am of my crucifix in particular. Your faith and devotion may not stand in need of such memorials; but mine, alas! do. I am too apt to forget what my Saviour has done and suffered for me; but the sight of his representation often brings this to my memory, and affects my sentiments. Hence I would rather part with most of the books in my library, than with the figure of my crucified Lord." *Letter XXXIV.* p. 33. This is a plain acknowledgment that his notions of Deity do not rise above material objects; for if he cannot remember his Saviour without an image of him, though his human nature was an object of sense, he cannot at all think of God who is a Spirit, without a visible representation of him. Thus he practises and teaches that very idolatry which is condemned throughout the whole Bible, and which it was the design of God by a revelation of himself to banish from the earth.

The other articles which Dr Milner defends in this part of his work are Transubstantiation, in all the grossness of it;—Communion under one kind, that is, withholding the cup from the laity;—the Sacrifice of the Mass;—Absolution from Sin;— Indulgence;— Purgatory;— Extreme Unction;—the Papal Supremacy, along with which he attempts to prove that the Pope is not Antichrist;—and a defence of his church against various misrepresentations, particularly of her persecuting spirit. On all these subjects I have written enough, particularly in my replies to the Catholic Vindicator, who, in his labours, drew largely upon this work of his great patron; so that if I were to reply to Dr Milner on the above points, I would be necessarily taken over ground which I have already occupied, and from which I have completely driven the enemy; for not one of our Papists has ventured to renew the attack, or even to stand on the defensive, since their hired champion was silenced, two years and a half ago: and I suspect Dr Milner himself will not condescend to enter the lists with a layman. This I know is the pretext of another clergyman for declining to defend his church against THE PROTESTANT; but this is all hollow Jesuitical shuffling; for as Papists profess to believe that Protestant ordination is null and void, I am no more a layman in their opinion than the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Before concluding I shall indulge the reader with a few sentences from Dr Milner's Letter on Supremacy:—"It is not, then, the faith of this church, that the Pope has any civil or temporal sovereignty, by virtue of which he can depose princes, or take away the property of other persons, out of his own domain: for even the incarnate Son of God, from whom he derives the supremacy which he possesses, did

not claim, here upon earth, any right of the above-mentioned kind: on the contrary he positively declared, that his *kingdom is not of this world!* Hence, the Catholics of both our islands have, without impeachment even from Rome, denied upon oath that the Pope has any civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm. But, as it is undeniable, that different Popes, in former ages, have pronounced sentence of deposition against certain cotemporary princes, and, as great numbers of theologians have held (though not as a matter of faith) that they had a right to do so, it seems proper, by way of mitigating the odium which Dr Porteus and other Protestants raise against them, on this head, to state the grounds on which the pontiffs acted, and the divines reasoned in this business. Heretofore, the kingdoms, principalities, and states, composing the Latin church, when they were all of the same religion, formed, as it were, one Christian republic, of which the Pope was the accredited head. Now, as mankind have been sensible at all times, that the duty of civil allegiance and submission cannot extend beyond a certain point, and that they ought not to surrender their property, lives, and morality, to be sported with by a Nero or a Heliogabalus; instead of deciding the nice point for themselves, *when resistance becomes lawful*, they *thought it right to be guided by their chief pastor.*" *Letter XLVI.* p. 131. Here Dr Milner admits that an odium attaches to the Papal administration; and that so far from being able to remove, he can only mitigate it. And his mitigation consists in admitting the fact, that the Pope exercised authority over all Christian states; and that for the express purpose "of deciding the nice point," when subjects should rebel against their sovereigns. And this must always have been when the thing was agreeable to the Pope himself, and when sovereigns refused to be subject to him; as in the case of king John, and Henry VIII. and queen Elizabeth. It is true Dr Milner confines his admission to the case of such sovereigns as Nero and Heliogabalus; but he has no right to do so, for the Pope is the sole judge; and Dr Milner knows, that in the esteem of the Pope a heretical prince is infinitely more hateful than a Nero. Whenever therefore Papists shall become powerful enough, for the purpose, in this kingdom, the Pope will "decide the nice point," when they shall throw off a Protestant and bring in a Popish sovereign. A sentence or two farther on, indeed, Dr Milner tells us, that "Since Christendom has been disturbed by a variety of religions, this power of the pontiff has been *generally* withdrawn." This is to quiet our fears in the mean time; for it was never *fully* withdrawn; and this power was never disclaimed by the Pope himself, so that we may expect he will resume the exercise of it whenever an occasion offers.

The reader will readily perceive a striking contrast between the Pope, even according to Dr Milner's partial representation of him, and the apostle Peter from whom he pretends to derive his authority. It was in the reign of Nero and such as he that Peter and Paul commanded every soul to be subject to the higher powers; and to pray for kings and all in authority: but the Pope sets himself above all sovereigns, and makes it his business to "decide the nice point," when subjects shall no longer obey, but rebel!

Yet it seems it is not the faith of the church that the Pope possesses temporal sovereignty, because Jesus Christ did not claim this when on earth. Does Dr Milner then really believe, or wish us to believe, that the conduct and claims of the Pope are regulated by those of Jesus Christ? His words imply no less than this impudent mockery of his readers, whom he must take to be no better than beasts of burden, else he would not venture to insult them by insinuating such a palpable falsehood, —a falsehood detected by his own words in the same paragaph. Christ declined being a judge or a divider among men, in their temporal affairs; but according to Dr Milner's own account, the Pope was the accredited head of kingdoms; and that "the kings and princes themselves acknowledged this right in the Pope, and frequently applied to him to make use of his indirect temporal power, as appears in numerous instances."

Dr Milner has another quibble, in the words of the oath, which, he says, Papists in this country swear; that is, that the Pope *has not* any civil jurisdiction, power, &c. within this realm. We know very well that he *has not*, and we do not require to be informed of the fact by them. But whom are we to thank for this? Our noble ancestors, who threw off the yoke, which their degenerate children are labouring to rivet on again. Papists will not swear that the Pope *ought not to have* any civil authority in this kingdom; and if they did, no man would believe them in earnest.

No. CCIV.

SATURDAY, JUNE 8TH, 1822.

DR MILNER, like most other Popish writers, repeats the silly boast of the Duke of Brunswick, that many Protestants, in the prospect of death, seek to be reconciled to the Church of Rome; but that he never knew an instance of a Papist, in these circumstances, desiring to die a Protestant. I do not know whether this is true or not; but supposing it to be true, it proves nothing in favour of Popery, which, like every other system, ought to rest upon

its own merits, and not upon what either dying or living men think of it. Both may be under a great delusion; and that multitudes both living and dying are so, is too evident to admit of reasonable doubt. A deceived heart has turned men aside from the love of God and obedience to him; and when they receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved, but have pleasure in unrighteousness, he sends them strong delusion; that is, he leaves them to the influence of those errors and vices which they have chosen, and from which they refuse to be reclaimed. This delusion consists in their believing a lie, which was the cause of the fall and ruin of our whole race; and which is now the cause, and the sole cause, why all those to whom the gospel comes are not saved by it; for their believing a lie is stated as the same thing as their not believing the truth, or not receiving the love of the truth that they might be saved; 2 Thess. ii. 10—12. The condemnation of such is represented as proceeding upon this ground alone; because their not receiving the truth, is a positive rejection of that salvation which God in infinite mercy provided for our fallen race; and those who will not accept of deliverance from the guilt and punishment of their sins in this way, shall never find another way. Thus, in strong and decisive language, Christ himself declares the truth of the case: "For God sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." But Christ never proposed to save any man against his will, or any man who continued to dishonour God by disbelieving the word of his Son. Therefore, he continues,—"He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil;" John iii. 17—19. Their loving darkness rather than light, is the same thing as their preferring the devil's lie to God's truth; and the reason is, the lie allows them to live in sin, while the truth would turn them from it. Their deeds are evil;—they have pleasure in unrighteousness;—therefore, they hate the truth that is holy in its nature, and which produces holiness in all that embrace it.

It is the devil's old and original lie by which he still deceives the world, for it is doubtful if he could ever make another equal to it, and while he gets the world to continue to believe it, there is scarcely another necessary for his purpose. It was, though you disobey God, ye shall not surely die: and it is now, though you live in sin, ye shall not surely die;—that is, ye shall not perish for ever;—by some means or other, you shall escape condemnation; and if you cannot find a way of escape for yourself, the church will do it for you;—the priest will absolve you at the hour of death;—and though you should go to purgatory for a time, he will, for a stipulated price, insure your ultimate and safe arrival in heaven. This, I confess, has the appearance of placing the subject in a light horribly ludicrous. But it is horribly true. There is nothing exaggerated in this view of the character of Popery; and not one feature of the picture distorted.

In his concluding letter, Dr Milner introduces some great Protestant names, as admitting "that salvation may be found in the communion of the original Catholic Church: but no divine of this church," says he, "consistently with her characteristical unity, and the constant doctrine of the holy fathers and of scripture itself, as I have elsewhere demonstrated, can allow that salvation is to be found out of this communion; except in the case of invincible ignorance," p. 197. I never knew before that salvation was to be found any where by *invincible ignorance*. This, I believe, is the highest commendation of ignorance that ever was penned, for the advantage of possessing it must be immense, seeing it is the only faculty by which salvation can be found, without submitting to the intolerable bondage of Rome! Who would ever desire to acquire knowledge after this?

But my design in quoting this passage is to show how the Church of Rome glories in that which ought to be her shame; that is, her stern, exclusive, sectarian spirit. It is to her narrow pale that Dr Milner applies the words "original Catholic Church;" though he knows that Protestant divines attach a very different meaning to the words. But admitting them in his sense, few Protestants, I suppose, will deny the possibility of salvation to men in communion with the Church of Rome. For my part, I believe that salvation is not only possible but certain to every man in that and every other church, who believes in Christ and turns from sin to holiness; and I doubt not this has taken place in numerous instances, by means of some part of the word of God, read or heard by individuals in communion with the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the monstrous corruption of that church, and her extensively organized opposition to the truth. The Lord knoweth them that are his every where, and as he preserved a few Jews in Babylon from the rage of their enemies, so he can preserve alive the souls that trust in him even in Antichristian Babylon. The very command,—"Come out of her, my people,"—which is as much in force as ever, implies that some of the Lord's people may still be in her, and that they are where they ought not to be. Such persons are saved, not *because* they are in the Church of Rome, but in *spite of it*, through the abounding mercy of our God and Saviour.

But, instead of imitating the Christian charity

of Protestants, who believe that persons in the Church of Rome may be saved, Dr Milner, and I suppose all Papists, triumph in maintaining the principle that there is no possibility of being saved out of her communion, except in the case of invincible ignorance, which of itself makes salvation impossible; for ignorance cannot be called invincible till knowledge has been presented, and rejected; and then it incurs, on its own account, the condemnation of not receiving the truth.

But this exclusion from salvation of all who are out of the Church of Rome is not all, nor even the worst of the system. The more dangerous and destructive principle is, that all who are within that church shall certainly be saved, in virtue of their being there, and their participating of her rites, whatever may be their personal character. To teach that a man will be saved in virtue of his belonging to any church, without being personally united to Christ by faith, and renewed by his Spirit, is to encourage presumption and immorality. This was the error of the carnal Jews, who thought all was well because Abraham was their father, and they were of the stock of Israel, which was the true church at the time. But as Paul told them afterwards,—"He is not a Jew who is one outwardly" only; so he is not a Christian who is merely one outwardly; that is, who has no more than an external visible relation to a Christian church, though it were as holy as that of Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." This means a new creation to holiness by the Spirit of God, and a turning away from sin. But the Church of Rome teaches that being in her communion, and receiving her sacraments, makes salvation perfectly secure. Thus persons who will not forsake their sins are flattered with the delusive hope that they shall be saved: and supposing it to be true that many Protestants, in the prospect of death, seek to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, this is enough to account for it. Wherever the Protestant religion is established, or generally prevalent, there will be found many who assume the name, and pass for Protestants, who live very wicked lives; and in consequence, they feel themselves miserable in the prospect of death and judgment. If they would apply to Christ even in the last hour, he would not cast them out; but such persons have no distinct apprehension of the gospel plan of salvation; and what is worse, they have no heart to it. They will not submit to the righteousness of God, and embrace the truth which brings, as the free gift of infinite mercy, salvation from sin, as well as from its punishment. It is not salvation from sin that they want; they desire only exemption from punishment; and this is what the gospel does not promise, without salvation from sin itself; that is, without sanctification,—a new heart, and a new life. Such persons as I am speaking of cannot endure this; but their misery may be increasing; they turn away from the word of God, for they find it is all against them; but the Church of Rome presents a remedy which she assures them is of sovereign efficacy. It is—Be reconciled to the church. Her baptism will most certainly regenerate you. Her sacraments are effectual means of salvation. Her priests will absolve you from your sins. At the hour of death they will anoint you with holy oil; and give you a passport from this world to the next, which will make your salvation absolutely certain. The priests are so sure of this, that they pledge their own salvation upon it, as the Duke of Brunswick says they did to him, and promised to take his damnation on themselves, if he should be damned. *See his Fifty Reasons*, No. 50. Now it is by no means wonderful that persons who reject the salvation of the gospel, and who cannot part with their sins, should be left, in righteous judgment, to believe this lie. They lay hold of it, as drowning persons do of a straw. Thus their conscience is pacified. They attend to every prescribed form, and observe all the rites of the church, expecting that by these they shall be saved, while living in sin, with their hearts at enmity against God. The delusion is so fascinating, that, instead of being surprised that some carnally minded Protestants should embrace it, the surprise is that there are so few.

I shall illustrate these things by an example of recent occurrence, which shows how closely the priests lie in wait to get dying Protestants reconciled to the church, which they maintain insures their salvation, though so ill as to be unconscious of what is done. The statement which is given upon oath has been published in some of the Irish Newspapers.

The following are the affidavits which the Rev. Warden Daly has found it necessary to publish, in justification of his own character, which was so insidiously and grossly attacked; and to prove to the world of what description the spirit of *modern* Popery is.

County of the Town of Galway, to wit. } James Daly, of the town of Galway, clerk, maketh oath and saith,

that he has been eleven years and upwards Warden of the Collegiate Church of St Nicholas, in said town; that during the whole of that time he has known Bartholomew Halliday to be a member of the established Church, and as long as he was able, a constant attendant at divine service, and the Supper of the Lord. That about three years ago the said Halliday received a hurt which confined him entirely to his room; that during the latter period he was regularly attended by deponent as a minister, and regularly received the sacrament at his own request, along with Thomas Blakely, a

friend of his; that in many of these occasions he did repeatedly, impressively, and with considerable agitation, supplicate deponent to prevent him from being tormented in his dying moments by a Roman Catholic priest; that having been visited by deponent about ten days before his death, he said to deponent, "Oh Sir, I wish I was out of this place!" giving deponent to understand that he was surrounded with bigots, and would not be allowed to die in peace; that deponent pledged himself to protect him from any unwarrantable intrusion; that at ten o'clock in the night of Wednesday, the 6th instant, or Monday the 4th, (does not perfectly recollect which of the two,) deponent visited the said Halliday; that he found him so weak in intellect, being ninety years of age, and at the close of a long illness; that he scrupled to administer the sacrament to him until asked to do so by himself; that then and there deponent did administer to said Halliday the Lord's Supper, with the aforesaid Thomas Blakely; that in the morning of Friday, the 8th instant, a man of the name of John Reilly called at his house, and informed him by a message, that Bartholomew Halliday was just speechless and wished to have deponent with him when he was dying; that deponent gave some answer that he would call upon him; that he accordingly did so at half-past twelve o'clock; that he found him breathing with the utmost difficulty; that his eyes were closed; that he was reduced to the lowest state of imbecility, bodily and mental; that he was, in deponent's opinion, utterly and absolutely incapable of understanding, adopting, or satisfactorily assenting to any new profession of faith; that, in deponent's opinion, he was equally incapable of calling any person out of the next room; that deponent standing close to his bed, and asking if he wanted any thing, thought he heard him pronounce the word water; that deponent went accompanied by Halliday's grand-daughter, to the church; gave her some wine; desired her to give it mixed with water to her grandfather, and promised to return, and say over him the departing prayer of the Church of England; that deponent was just setting out to do so at about ten minutes past four o'clock, that he was met by a female parishioner of his who told him that the women of the house had sent for a priest for Bartholomew Halliday; and that when she heard them doing so, she came off for deponent; that deponent walked fast to Halliday's room; that he found a priest at Halliday's bed-side; that deponent paused at the door unseen by the priest; that he was not administering any of the rites of the Latin Church; that he heard him distinctly ask Halliday, "Do you choose to die a Catholic?" that before any answer could be given by his gasping parishioner deponent interfered; that he strongly remonstrated with the priest upon the impropriety of torturing an unoffending man, and leading the deluded people about him to suppose that the great work of conversion to God could take place under such circumstances; that the priest said he was sent for; that deponent flatly denied his being sent for by Halliday, and stooped down to speak to the dying man; that the priest pushed himself between them, exclaiming, "Ours is the ancient religion, we can absolve you from your sins," and other similar expressions; that it was in answer to them and such like expressions, only, that deponent frequently said, "Bartholomew Halliday, that's a lie;" that the priest did then prepare himself to administer Extreme Unction; that being under a promise to his helpless parishioner, and now his only protector, deponent felt himself called upon to prevent by every lawful means the torture so long and so justly apprehended; that he *did* break the bottle of water; that he *did* extinguish the candles; that he *did* fling himself on the bed, between the priest, and his parishioner (to prevent the anointing); that he was then laid hold of by some women; that his great-coat was torn; that he was forcibly dragged from the bed of his parishioner; that the impression upon the minds of these infatuated women seemed to deponent obviously to be, that whatever Halliday might be, till within a few hours of his death, that if the priest was in time to read his absolution over him, all would be well in an eternal world; and deponent is sorry to be obliged solemnly to swear that the priest did (more than once, after anointing Halliday) fully countenance this strong delusion, by exclaiming in the most positive manner, "He's a Catholic, and his soul is saved;" that deponent, while dragged by the women, snatched the priest's book, in which he was reading Latin, out of his hands; that he then challenged the priest if he was indeed a minister of God to kneel down without his book, and say one prayer in English, suited to the circumstances of the dying sinner; and that if he did so, deponent was satisfied to quit the room; that the priest was irritated at this proposal; that he began to rave against Luther and the Reformation; that he repeatedly called the Protestant religion a diabolical religion; that he told the deponent that he would crush him under his feet; that a woman of the name of Mary Cox entered the room; that seeing deponent's situation she ran for Mr James Forster; that when Mr James Forster came in deponent requested him to send for the Mayor; that the priest seeing two policemen enter, quitted deponent, and commenced an altercation with them; that deponent did then lean over his poor parishioner, saying, "Bartholomew Halliday, shall I pray with you?" that "Yes, Sir," was answered by him; that deponent knelt in prayer; that Halliday repeated after him the Lord's prayer, and a part of the confession; that the Mayor

knocked at the door; that the priest began and continued for some time to justify his conduct; that deponent requested the Mayor to ask the dying man which clergyman he chose to have; that the Mayor, after some hesitation, stooped down and said to Halliday, "Do you choose to have Mr Daly the priest, or Warden Daly?" that Halliday, in deponent's hearing, answered, "Warden Daly;" and that the Mayor acknowledged that he did. Warden Ffrench, the Roman Catholic Warden, being in the room, the priest complained loudly, that deponent had called him a liar; that deponent said to him in Warden Ffrench's presence, that he was obliged by his principles to declare, that every man who inculcated religious falsehood was a liar, and under the influence of the father of lies; and that it was in that sense only that he ever made use of the expression; that Warden Ffrench seemed satisfied with the explanation; that the sheriff now entered the room, and a new altercation commenced; that during the altercation that deponent sat upon Halliday's bed, and repeated to him passages of scripture; that Warden Ffrench and the sheriff now advanced to ask him which clergyman he choose to have; that deponent did then retire from Halliday's bed-side to make room for Warden Ffrench and the sheriff; that the sheriff asked Halliday, "Do you choose the minister or the priest?" that in answer to this question, deponent's poor parishioner gave utterance to a sound which was partly an articulation of the tongue, and partly a rattle of the throat; that the sheriff and the persons near the bed exclaimed, "He says the minister;" that Warden Ffrench protested he did not hear it; that the sheriff again asked the same question; that Halliday uttered the same heart-sickening kind of sound; that the sheriff and the persons about him cried out, "Now he says the priest;" that Halliday's grand-daughter now came in; that she appeared surprised at what happened; that she went up to her grandfather's bed, and asked him who he would have; that she says he answered, "Warden Daly, Warden Daly;" that deponent, disgusted at the uproar and confusion about him, and at the cruel treatment of his parishioner, requested Mr Forster to kneel down with him in prayer; that they knelt close to Halliday; that as soon as deponent opened his lips, Halliday followed him and said a distinct "Amen," to deponent's petitions; that deponent called upon Mr Forster to observe him; that Mr Forster said he did observe him; that when the priest heard deponent say, "We have erred and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep," he loudly interrupted him, saying, "Indeed you have erred and strayed, and grossly;" that the priest then began to read out of his book in a strong voice; that after some time thus spent the Mayor said that he thought both clergymen ought to leave the room; that the priest stopped and consented to do so; that deponent did so too after putting up a prayer, (for his own sake and the sake of those around him) that the Lord would be pleased to kill and crucify in his own way, any angry or wrong feeling that might arise out of the scene that had occurred; that before deponent got off his knees, Warden Ffrench said that he and the priest ought to shake hands; that deponent said, "Oh! surely I will kiss his hand, to show him I have no personal animosity to him;" that deponent having done so, rose and quitted the room, (about seven o'clock in the afternoon:) deponent does solemnly swear, that he did not call the Roman Catholic religion mummery, nor speak disrespectful of its ministers in general; that it was only the horrid and deluding scene then and there exhibited, that he called, and always will call, mummery; and that it was the conduct of the unhappy persons concerned in it that he loudly, and as he conceives, justly, reproached.

JAMES DALY.

Sworn before me in the Tholsel of Galway, this 25th day of March, 1822.

JAMES O'HARA, Jun. Recorder.

[Then follow several other affidavits confirming the above statement.]

No. CCV.

SATURDAY, JUNE 15TH, 1822.

My last Number contained an account of a *fracas*, or rather a pitched battle, which took place in Ireland, in March last, between two priests, the one a Protestant, the other a Papist, occasioned by a dispute whether an old man should be suffered to die, as he had lived, a Protestant, or whether he should be converted to Popery? In this battle, as in every other, much damage was sustained on both sides. The Protestant had his great-coat torn, and the Papist's bottle-holder being a woman, he had his bottle broken, and his holy water spilled on the ground; and, as has happened with many engagements on a larger scale, it remains to this day uncertain which party gained the victory; for instead of being claimed by both parties, as is often the case in the wars of nations, it is not claimed by either; and both retired from the field covered with shame.* The narrative in my last Number is given in the form of an affidavit by the Protestant clergyman; and it is confirmed by several other affi-

* Since the above was written I have met with a gentleman who is acquainted with the Protestant clergyman, Mr Daly. He is a highly respectable and amiable person; and what appears reprehensible in his conduct, was occasioned by the strong provocation of seeing his dying parishioner exposed to the torture from which he had promised to protect him.

davits, which I do not think it necessary to insert.

Peter Daly the Popish priest, has not, so far as I have seen, published any account of the affair in his own name. But there is a letter by him in the Warder, Dublin Newspaper, of March 30, in which he complains grievously of the misrepresentations of the other party. He says,—"The principles of Catholicity are a sufficient refutation of the assertion, that I forced my attendance on the unwilling individual. According to the doctrine of my church, sacred things are not to be administered except to those who are willing and well-disposed; and it betrays an ignorance of the sacred responsibilities of the priesthood, to suppose that a Catholic clergyman would desert his duty, even with the risk of his life." He publishes along with this letter six affidavits, which do not materially contradict those on the Protestant side, farther than that John Reilly swears that the dying man desired him to bring "a *Catholic* priest." At the same time the deponent says, when Halliday first spoke of his bringing a priest, he thought he "was raving or delirious;" and "asked him two or three times, whether it was a Protestant or a Catholic clergyman he wished to have?" In this condition it is very evident that the dying man was not capable of giving a distinct answer to the question, or conscious of what he was saying; and allowing that his tongue unconsciously expressed the words "Catholic priest," this could have no weight with any rational man, when it was opposed by the whole tenor of a life of ninety years, during which he professed a firm adherence to the Protestant religion, and an abhorrence of Popery; yet this is all the foundation that this priest had, according to the oath of his own witness, for considering the dying man "willing and well-disposed" to the rites of his church.

An affidavit is given on the same side by the Popish Warden Ffrench, in which he swears as follows;—"Some doubts having arisen as to the religion of said Halliday; and he and the said mayor were deputed to ask the said Halliday what clergyman he wished to have, when said Halliday distinctly declared he wished to have *the* priest; upon which it was acknowledged and acquiesced in by the said mayor, that Halliday had called for '*a* priest.'" This is the only farther evidence of the poor man's being "*willing* and well-disposed" to be converted to Popery; and every one acquainted with the nature of evidence must see, that here there is no evidence at all. All that is sworn to by this witness is, that the dying man wished to have the priest; but in the feeble state of his mind, this might designate the Protestant as well as the Popish clergyman; and what the mayor is said to have acknowledged is, that Halliday called merely for *a* priest. Mr Ffrench's affidavit, therefore, proves that Halliday did not call for the "Catholic" priest; for if he had, Ffrench would not have omitted to say so, seeing that was the very thing which his brother priest wished to prove by his testimony.

This priest adopts a truly Popish way of rebutting the accusation contained in the Protestant priest's affidavit:—"The principles of Catholicity are a sufficient refutation of the assertion, that I forced my attendance on the unwilling individual," &c. He wishes the world to believe that his personal conduct could not be wrong, because the principles of his church are right: as if a man accused of murder were to argue,—the divine law which I believe is a sufficient refutation of the charge, for it is written, "Thou shalt do no murder." It is not however worth while to dwell on this subject, considered merely as the improper conduct of an individual; and if this were the subject of discussion, we would have only to express our abhorrence, and have done with it. But it illustrates the system of Popery, which teaches that a man may live in sin, even in heresy, which is the greatest of all sins in Popish estimation, and continue in this state till his senses are so far gone that he cannot express a coherent sentiment, or even articulate an audible word; and yet by the mystic spell of holy water and holy oil, a priest can reconcile him to the church, and save his soul! The first thing that strikes one in reading such an account as that in my last Number, is the horrible barbarity of tormenting a poor dying man with their teasing entreaties to submit to those rites which he had abhorred during his whole life, and when he had not strength to resist, or so much as to protest against them. But this is little in comparison of the fiend-like malignity of deceiving men in health, by teaching them that, live as they will, the priests can save them in their last moments. This is the quintessence of Satanic imposture and delusion. My private correspondence from Ireland apprised me long ago, that the priests were constantly on the watch to ensnare dying Protestants in the manner described in the case of poor Halliday; but I did not expect to see such a public exhibition of it, of so recent a date as the spring of the present year; for the priests are as artful in concealing as in practising their works of darkness.* The above case, interesting and shocking as it is, will be little known, even in Ireland; for most of the Newspapers are in the Popish interest, and carefully guarded

* Since this Number was sent to the printer, I have received a letter from a respectable corresponent, containing a narrative of similar cruelty and imposition practised upon an old woman in the north of Scotland, who, in her dying moments, after resisting to the utmost of her feeble strength, had the sacrament forced down her throat. "This took place in Scotland," says my correspondent, "and was well known in the country round at the time; and it shows that the genius, the spirit, and the practice of Popery are the same wherever it has power."

against the admission of any thing prejudicial to the cause. But for the Antidote and the Warder, two papers lately established in Dublin, for the purpose of upholding the constitution and Protestant interest, I should probably never have heard of the story, which was originally published in a remote provincial journal near the place where it happened.

The rage of the day—for every period has its particular rage—is "conciliation." It is a good word; but in all ages the worst things have been introduced under the best names; and thus they got possession of the human mind before their true nature was detected. Protestants, especially our Protestant legislature, have made many concessions to Papists, with a view to conciliate them, within the last fifty years. But they are at this day farther from the point they aimed at than ever they were. Papists have never conceded one iota to us; and they tell us plainly that they will not, and cannot concede any thing; for theirs is the ancient church, which was unjustly dispossessed of its power and property by Protestants; and all our concessions to them —all our attempts at conciliation—have only given them a standing ground to annoy us by demanding restoration of their lost power and possessions. This they are doing at this day most clamorously, and with the most virulent abuse of the English and their government; and while Protestants, in their simplicity, are dreaming that their attempts at conciliation will produce blessed effects in the next age, when their children will be regarded as brothers by the Papists of that day, the Popish priests in Ireland are sowing the seeds of more fell discord and deadly hostility against Protestants, than any thing else that the present age has witnessed, or that can easily enter into the mind of men of Christian temper and feeling.

The leading men among the Papists in Dublin, finding that, in the hands of the Hibernian and other societies, the work of education was proceeding with great success; and that the poor people would be taught to read the Bible in spite of the priests, have resolved to take the work of education in their own hands, and to furnish the children with such reading only as is agreeable to themselves. They have formed, says the editor of the Antidote, in his paper of 11th ult. an establishment which they call 'The Hibernian Education Society,' "for which they are making the most vigorous exertions to obtain parliamentary aid. When the public are informed that one of the *standard* books, introduced into the Roman Catholic schools, (we are justified in saying without any exception whatever,) is 'A SKETCH OF IRISH HISTORY, compiled by the Rev. Mr England, formerly parish priest of Brandon, and now R. C. bishop in Carolina, America—a work pregnant with treason and falsehood, and inculcating the most inveterate hatred to the British government—they will duly appreciate the claims of such schools to parliamentary support! The work in question is in our hands, and we feel it would be criminal in us to withhold it from a discriminating public. The greater part of it, indeed almost every page, shall therefore be submitted to our readers, who will be enabled thus to judge pretty clearly, what system of education the Roman Catholic hierarchy wish to promote. A few passages from this precious production must for the present serve as a specimen. What a hopeful method to render the rising generation loyal!!!"

"What was the conduct of the English toward the natives?

It was marked by every species of dissimulation, and oppression, that disgraces human nature; nor does it appear that they for some time pursued a different line of conduct. For from this period, a deluge of woes poured in upon Ireland; her subsequent annals are written in characters of blood, and are but the records of division and persecution.

Were any Irish Catholics put to death for their religion during her reign? (Elizabeth's.)

Yes, multitudes; but the names and history of only two hundred are upon record. The common stretching rack was frequently employed against the Catholic prisoners, and it was not unusual to tear the nails from their fingers, or to batter the shaven crowns of the clergy until their brains appeared.

Did James restore the Catholics to their *birth-rights* by a change of the act of settlement, commonly called the *Black Act?*

No; as this act had the sanction and experience of twenty years, *he dreaded the inconvenience and disorder likely* to result from such a general transfer of property.

Had not Ireland much heavier causes of complaint than the revolted colonies?

Infinitely greater. America had been founded and cherished by England; Ireland, on the contrary, by a long and various warfare, as well as by a perfidious policy, was subjugated, depressed, degraded, restricted in manufactures and commerce, exhausted by taxes, and drained by enormous remittances to England. The people could not but feel that they were ruled with an iron rod, not for their improvement or advantage, but for their impoverishment and oppression.

Did Mr Pitt lend the arm of the executive to all the *purposes of intolerance, to which his Irish undertakers thought fit to apply it?*

He did most largely. The weakening of Ireland by internal dissensions was the private order given to the chief agents, while the public instructions to the ostensible and responsible ministers of the crown, concealed the destructive principle in the back ground.

What do you mean by the Protestant ascendency?

An oligarchy who claimed exclusive possession of loyalty, and who, for the purpose of securing to themselves the places which they held and the patronage which they enjoyed, continually charged with disaffection to the government all persons who were desirous of conciliating the people, by extending to Ireland that portion of civil and religious liberty which is the best gift of the British constitution.

What were the principles of the Orangemen?

They affected to unite in support of the constitution as established by king William at the Revolution of 1688, and their original object and obligation are stated to have been *the extermination of the Catholics of Ireland,* as far as in them lay. This oath of extermination they afterwards changed into that of supporting the king, *as long as he should support the Protestant ascendancy.*

Did the united Irishmen take any *improper* steps in 1797?

Yes; they renewed their league with the French directory, and laid plans for the rebellion of 1798.

Did any occurrences tend to goad them on to this treasonable act?

Yes; the *violent and unconstitutional outrages of the Orangemen,* the unwarrantable and illegal excesses of a portion of the magistracy, and the half-hanging, tortures, floggings, and burnings, which, under the pretext of excessive loyalty, were permitted by the minister, and inflicted by his sycophants.

What was the result of the rebellion?

It deprived his majesty of 70,000 *most useful subjects,* whom wiser councils would have preserved to fight the battles of the *British empire against its most potent enemy,* and it laid the foundation for the legislative union.

Was any particular class of the Catholics especially deceived by the ministry on this occasion?

Yes; the ecclesiastical trustees of Maynooth college; ten unsuspecting prelates were *cajoled* by the ministry, particularly by Lord Castlereagh, with the expectation that emancipation would be granted and their religion protected.

Did not these prelates consent to have the power of a veto upon the appointment of bishops vested in the crown?

No; they indeed resolved that some degree of interference on the part of his majesty may be allowed, for the purpose of assuring him of the loyalty of the persons nominated to the vacant sees; but they did so without reflection or authority, and under the most deceitful circumstances, which rendered the resolution less censurable than it otherwise would have been: but even their fellow-prelates were ignorant of this fact for nearly nine years after.

What was the grand active principle upon which Lord Hardwick accepted the government of Ireland in 1802?

A principle he dared not openly avow—viz. to resist her emancipation, and to perpetuate the old system of division and exclusion, under the delusive semblance of a new system of conciliation and mildness.

Did the Catholics receive any concessions from government, during the administration of Mr Addington, now Lord Sidmouth?

No; this minister pledged himself to march in the steps of his predecessor; consequently, he deprecated the very thought of Catholic emancipation.

Did not many unequivocal proofs bespeak the determination of the Richmond administration to rivet Catholic Ireland in degradation and despondency?

Yes; a fostering countenance was particularly given to the Orangemen, that tended rather to foment and encourage, than to put down or punish, their atrocities.

Did not Orange ferocity sensibly increase in the year 1809?

It did. The native leaders of the Orange societies rendered their systems at that period so additionally ferocious, that some of the less blood-thirsty withdrew their names, who nevertheless adhered to the general principles of their institution: that is, to a proscriptive and implacable hatred to Catholicity."

The above is a short specimen of the sort of reading which the Papists in Ireland have introduced into their schools, and which they make to supersede lessons from the holy scriptures, which are not so much to their taste, and with which they think the children cannot be so safely intrusted. It would be easy to show from authentic history, that the above statements are grossly false, or shamefully distorted representations. But supposing every one of them literally true, what good end could be served by preoccupying the minds of all the children in Ireland with matters so hostile to their neighbours and fellow-subjects in England,—especially against the government? I believe that no other answer can be given than that the Papists wish to cherish and propagate a spirit of hostility and rebellion in the country, in the hope of ultimately overturning the Protestant establishment, of getting their own church established on its ruins, and recovering not only the property of the church, but also all the lay property that has been forfeited in successive rebellions since the time of Queen Elizabeth.

Much has been said and written about the misgovernment of Ireland; and it is very common for persons who do not generally complain of public measures, to admit, that with regard to Ireland nothing has been rightly managed. But I defy the wisest man in the world to say how it is possible to govern a people circumstanced as the Irish are, and have been for many centuries. Before government can do any thing for a people, they must be taught to

do something for themselves; or, at least, to submit to what government is willing to do for them. But the great body of the people in Ireland acknowledge an authority superior to that of the supreme government of the kingdom. This is the authority of their priests, to which they implicitly subject themselves both in body and soul. Government cannot possibly get at them, but through the medium of the priests; and it has always been the study of these priests to neutralize, and render abortive every effort to enlighten the people, or to make their condition more comfortable, because this would tend to withdraw the people from under their ghostly authority.

People will not derive benefit from the very best endeavours of those whom they have been taught to hate. The Irish are taught from their infancy to regard with mortal hatred the people and the government of England. Formerly this hatred was instilled into their minds by oral tradition;—now it has become the subject of reading and instruction in their schools, as appears by the above extracts from their school book; and with astonishing impudence, they have applied, or are about to apply, to parliament, for a grant of money to enable them to carry on this instruction upon a more extensive scale! that is, to enable them more effectually to overturn the present establishment, which is the object which they are not ashamed to avow among themselves; for the truth of which I appeal to one of their own number, the Rev. Mr Morrissy, whose words are given in an early part of this volume. (See Nos. 171—174.) Though Solomon himself had the government of a people so perverted, enslaved, and besotted by ignorance and superstition, he would find it impossible to govern them either for their benefit, or to his own satisfaction.

That the people of England have no hostility towards those of Ireland, but rather regard them with a brotherly affection, is demonstrated by the efforts which they are making at this moment for the relief of the many thousands of them, almost all Papists, who are in a state of starvation, in the southern parts of that kingdom; and government has really done more for their subsistence than for that of any other part of the empire in the present age. The simple statement of this notorious fact ought to cover with shame the author and the distributers of that most seditious school catechism, which has occupied so much of the present Number; but I fear the priests are not capable of shame or of any other right feeling; for if they were, such a book would never have been written or received among them.

No. CCVI.

SATURDAY, JUNE 22D, 1822.

THE true religion has in all ages been opposed by error, idolatry, and superstition. The enmity of the seed of the serpent against the seed of the woman has not been suspended for a single day since the time of Cain and Abel; and he who was a liar from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, has never ceased to oppose the truth, or to pervert it, or to conceal it by substituting something in its place, or by any means to divert the minds of men from it, lest they should believe and be saved. This opposition to the truth has been carried on in various forms and under different names; but the general character of it has been substantially the same in all ages. It was reserved, however, for the last age of the world, or the New Testament dispensation, to exhibit it in a more systematic and organized form than it had been at any former period; and to effect its object more insidiously than before, by assuming the name of Christianity, and under that sacred name, to teach and practise all the idolatry and immorality of the ancient heathen.

This in the language of prophecy is emphatically called The Antichrist; and the impure character of the system is exhibited under the figure of a great harlot, corrupting the earth with her fornications. How applicable to the Church of Rome the description is, I hope will appear to the reader's satisfaction from the general tenor of my work, in which it has been my endeavour to exhibit the genuine character of Popery, for the purpose of warning my countrymen against it, and if possible of gaining some from under its deadly influence.

This great apostasy was the subject of very ancient prophecy. The Holy Spirit thus gave warning of the evil that was coming upon the world, that the true worshippers of God might be on their watch, and that those who were seduced by it might be without excuse. As early as the time of Daniel the prophet, we have the character of the system described, and even mention made of the period of its continuance; and I am not sure but there are obscure and parabolic allusions to it at a much earlier period. With an attempt to illustrate some of these, I shall occupy the present Number.

The God of Israel graciously condescended to speak of the union between him and his church under the figure of the marriage relation. Thus he says by one of the prophets,—"I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, and the love of thine espousals;" Jer. ii. 2: and by another,—"Thy Maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name;" Isa. liv. 5. The church maintained the fidelity of a chaste

spouse while she practised the worship of the true God according to the purity of his institution; but idolatry is, in numerous passages of the Old Testament, called, "playing the harlot." Indeed, in hundreds of instances the word adultery is used for idolatry; and when Israel showed the least leaning towards idolworship, she was accused of forgetting the marriage relation. The church then assumed the character of a strange woman; and there is one described by Solomon as THE Strange Woman, which from the narrative, I think, cannot mean an individual, any more than THE sinful man, or "Man of sin" can mean any one person. It is a power, or system,—a mystery of iniquity,—always at work; but so organized in the Church of Rome as to be described under the character of one great meretricious personage, seducing and corrupting the world by her allurements. I am by no means disposed to speak peremptorily on such a subject; and I am aware that there is danger of straining the language of prophecy, so as to make it speak what the Holy Spirit never intended, against which every writer on religious subjects ought to be on his guard; but after not a little reflection, I am inclined to think that an apostate church, or the antichrist, is pourtrayed by Solomon, under the character of the "strange woman, even the stranger who flattereth with her words; *who forsaketh the guide of her youth, and forgetteth the covenant of her God;* for her house inclineth unto death and her paths unto the dead. None that go unto her return again, neither take they hold of the path of life;" Prov. ii. 17—19. It is the boast of Popery that none who go unto her return again; and indeed there are so few who have left the profession of true religion, and who have taken up with this harlot, that are recovered from her snare, as to justify the declaration in general terms,—that there are none.

The same personage is described, and her wickedness exposed more particularly in the seventh chapter of the same book. I believe many persons in reading this, think that Solomon is only relating an incident that took place under his own eye in the streets of Jerusalem; and warning men to beware of a common street walker. But I cannot help thinking that more is meant than this. That part of divine revelation is professedly a book of parables; and I think the inspired penman, in this passage, takes occasion from the known practices of wicked seducers, and the folly of those who are seduced by them, to warn the worshippers of the true God in all ages, to beware of idolatry, which was not only adultery in a spiritual sense, but was usually connected with lasciviousness; which was indeed one of the allurements by which persons were drawn to the idol temple.

The seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters are evidently one discourse or parable, and in order to understanding their import they ought to be read together without a break. In doing so we find there are two ways, two houses, and two conspicuous persons, to whom the houses respectively belong. The persons, the houses, and the ways, or paths, are all contrasted, and opposed to each other. Of the first mentioned person, that is, the strange woman, it is said, "Her house is the *way* to hell, going down to the chambers of death;" and of the other, it is declared with equal explicitness;—"I lead in the *way* of righteousness, in the midst of the *paths* of judgment, to cause those that love me to inherit substance, and I will fill their treasures;" and "Blessed are they that keep my ways"—"for whoso findeth me findeth life." Here the way of death and the way of life are distinctly set before us; and they are respectively connected with the house of the strange woman on the one hand, and the house of Wisdom on the other.

I suppose there is little difference of opinion as to who is described under the name of WISDOM. He who says, "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice; by me princes rule, and nobles, yea, all the judges of the earth," must be the same divine person who is mentioned, in the 19th of Revelation, as having the name "King of kings, and Lord of lords." And he who was set up from everlasting, "from the beginning ere ever the earth was," &c. can be no other than he of whom it is declared by the apostle John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." This is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world, whose unsearchable riches the apostles preached; and who says of himself in this parable;—"Riches and honour are with me; yea, durable riches and righteousness."

There can be as little doubt as to what is meant by the HOUSE which, at the beginning of the 9th chapter, Wisdom is said to have built; "This man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house. For every house is builded by some man; but he who built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end;" Heb. iii. 1—6. The house of God is the church of the living God, 1 Tim. iii. 15. Christ constituted his church for the reception and edification of all who should be saved by his death; that is, of all who should believe in him from the beginning to the end of the world. He furnished it with every thing needful. He gave apostles and prophets, &c. who are pillars in his house;*

* The pillars are *seven*, which is also a parabolical ex-

and the provision of it is described in language suitable to the period of sacrifices and peace-offerings; chap. ix. 2. The door of it is set open to all men; and men of every character, and rank, and nation, are invited to come in, and enjoy all the goodness of his house. Such seems to be the import of the following kind and intreating message, by her maidens; that is, by the servants of Wisdom, who in the parabolical language of the passage are called maidens, as is befitting the personification of Wisdom as a female: "She hath sent forth her maidens; she crieth upon the highest places of the city, Whoso is simple let him turn in hither; as for him that wanteth understanding, she saith to him, Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled; forsake the foolish and live, and go in the way of understanding." This is the gospel message to sinners as such, in language almost as plain as that by Isaiah:—"Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters," &c. chap. lv. 1. or that of Christ himself, "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink." In short, Christ uses nearly the same language, in one of his parables, in which he represents a great king as making a feast, and commanding his servants to go to the high ways, and proclaim to all they met, "My oxen and fatlings are killed, all things are ready; come ye to the feast."

This house then, has an open door for passengers; and all are invited to enter. Now who is the person that is of importance enough to be described as having a rival establishment? and an establishment of such extent, that she also invites all passengers in the same universal terms, "Whoso is simple let him turn in hither," chap. ix. 15. Not surely a wretched individual street walker, whose allurements can ruin only a few persons, who are so foolish as to be ensnared by them, in the course of a short and miserable life. The language is far too high for this;—"She sitteth at the door of her house, on a seat in the high places of the city, to call passengers that go right on their ways;" chap. ix. 14, 15. Her house is as conspicuous as the temple itself; and "She hath cast down many wounded; yea, many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell, going down to the chambers of death;" vii. 26, 27. At the conclusion of the parable she is called simply *a* foolish woman; but I apprehend it should be *the* foolish, or strange woman, for it is evidently the same personage that is described at the beginning. She is clamorous; that is, she makes great pretensions; and yet she knoweth nothing, for ignorance is the foundation of her throne.

In parabolical language, and also in prophetic vision, wickedness, or rather an organized system of wickedness, is represented as a female. There is a remarkable vision to this effect in the book of Zechariah, which, taken by itself, appears very obscure, and almost inexplicable; but if taken in connection with this parable of Solomon, and the vision of John in the 17th of Revelation, some light may be thrown upon it, and the passages may illustrate one another. "Then the angel that talked with me went forth, and said unto me, Lift up thine eyes, and see what is this that goeth forth. And I said, What is it? And he said, This is an ephah that goeth forth. He said, moreover, This is their resemblance through all the earth. And, behold, there was lifted up a talent of lead: and this is a woman that sitteth in the midst of the ephah. And he said, This is Wickedness, and he cast it into the midst of the ephah, and he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof. Then lifted I up mine eyes, and looked, and, behold, there came out two women, and the wind was in their wings, (for they had wings like the wings of a stork) and they lift up the ephah between the earth and heaven. Then I said to the angel that talked with me, Whither do these bear the ephah? And he said unto me, *To build it an house in the land of Shinar; and it shall be established, and set there upon her own base;*" Zech. v. 5—11. The land of Shinar is Babylon; and we are told at the beginning of the book of Daniel, that Nebuchadnezzar, when he had taken Jerusalem, took the king and part of the vessels of the house of God, which he carried into the land of Shinar, to the house of his God. This was the place where idolatry was established, and upheld by the power that had subdued the world, and that was the most cruel oppressor of the church of God. Here, according to the vision of Zechariah, wickedness was to establish her seat and occupy her own house. But Zechariah saw his vision after Babylon had been taken and her mighty monarchy subverted. It is true; but there was another power to arise, to which the spirit of prophecy gave the same name, in which wickedness should be organized and established on her own base, or throne, and have a house built for herself. Her character is given more in detail in Rev. xvii. than that of the woman in the ephah; but the sum and substance of it is wickedness, and that the most monstrous and abominable. This personage is called "the great whore who sitteth upon many waters;" (the waters signify people and nations, as explained, v. 15,) "with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication; and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in

---

pression. Seven was the first series of numbers with which men were acquainted. The days of the week were counted from the first to the seventh;—then the count began again; and time went round in perpetual circles of sevens. Hence the word seven came to express any thing that was perfect or complete; and it is so used hundreds of times in the Old and New Testament.

the spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, and having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," Rev. xvii. 1—6. In the sequel, this mysterious woman is described under a variety of figures; in conclusion the figurative style is dropped, and we are told plainly, that this woman "is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." That this means Rome, and nothing else, is so evident from the whole passage, that the most candid Papists admit it; only they apply it to Rome in her heathen state, before the establishment of Christianity. But that it means Rome under the name of Christian, has been demonstrated a hundred times by Protestant writers; and I defy all the Papists in the world to make sense of the passage as applied to any thing else. When John saw the vision, pagan Rome was in the zenith of its glory; and not a monster yet to rise, as the great harlot was.

This is the woman whose name is Wickedness; and, if I am not mistaken, the same that Zechariah saw in vision, shut up in the ephah, (bushel, or corn-measure) covered with a talent of lead, that is, restrained from expanding herself, or appearing to the world in her true character, till she was transported to the mystical Babylon, where she built her house and was established upon her own seat or throne: and this corresponds with what the apostle Paul tells us of the "Man of sin," and "Son of perdition:"—"Now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the Mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth, will let, (that is, hinder) until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that WICKED be revealed," &c. The secular Roman power was the talent of lead that suppressed, or prevented the expanding of this monster of wickedness; and when that power was taken out of the way, the harlot rose up in full stature, as the monster that has been described.

Again, if I am not mistaken, for I do not like to speak confidently on such a subject, I think this is the "Strange woman," described by Solomon as having set up a house in opposition to the house of Wisdom. This last, as I have shown, is the church of Christ; the rival establishment, therefore, is that of antichrist, which is the Church of Rome. That is, an organized system of opposition to Christianity under the Christian name; and while pretending to be the Catholic church,—claiming to be the only true church, she directs all her devotion to idols, such as relics, saints, and images; showing that she has forgotten her Lord and husband, who, she says, is not at home, but gone on a long journey; and she not only prostitutes herself to strangers, but becomes a public seductress; making it her business to make all men as wicked as herself.

One of the arts of antichrist, by which he seduces men from the faith and worship of Christ, is, to imitate divine institutions, and to adopt the very words of Christ, taking care, however, to turn them to a meaning the very opposite of what the Holy Spirit intends by them. In this Jesuitical trick the "Strange woman" is very expert. Wisdom is described as having killed her beasts, (that is, having made the sacrifice of atonement,) having mingled her wine, and furnished her table. The Strange woman professes to have a well furnished table too;—"I have peace-offerings with me; this day have I paid my vows;" she appears, therefore, a very religious person, strictly attentive to her duty; but there is one article wanting that vitiates all her professions. There is no animal slain; that is, there is no atoning sacrifice in her house. This is the first thing that is thought of in the house of God, into which there is no entering without regard to the blood sprinkled upon the lintel and the door-posts; and without reference to this, there are no peace-offerings in the house of God; for all these were ordained to follow upon the sacrifice of atonement being first offered: the meaning of which is, that God has no friendly intercourse with a sinner, acknowledges none of his thanksgivings, and accepts none of his peace-offerings, but in relation to Christ's atonement. But the strange woman, like other teachers of false religion, makes no account of any thing of this kind; she leaps to her peace-offerings at once, like Cain, who scorned to confess himself such a sinner as to require an atoning sacrifice, but brought a peace-offering of the fruits of the earth, as if there had been nothing between him and his Maker, why he should not be accepted; or like the proud Pharisee, who prayed thus, "God, I thank thee I am not as other men," &c. That this is in the very spirit of the Church of Rome appears in her virtually rejecting the atonement of Christ, and trusting in the merits of her saints, and in her mass sacrifice, which she declares to be propitiatory for the living and the dead.

Again, the Strange woman uses the very words of Christ, so far as serves her purpose; and breaks off in the middle of them, that she may effect the seduction and ruin of those who listen to her. Christ says, "Whoso is simple, let him turn in hither; as for him that wanteth understanding, she saith to him, Come eat of my bread, and drink of the wine that I have

mingled. Forsake the foolish and live, and go in the way of understanding." The foolish woman stands at the door of her house making the same speech: "Whoso is simple, let him turn in hither; and as for him that wanteth understanding she saith to him,"—here she drops Christ's words, and turns away to the language of seduction,—"Stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant;" and that this is meant to seduce to sin is evident from the words which immediately follow, and which conclude the parable, "He knoweth not that the dead are there, and that her guests are in the depths of hell."

Had Solomon been speaking of a common prostitute who had made such havoc among his subjects, wounding many and slaying many of them, it would have been his duty as a righteous king, to have made a public example of her, and to have destroyed her house; and this was no less his duty supposing her to have been an idol, and her house a temple. This he certainly would have done, in the state of mind in which he wrote the book of Proverbs, and before his melancholy fall into idolatry, or after his recovery from it, if he was recovered. But that he is speaking of a spiritual seduction, over which he had no authoritative control, is farther evident from the instructions which he gives for avoiding the snare, "Say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister; and call understanding thy kinswoman, that they may keep thee from the strange woman, from the stranger that flattereth with her words;" ch. vii. 4, 5. Wisdom here, I think, is not Christ personally; but the saving knowledge of him,—the spiritual understanding of his doctrine, which is the only sure preventive against error and all immorality; and not merely from one species of it, as most readers understand the passage. But supposing Christ himself to be meant, the exhortation would be substantially the same; "*Acquaint thyself with Him*, and thereby good shall come unto thee."

No. CCVII.

SATURDAY, JUNE 29TH, 1822.

IN my last Number I endeavoured to illustrate some of the prophecies of the Old Testament, which, I think, have reference to the grand apostasy from the worship of the true God; in which the apostate church is described under the figure of wickedness embodied and organized, and as the great harlot seducing and ruining the souls of men. In the prophecies of Daniel we have the same system of wickedness predicted under the figure of a horn, which is an emblem of power and dominion. The four successive monarchies are represented as so many wild beasts, the fourth of which exceeded in fierceness all the rest. "It was dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts which were before it, and it had ten horns." "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces;" Dan. vii. 7, 23. This, I believe, is allowed on all hands to be the Roman empire; and the ten horns signify as many kingdoms. Besides these ten there was another little horn to spring up, which was to be distinguished from all the rest: "I considered the horns, and behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things;" ver. 8. This little horn was to rise up after the others, or behind them, unobserved till he should overtop them; "And he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings (or kingdoms;) and he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, times, and the dividing of a time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume it, and destroy it unto the end;" ver. 24—26. "This is no other than the Popedom, or antichrist, who hath raised himself to great power by seizing three principalities or kingdoms, which Sir Isaac Newton reckons up to be the exarchate of Ravenna, the kingdom of the Lombards, and the senate and dukedom of Rome. And it is hence that the Pope wears a triple crown."—*Signs of the Times, by Bicheno*, p. 17.

"What is here represented as a horn of the fourth beast is the same tyranny which is shown to John (Rev. xiii. 1—10.) as a beast In this all our best commentators are agreed. Nor let it seem strange that what is here prefigured by a horn of the fourth beast, should be represented in another vision, as a beast with seven heads and ten horns. For nothing is more usual than to describe the same person or thing under different images, upon different occasions; and besides, in this vision, the spiritual tyranny of the Roman empire is not meant to be described at large. Here notice is only given of it in the general representation of the Roman dominion; when the time of the appearance of this tyranny draws near, then a more enlarged description is given. And what is here represented under one image is there represented under two, a dragon and a beast, each having seven heads and ten horns. The slightest attention is sufficient to convince us that the horn here and the first beast in Rev. xiii. are the same tyranny; if we compare the

two descriptions, their language, their enormities, their duration, and end are the same." —*Ibid*

It is not my intention to write a dissertation on the prophecies. There are plenty of books on these, written by men who understand them much better than I can pretend to do. What I intend is to show in few words, that the Holy Spirit warned the church in ancient times, that a monster should arise in the latter days, whose character corresponds in every particular with that of the Church of Rome. He is one who speaks great words against the Most High. The greatest words which a creature can speak against the Most High, are those which claim equality with him, or which claim to hold his place, and to exercise his authority. This has been done by the Church of Rome for twelve hundred years. I do not speak merely of the high titles assumed by the Pope, such as, "His Holiness," which is his acknowledged title as much as "His Majesty" is that of our Sovereign; nor of "our Lord God, the Pope," as he is styled by his flattering courtiers; nor of "the Prince of the Kings of the Earth," as he affects to be, and agreeably to which he has disposed of kings and kingdoms. It is enough that this church sets up her authority as at least equal to that of God, if not superior to it, by lording it over the consciences of men, presuming to dictate what they shall believe, and actually setting aside the authority of the word of God, which she does every day by her traditions. The head of this church pretends to be God's vicar on earth; that is, to hold God's place, and to be instead of God to human creatures; and, considering what his personal character has generally been, no greater words against God can be spoken, than that this is his representative.

"He shall think to change times and laws;" and not only think, or imagine the thing, but actually do it. The Church of Rome has changed half of the year, in which men ought to follow their lawful business, into *holy* time, in which they must not do any work; and she allows the Lord's day, the only holy time recognized in the New Testament, to be prostituted by her children to the purposes of amusement. And as for laws, she has used such freedom with the law of God as to strike one of the ten commandments out of the decalogue, because it forbids the worship of images; and she has taken all the matter of the other commandments under her control, insomuch that disobedience and obedience are just what she is pleased to declare. She makes a thing unlawful to-day; and then, by a dispensation, for a stipulated price, she makes it lawful to-morrow. There was never such trafficking among the heathen as there is in the Church of Rome in relation to the divine law. This is so changed by Popery, that a man may live in the habitual flagrant violation of all its precepts; and though it says peremptorily, "The soul that sinneth it shall die," a Popish priest professes to have the power of absolving the greatest transgressor, at the hour of death, and of giving him a sure passport to heaven. In short, the law of God, which is holy, just, and good, is so changed in the Church of Rome as to be quite subverted; and to have a system of priestcraft and immorality put in its place. "They shall be given into his hand until a time, times, and the dividing of a time;" that is, three years and a half, or 1260 days, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, which was 360 days to a year; which, according to prophetic language, means 1260 years. During this long period, it was predicted by Daniel that this system of iniquity should be suffered to have power on the earth, to blaspheme the God of heaven, by speaking great words against him,—to change or subvert his laws, and practise all manner of iniquity.

But the vision presents another feature of the character of the monster, which applies most decidedly to the Church of Rome; "He shall wear out the saints of the Most High." There was never in the world, under any name, a power of whom this can be so truly said as of Popery. From the time that the beast was established on his throne, no man within the sphere of his influence was permitted to believe and publish the genuine gospel of the grace of God, and to serve God as his saints in the time of the apostles did. The Christian doctrine having been corrupted, and divine institutions superseded by human inventions, if any man dared to profess the unadulterated gospel, and to worship God with New Testament simplicity, it was at the hazard of his life. Genuine Christianity was proscribed as heresy; and every potentate, and every private individual, whom the church could move by her promises or threats, was called to labour to the utmost of his power in the *pious*—the *meritorious* work of extirpating heresy; that is, to use words of Pope Innocent in his bull to that effect, "to root out, and cause to perish the venomous adders" who presumed to believe and worship according as they were instructed by the word of God.

By persevering in this course for ages, the Church of Rome succeeded in "wearing out" the saints; not absolutely, for God still had witnesses for the truth on the earth; but so worn out, and exterminated, that they were comparatively few for a long period. What a wasting and wearing out of the saints does this represent, during the long period of 1260 years! It has been said, that persecution tends to the increase of a persecuted sect, which may be true of moderate persecution, if there be such a thing; but not of such persevering, relentless, and savage persecution as that of the Church of Rome, especially where the Inqui-

sition was established; for it is a fact, that in many places, particularly in Spain, this horrid engine of Popish tyranny prevailed to the entire extirpation of what they called heresy. The saints of the Most High were quite worn out in these parts. No man could even think in his heart what was taught in the word of God; for his confessor would have brought it out of him, and have sent him to the rack and the fire if he did not recant.

In the crusade against the Waldenses hundreds of thousands were murdered in cold blood, or died of cold and hunger upon the mountains; yet the light of the true religion was never altogether extinguished there, as it was in Spain by the Inquisition. The inhabitants of the mountains and valleys of Piedmont were exposed to the most cruel persecution, centuries before the Reformation, and it was continued, with little interruption, down to the middle of the seventeenth century. It was on the occasion of a dreadful massacre of them in 1655, that Milton wrote the following sonnet, which Mr Jones has given as a motto in the title page of his History of the Waldenses, a book which I recommended in an early part of my work, and which I again recommend to all who wish to know what Christians have suffered from the Church of Rome.

Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughter'd saints, whose bones
Lie scatter'd on the Alpine mountains cold;
Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old
When all our fathers worshipp'd stocks and stones,
Forget not; in thy book record their groans
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piemontise that roll'd
Mother and infant down the rocks: their moans
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyr'd blood and ashes sow
O'er all the Italian fields, where still doth sway
The triple tyrant; that from these may grow
A hundred fold, who having learned thy way
Early may fly the Babylonian woe.

The following curious document shows in what a cold-blooded manner a Papist can plan and even execute the extirpation of heretics. It is a letter from father La Chaise, Confessor to Louis XIV., to father Peters, Confessor to James II. of England, in 1688. It is furnished to "The Antidote" by Sir Harcourt Lees, who, for its authenticity, refers to the seventh volume, 4to. of the collection of manuscript papers selected from the library of Edward Harley, Earl of Oxford.

Father La Chaise's Project for the Extirpation of Heretics, in a letter from him to Father P——rs, 1688.

WORTHY FRIEND,

I received yours of the 20th of June last, and am glad to hear of your good success, and that our party gains ground so fast in England; but, concerning the question you have put to me, that is, "What is the best course to be taken to root out all heretics?" to this I answer, there are divers ways to do that, but we must consider which is the best to make use of in England. I am sure you are not ignorant how many thousand heretics we have in France, by the power of our dragoons, converted in the space of one year: and by the doctrine of those booted apostles, turned more in one month, than Christ and his apostles could in ten years. This is a most excellent method, and far excels those of the great preachers and teachers that have lived since Christ's time. But I have spoken with divers fathers of our society, who do think that your king is not strong enough to accomplish his design by such kind of force; so that we cannot expect to have our work done in that manner, for the heretics are too strong in the three kingdoms; and therefore we must seek to convert them by fair means, before we fall upon them with fire, sword, halters, gaols, and other such like punishments; and therefore I can give you no better advice, than to begin with soft, easy means. Wheedle them by promises of profit and places of honour, till you have made them dip themselves in treasonable actions against the laws established, and then they are bound to serve for fear. When they have done thus, turn them out, and serve others so, by putting them in their places; and by this way gain as many as you can. And for the heretics that are in places of profit and honour, turn them out, or suspend them on pretence of misbehaviour; by which their places are forfeited, and they subject to what judgment you please to give upon them. Then you must form a camp, that must consist of none but Catholics; this will make the heretics heartless, and conclude all means of relief and recovery is gone. And lastly, take the short and the best way, which is, to surprise the heretics on a sudden; and to encourage the zealous Catholics, let them sacrifice them all, and wash their hands in their blood, which will be an acceptable offering to God. And this was the method I took in France, which hath well, you see, succeeded; but it cost me many threats and promises, before I could bring it thus far; our king being a long time very unwilling. But at last I got him on the hip; for he had lain with his daughter-in-law, for which I would by no means give him absolution, till he had given me an instrument, under his own hand and seal, to sacrifice all the heretics in one day. Now, as soon as I had my desired commission, I appointed the day when this should be done; and, in the mean time, made ready some thousands of letters, to be sent into all parts of France in one post night. I was never better pleased than at that time; but the king was affected with some compassion for the Hugonots, because they had been a means to bring him to his crown and throne; and the longer he was under it, the more sorrowful he was; often complaining, and desiring me to give him his commission again;

but that I would by no persuasion do; advising him to repent of that heinous sin, and also telling him, that the trouble and horror of his spirit did not proceed from any thing of evil in those things that were to be done, but from that wickedness that he had done; and that he must resolve to undergo the severe burden of a troubled mind for one of them or the other; and if he would remain satisfied as it was, his sin being forgiven, there would, in a few days, be a perfect atonement made for it, and he perfectly reconciled to God again. But all this would not pacify him; for the longer the more restless; and I therefore ordered him to retire to his closet, and spend his time constantly in prayer, without permitting any one to interrupt him; and this was in the morning early, when, the evening following, I was to send away all my letters. I did, indeed, make the more haste, for fear he should disclose it to any body, yet I had given him a strict charge to keep it to himself; and the very things that I most feared, to my great sorrow, came to pass; for just in the nick of time, the devil, who hath at all times his instruments at work, sent the Prince of Conde to the court, who asked for the king; he was told that he was in his closet, and would speak with no man. He impudently answered, "that he must and would speak with him," and so went directly to his closet; he being a great peer, no man durst hinder him. And, being come to the king, he soon perceived by his countenance, that he was under some great trouble of mind; for he looked as if he had been going into the other world immediately. "Sir," said he, "what is the matter with you?" The king at first refused to tell him, but he pressing harder upon him, at last the king, with a sorrowful complaint, burst out, and said—"I have given father La Chaise a commission, under my hand, to murder all the Hugonots in one day; and this evening will the letters be despatched to to all parts, by the post, for the performing it; so that there is but small time left for my Hugonot subjects to live, who have never done me any harm." Whereupon this cursed rogue answered, "Let him give you your commission again." The king said, "How shall I get it out of his hand? For, if I send to him for it, he will refuse to send it." This devil answered, "If your majesty will give me order, I will quickly make him return it." The king was soon persuaded, being willing to give ease to his troubled spirit, and said, "Well, go then, and break his neck, if he will not give it you." Whereupon this son of the devil went to the post-house, and asked, if I had not a great number of letters there? And they said, "Yes, more than I had sent in a whole year before." "Then," said the prince, "by order from the king, you must deliver them all to me;" which they durst not deny, for they knew well enough who he was. And no sooner was he got into the post-house, and had asked these questions, but I came also in after him, to give order to the postmaster to give notice to all those under him, in the several parts of the kingdom, that they should take care to deliver my letters with all speed imaginable. But I was no sooner entered the house but he gave his servants order to secure the door, and said confidently to me, "You must, by order from the king, give me the commission, which you have forced from him." I told him I had it not about me, but would go and fetch it; thinking to get from him, and so go out of town, and send the contents of those letters another time; but he said, "You must give it; and if you have it not about you, send somebody to fetch it, or else never expect to go alive out of my hands; for I have an order from the king either to bring it back or break your neck, and am resolved either to carry that back to him in my hand, or else your heart's blood on the point of my sword." I would have made my escape, but he set his sword to my breast, and said, "You must give it me, or die; therefore deliver it, or else this goes through your body."

So, when I saw nothing else would do, I put my hand in my pocket and gave it him; which he carried immediately to the king, and gave him that and all my letters, which they burned. And, being all done, the king said, now his heart was at ease. Now, how he should be eased by the devil, or so well satisfied with a false joy, I cannot tell; but this I know, that it was a very wicked and ungodly action, as well in His Majesty, as the Prince of Conde, and did not a little increase the burden and danger of His Majesty's sins. I soon gave an account of this affair to several fathers of our society, who promised to do their best to prevent the aforesaid prince's doing such another act, which was accordingly done; for within six days after the damned action, he was poisoned, and well he deserved it. The king also did suffer too, but in another fashion, for disclosing the design unto the prince, and hearkening unto his counsel. And many a time since, when I have had him at confession, I have shook hell about his ears, and made him sigh, fear, and tremble, before I would give him absolution; nay, more than that, I have made him beg for it on his knees, before I would consent to absolve him. By this, I saw that he had still an inclination to me, and was willing to be under my government: so I set the baseness of the action before him, by telling the whole story, and how wicked it was, and that it could not be forgiven, till he had done some good action to balance that, and expiate the crime. Whereupon, he at last asked me, what he must do? I told him, that he must root out all heretics from his kingdom. So, when he saw there was no rest for him, without doing it, he did again give

them all into the power of me and our clergy, under this condition, that we would not murder them, as he had before given orders, but that we should by fair means, or force, convert them to the Catholic religion. Now, when we had got the commission, we presently put it in practice; and what the issue had been, you very well know. But now in England the work cannot be done after this manner, as you may perceive by what I have said to you; so that I cannot give you better counsel, than to take that course in hand wherein we were so unhappily prevented; and I doubt not, but it may have better success with you than with us.

I would write to you of many other things, but I fear I have already detained you too long, wherefore I will write no more at present, but that I am

Your friend and servant,
LA CHAISE.

Paris, July 8th, 1688.

No. CCVIII.

SATURDAY, JULY 6TH, 1822.

I HAVE shown that the Antichrist was a subject of Old Testament prophecy; and that in the New Testament he is pointed out in such characters as identify him with the Church of Rome. The centre of his power was to be that great city, which, in the time of the apostle John, reigned over the kings of the earth; and such was the state of the world at that time, that the words cannot be applied to any city but Rome.

But there are two passages in Paul's epistles, in which the character of this monster of wickedness is portrayed with wonderful precision. They are as follow:—"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he that now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish: because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be condemned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness;" 2 Thess. ii. 1—12. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth;" 1 Tim. iv. 1—3.

In these two passages the whole system is described, from the comparatively small abridgment of Christian liberty, by forbidding to eat flesh on certain days, up to the universal and tyrannical domination of one who puts himself in the place of God, claiming and exercising absolute authority over the bodies and the souls of men;—even exalting himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped, by presuming to alter what God has ordained, and to withhold or give the word of God at his pleasure. It is not necessary to ascribe all this to the Pope in his single person; or to say that he alone is the Man of Sin, or Son of Perdition, or the Antichrist. It is the system of superstition, idolatry, and arbitrary domination over the consciences of men, skilfully organized, and rigorously exercised by the church of which the Pope is the acknowledged head.

Paul in his preaching to the Thessalonians had told them these things. They had mistaken something that he had said to them, or something that he had written in his first epistle about the last judgment, expecting that the end of the world was just at hand. Here he corrects their mistake, and assures them that a great apostasy should take place before the end of the world; and he informs them farther, that it was begun. It was not then revealed, or publicly manifested; but it was working in secret, and would be revealed in due time, and appear in great power, when the obstruction was taken out of the way.

It was working among all the churches in Galatia where certain false teachers perverted the gospel, and taught the people to trust for salvation, partly at least, to their observance of rites and ceremonies. This was the same thing as to deny Christ altogether; for if righteousness came in that way, Christ had died in vain. This is substantially the same error that pervades the whole system of Popery; which teaches to trust for salvation to the effi-

cacy of sacraments, especially of the mass sacrifice; and if this were really propitiatory, as the Church of Rome teaches, Christ must have died in vain, for his death was unnecessary, upon the supposition that any other sacrifice could serve the purpose of propitiation, or making an atonement for sin. The mystery of iniquity began also to work in the church in Corinth, when the members were divided into parties, calling themselves by the names of mere men, though these men were apostles. One said, I am of Paul; another, I am of Apollos; and another, I am of Cephas. These were the orders of monks and nuns in embryo. They were the Augustinians, and the Franciscans, and Dominicans of the day. And yet what could be more harmless than the thing appeared at first? It was only every one paying a compliment to his favourite preacher, and they were all inspired men to whom this was paid. Yes: but the apostle says, it was because they were carnal; and it was from this apparently trifling error of the carnal mind, that the system of religious orders arose. It was not like calling different sects by their leaders, such as Luther and Calvin, though, I think, there is antichrist in that too; but it was forming different religious orders in the same church, that was the fault of the Corinthians; and for this the Church of Rome has been distinguished above all others.

It is not my intention to illustrate and apply the different parts of the above passages, because I have already touched on them all, in different parts of my work, particularly under the head of worshipping saints, which is meant by the doctrines of demons, that is, deifying departed spirits as the heathen did. Forbidding to marry, I have discussed under the head of clerical celibacy. Speaking lies in hypocrisy, has been exposed in every view which I have given of the character of Popery; as also the deceivableness of unrighteousness, and the lying wonders by which she imposes on the world.

There is one part of the description, of which, indeed, I have said little or nothing; that is, the manner and the means by which Popery shall be destroyed and rooted out of the world. The apostle says of that wicked one, "The Lord shall consume him with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of his coming." But as this is not yet accomplished, there is danger of mistaking, at least of not taking up the full import of the prediction. Those who live a few ages hence will understand the passage much better than we of the present age can do. No doubt, however, there is this implied in it, that one great instrument by means of which God will destroy this system of delusion and idolatry, will be his own word. This, I suppose, is what is meant by the spirit of his mouth. When John saw a vision of Christ in his glory, there was the appearance of a sword proceeding out of his mouth; and elsewhere he is said to "fight against his enemies by the sword of his mouth," Rev. ii. 16, that is, by the almighty energy of his word, which is "quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow; and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart;" Heb. iv. 12; Eph. vi. 17. It dissects and lays open the mind and heart of man; kills and destroys the principle of error and enmity against God; and imparts a new mind to the acknowledgment of the truth, with submission to the divine righteousness and the divine will. It is in this way that Christ subdues his enemies.

The sword which John saw coming out of the mouth of Christ, was, I suppose, like a ray of light or flame of fire, and so it corresponds with what is here called the spirit of his mouth, and "the *brightness* of his coming;" and this reminds us of the magnificent description of the prophet Daniel, when he saw a vision relating to this very subject, namely, the destruction of Antichrist: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels like burning fire. *A fiery stream* issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld, even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame;" chap. vii. 9—11. "The judgment set," in this passage, is not the last judgment; but what the angel described to John, as the "judgment of the great whore, who did corrupt the earth with her fornications." See Rev. xviith, xviiith, xixth, throughout. And in the passage in Daniel, we find, immediately after the beast is destroyed, the nations of the world are given to Christ; that is, they are converted by the gospel preached to them; and the preachers, I suppose, are the thousand thousands that minister to the Ancient of Days, and the ten thousand times ten thousand, meaning a great indefinite number, that stand before him. These, enlightened and animated by the fiery stream issuing from the mouth of God, carry the light and the influence of it throughout the world; and all nations shall be converted to the Messiah, who has received in promise, from his Father, the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possessions.

But these heavenly messengers are represented as standing before God, and ministering to him, before the beast is destroyed; from which it is probable that their ministry will be the means of his destruction. By preaching

the gospel, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, and giving copies of the bible in every language, the minds of men shall be enlightened, and turned from the power of Satan to God. They shall then cast their idols to the moles and to the bats. They shall renounce the Pope and all the mummery of their apostate church; and thousands of truly holy churches shall rise up in its stead. At the same time, other messengers will be labouring in all parts of the Pagan world; and by the blessing of the same divine Spirit, the heathen also will forsake their idols, and submit to the Saviour. The Lord shall be one, and his name one, to the ends of the earth. That which is now a wilderness shall become like Eden, and the desert shall be like the garden of the Lord.

I am aware that most people expect that Antichrist will be destroyed by means of dreadful temporal judgments, which are described as vials of wrath, poured out upon the seat of the beast. These are, pestilence, and famine, and earthquakes, and desolating wars, by means of which the nations which gave their power to the beast,—which have been corrupted and seduced by her,—shall be depopulated and almost exterminated. All this may happen, and, I suppose, something like this will take place, when the judgment of the great whore is to be executed; but all this would not destroy the Man of Sin; it would in fact make no impression upon him, but to make him more sinful by blaspheming God on account of these plagues. Millions of supporters of the beast may perish by these judgments; but the beast himself cannot be killed by any material weapon; for his soul is as immaterial as the soul of man. When the judgment takes place, his body shall be cast into the burning flame; that is, his material form, as existing and organized in different nations, shall be destroyed. But nothing can destroy the subtle intellectual enmity against God, in which his soul consists, but the Spirit of God's mouth, and the brightness of his coming; that is, the gospel of the grace of God, by which he subdues his enemies, and converts them to himself. Where Antichrist is not destroyed in this way, he is not destroyed at all; for he reigns with full power in the hearts of all who live and die in their sins; and though he cannot properly be said to reign after the judgment is executed upon him, he will continue to exist in the regions of despair, with the full malignity of his heart against God, for ever and ever.

Another subject of inquiry is,— *When* shall this antichristian system be destroyed?—and it is perhaps still more difficult to answer this question than that relating to the means of his destruction. We all know it shall be at the end of the 1260 prophetic days, that is, years; but no one can tell with certainty when this period commenced. The mystery of iniquity was working in secret in the days of the apostles; and the monster grew up so gradually and imperceptibly, that we cannot tell the precise year when he became organically the Man of Sin, any more than we can mark the precise moment of twilight when day ceases, and night begins. In his gradual progress to supreme power, however, he left a few landmarks, if I may use the expression, from which we can take our departure in measuring the period of his reign. We cannot say with certainty which of these landmarks is the last from which we ought to reckon. There is one, to which if we add 1260 years, we are brought down to the period of Luther's reformation; there is another, to which if we add the same number, we come to the era of the French Revolution. But though Popery received a wound at these periods, particularly the first, the event has shown that neither of them was the termination of the beast's reign, and therefore neither of the points of departure was the final one, or that at which the beast reached the zenith of his power; but as they mark certain steps of his elevation, so the prophetic number points out corresponding steps of his decline. I think one of the most prominent landmarks in his progress is that when the Pope was declared universal bishop, which took place in the year 607, to which if we add 1260 we have 1867, or 45 years from the present date; and several modern authors have fixed on this as the period when the Man of Sin shall be destroyed. But the Pope had a farther elevation after he was made universal bishop. He became a temporal prince 150 years thereafter, and perhaps his reign may be prolonged for that period beyond the above date. At all events, I am not so sanguine as to hope to live to see his downfall, though I may live to see a considerable enlargement of his power, perhaps his re-establishment in certain dominions which he had lost. But I confess, I am a mere tyro in these matters, having never applied my mind to this kind of calculation; and instead of quoting the words of other authors, I think it better to refer to their works, because they can easily be had, and from their own merit they are worthy of attentive perusal. "Dissertation on the Seals and Trumpets, and the Prophetic Number of 1260 Days, by William Cunninghame, Esq." "Two Essays on Daniel's Prophetic Number of 2300 Days, by the Rev. Mr Mason." "The Fall of Babylon the Great," by the same. Also Bicheno's "Signs of the Times," and other writings.

I intended, before concluding, to have made free use of the Reverend Mr Graham's Annals of Ireland, and Sir Richard Musgrave's History of the Rebellion of 1798, as illustrative of the cruel and sanguinary character of Popery. But I find I should not do justice to these works without writing another volume at least, and it would scarcely be justice to the authors to reprint so much of the matter as would be ne-

cessary to give a full view of the subjects. It must therefore refer to the works themselves; the first of which shows immense industry and research into the records of the kingdom for the 16th and 17th centuries; and the second shows no less attention to events which took place within our own memory. My copy of the work is a present from a Right Honourable Senator, who certifies under his hand on a blank leaf, that the facts are correctly stated, he having had command of a regiment, with which he served during the whole period of the troubles, so that he was an eye-witness of many of the atrocities which were committed; and such scenes were acted as would have disgraced the most barbarous savages.

There is much in the state of Ireland at present, and in the state and progress of Popery in England, considered in connection with the attempts of Protestants to get Papists set over them, that might admit of profitable discussion; but I cannot enter upon these things without danger of transgressing the law as it now stands with regard to periodical publications. "Emancipation," as an abstract question, I have discussed at considerable length in this volume;* but I must not touch on passing events, or matters pending in parliament, because this would incur the Newspaper duty. I do not, upon the whole, regret that my field of discussion has been narrowed on this account; because it has kept me more closely to what was my original object—the exposure of the religious errors of Popery. To those who wish to see sound Protestant principles maintained on political grounds, I would strongly recommend the "True Briton," and the "Antidote." The former is a London daily Paper, and the latter a Dublin weekly one. The London "Sun" and "Morning Post" have given many excellent letters on the subject of emancipation, and the "Courier" a good article now and then: but the two first named are established upon the avowed principle of maintaining the Protestant ascendency and the Revolution settlement. Most of the popular journals on the opposition side are on the side of the enemy; and with strange inconsistency, while professing to be advocates of civil and religious liberty, they plead for admitting to power over us, the determined enemies of all liberty, except that of being allowed to trample upon their fellow-creatures, and to bring all men under their yoke. To bring such men into political power in our Protestant country may be friendly to liberty, but I suspect it would be such liberty as that which Jeremiah was commanded to proclaim, chap. xxxiv. 17. that is, a liberty to the sword, and to all the miseries which follow.

I come now to take farewell of my readers, which I do with thankful acknowledgments for their long-continued approbation, countenance and support. If I have been honoured in any degree to serve the cause of truth, it is in a great measure owing to them; for, instead of continuing to write four years, I should probably not have continued three months, had my writings been despised, or received with indifference. My thanks are also due to my numerous and respectable correspondents, in Scotland, England, and Ireland, for their valuable communications, and for pointing out sources of information, which they justly supposed would not be familiar to one, who has been engaged all his life in mercantile and other secular pursuits.

* Since this was written, a bill for the emancipation of the Catholics, as it was popularly called, was finally passed in the year 1829, mainly through the influence of the Duke of Wellington and the former opposers of the measure. The following abstract of the fate of various motions respecting it may not be unacceptable to our readers. In the year 1805, a majority of 129 in the house of lords, and of 212 in the house of commons, refused to act on the petition of the Catholics, moved severally by lord Grenville and Mr Fox. In 1807, lord Grenville withdrew his motion in favour of emancipation, it being understood that his majesty was averse to it. In 1808, Mr Grattan's motion was rejected, in the house of commons, by a majority of 153, and lord Donoughmore's, in the house of lords, by a majority of eighty-seven. In 1810, a motion to the same effect, by the same members, was again lost, by a majority of 112 in the commons, and 86 in the lords. In 1812, there was a majority of 72 in the lords, and 85 in the commons, against the movers. Mr Canning's motion was lost, in the same year, by a majority of 129 in the commons, and that of the Marquis of Wellesley, by a majority of 113 in the lords. In 1813, the motions of Mr Grattan, Sir John Cox Hippesley, and doctor Duigenan, drew forth majorities against the Catholics of forty, forty-eight, and forty-two, and on the 24th of May, the bill was given up. In 1821, Mr Plunkett carried the bill through the house of commons by a majority of nineteen; but it was lost in the lords by a majority of thirty-nine. In 1822, Mr Canning carried it, in the commons, by a majority of twenty-one; but it was thrown out, in the lords, by a majority of forty-two. In 1825, Sir Francis Burdett carried it, in the commons, by a majority of twenty-seven; but it was again thrown out, in the lords, by a majority of forty-eight. In 1827, Sir Francis Burdett's motion for a committee was lost, in the commons, by a majority of three. In 1828, the motion for a conference with the lords was carried, in the commons, by a majority of six; but thrown out, in the lords, by a majority of forty-five. And, in 1829 (April 10), a *relief bill*, abolishing the civil disabilities on Roman Catholics, by repealing the oaths of supremacy, &c., was carried through the commons by Mr Peel, with a majority of 180 on the second reading, and 178 on the third; and through the lords, by the duke of Wellington, with a majority of 105 on the second reading, and 104 on the third. By this bill, Catholics are eligible to all offices of state, excepting the lord-chancellorships of England and Ireland, the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland, the office of regent or guardian of the United Kingdom, and that of high commissioner to the church of Scotland. They are still excluded from the right of presentation to livings, and all places connected with the ecclesiastical courts and establishment. The church patronage attached to any office in the hands of a Catholic is vested in the archbishop of Canterbury. Attached to the bill is a clause for the gradual suppression of the Jesuits and monastic orders (religious establishments of females excepted). At the same time, the duke carried a *disfranchisement bill*, by which the forty shilling freeholders of Ireland were disfranchised, and the income of real estate necessary to entitle to a vote in elections in that country raised to ten pounds sterling.

There is one subject that I have never mentioned in my pages, but which it would be unpardonable not to notice before I conclude; that is, the handsome and liberal manner in which the public came forward a year ago, to relieve me of the heavy expense of Mr Scott's lawsuit. This was quite unsolicited on my part; and though I am neither so rich, nor so indifferent to the things of the world, as to make no account of a sum bordering on fourteen hundred pounds, I have always considered the expression of the public mind in my favour as infinitely more valuable than mere pecuniary remuneration. The sum subscribed has not indeed been equal to the charge, but it has been more than my friends contemplated as necessary at the time, for the court did not fix the amount for nearly six months after the trial; and when I have added the profits of my work not previously given for charitable purposes, my loss will not be very great; but had I sustained the loss of the whole, I should have considered it honourable to suffer in so good a cause.

Though I retire from the field at present, I am determined to hold myself in readiness to meet any champion of Popery who may arise; for it is probable some coward will sculk out from his hiding-place, when he thinks he has no enemy to fear. I remind all such, that I have kept *undisputed* possession of the field for two years and a half; and that I am ready to return to it at an hour's notice, if any Papist shall have courage enough to show a face disposed to renew the contest.

Since it has gone abroad that I was about to conclude, I have been pressed with the most urgent solicitations to write another volume; and several subjects have been suggested to me both by word and letter. But having gone over all the great topics of controversy with the Church of Rome, I feel convinced in my own mind, that unless some new champion of Popery should arise, I could not keep up the spirit of the work, and retain the hold which it has on the minds of my intelligent readers, for another year. I have always held it wise in a writer, as well as a speaker, to stop when he is done; and I should be sorry to think, that any person found out the secret, that I was done, before myself.

INDEX.

A

Absolutions of the Romish Church, 63, 64; document from Rome granting the power of absolution, 607.
Adrian, IV. Pope, Bull of, regarding Ireland, 745.
Albigenses, persecutions of the, 82 and 517—523; references to historical works on the subject, 520, *n.*
Alcala, declaration of the university of, 129.
Alum Works, the pope a proprietor of certain, 52; his imprecations on a workman for absconding and revealing the secrets of the trade, 53.
America, United States of, curious case between a priest and his bishop there, 713—715; state of Popery in, 715—719.
Amicus Veritatis, letters of, and replies to, 12—32; Advertisement by, 34; animadverted on, 42; False quotation from Luther's works by, 39; Further replies to, 75, *et seq.* and 89, *et seq.*; his observations about Luther and Good Works exposed, 501, 507—509; his statement about Pope Urban VIII.'s bull answered, 541; detected as a plagiarist, 615; his arguments about indulgences and dispensations answered, 616—619; his allegations against Luther, Knox, and other reformers rebutted, 619—623.
Amphibolus, a fictitious saint of the isle of Man, 210.
Andrews, St, Paul Craw, an early reformer, burnt at, 84; Patrick Hamilton burnt at, 85; other persecutions there, 86.
Andrews, W. E., his Catholic Vindicator, 143; his School Book compared to the Bible, *ib.*; maintains the lawfulness of breaking faith, 178, 179; his remarks upon devotion to the Virgin Mary, 185, 186; his abuse of The Protestant, 193; his life of Saint Wenefride, 199, 201—205; other works published by, 206: Referred to, 255, *Note;* notice of his school book, 475.—See CATHOLIC VINDICATOR.
Angel-worship, lawfulness of praying to angels discussed, 657.
Ann, St, mother of the Virgin Mary, account of, 183.
Antichrist, a subject of ancient prophecy, 834; illustration of several passages in the Old Testament as applicable to, 835—839; other passages in the New Testament, 842—844· means by which antichrist will be destroyed, 844.
Apostles' Creed, notice of the, 629; its antiquity and orthodoxy, 630; the question of its being a composition of the apostles handed down by tradition, considered, 775, 776.
Apostolic Chancery, the tax of the, noticed, 619.
Apostolic Headship, no evidence of, 421—424.
Apostolic Succession, incidentally handled, 427, 428; claim of the popish priests to be true successors of the apostles discussed, 650, 651; "Apostolicity," Dr Milner's fourth mark of the True Church, not applicable to the Church of Rome, 813; short account of Apostolic churches, ib., 814; Apostolic character of Christian pastors contrasted with that of the Popish clergy, 814, 815; doctrine of the Church of Rome opposed to that of the apostolic churches, 815—819; the apostolical succession of the clergy shown to be a mere figment, 820, 821; Dr. Milner's apostolic tree described, 823.
Apostolicity. See APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.
Argyle, Countess of, censured by the General Assembly for countenancing Popery, 102, 103.
Atonement, Scripture doctrine of the, stated and illustrated, *versus* the sacrifice of the mass, 278—281; the same *versus* confession and penance, 397—400.
Augustin, St, quoted, 421, 497.
Auto-da-fe, account of an, 536.

B

Baher, Father, extracts from his work on the mass, 275 and 289, and 293—295.
Baptism, Popish views of, 72.
Beaghan, James, confession of, 695.
Beatification, definition of, 212.
Becket, Thomas à, appearance of the Virgin to, 195.
Belfast, a correspondent's remarks on the manner in which Popery is treated by many Protestants in, 363, 364.
Belgium, doctrinal decision of the bishops of, 87, 88.
Bells, account of the baptism of, in Canada, 316—318.
Berington and Kirk's work in support of the Catholic religion referred to, 572 and 573; character of the work, and some of its propositions commented on, 599—606.
Beuno, St, notice of, 200 and 206.
Beziers, city of, inhabitants put to the sword as heretics or Waldenses, 520.
Beziers, earl of, endeavours to protect the Albigenses from the persecutions of the Pope's legate, 520; foiled at the siege of Carcassone, 521, 522.
Bible, authority of the, with Papists, 44, 45; tax proposed on reading the, 79; practice of the Romish church in withholding the Bible from the people, 143; denied by the Rev. Andrew Scott, 144; and Amicus Veritatis, 145; answered by The Protestant, *ib. et seq. ad* 176; early translations of the, 148; Wickliffe's, *ib.*; Luther's, 149; Pope Sixtus V.'s, *ib.*; Italian mutilated edition, 150; Rhemish translation, 152; proposed society for circulating the Douay Bible, 156, 157; Bible addressed to all, 160, *et seq.*; opposed by Popish writers, 162—168; reflections on the general circulation of the, 168—171; hostility to the, in Spain, 173; in Ireland, *ib.*, 174; effects of reading the Bible and preaching, 175, 176; English translation of the, 198 and *note;* Bishop Copinger on the use of the, in schools, 404; resolutions by the Popish clergy of Cloyne and Ross against the reading of the, in schools, 405; Daniel O'Connell's speech against the use of the, in schools, 406, 407; remarks on, 407, 408; examples of absurd interpretations of the, by Popish divines, 410, 411; sufficiency of the, as a rule of faith, 549, and 551, 552; held by Papists as secondary to the authority of the church, 552; arguments of Papists that we owe to the authority of the

Church, our knowledge of the genuineness of the, 552; aversion of Papists to the general circulation of the, 553, 554; instances of alleged corruptions in the early translations of the, 555; how a Christian knows the Bible to be the word of God independently of human tradition, 556—560; errors in the Pope's edition of the, 560; the Church of Rome guilty of withholding the, from the common people, 646; this defended by the Catholic Vindicator, *ib.*, 647; aversion of the Papists generally to the free use of the, 648—650; question as to the difficulty of understanding the, *ib.*; beneficial effects of reading the, 654; subject of the, taken as a rule of faith, discussed, 753—756; doctrine of Papists that the Bible alone is not a sufficient rule of faith, 756; the same subject enlarged on, 757—761; the Church of Rome claims the exclusive right of explaining the, 784; injunction of "searching the Scriptures" explained, 785; "the Church proves the Bible and the Bible proves the Church," 787.

Bible Schools, bull of the Pope against, in Ireland, 347; commented on, 348—350.

Bible Society, denounced by the Pope, 79; its practice in distributing the Scriptures, 145; ridiculed in the Orthodox Journal, 151; bull of the Pope against Bible Societies, 158.

Bigotry, Phillips on, 31; definition of the term, 76; instances of, among the Papists, 76—79.

Blindness, counterfeited to perform a sham miracle, 224.

Blood, question as to the Mosaic law against eating of, 781, 782; the obligation of the law not abolished by tradition, *ib.*

Bogue, Dr, of Gosport, his translation of the French catechism noticed, 618.

Bonaparte, blessed and crowned by the Pope, 444; excommunicated by the same, 445—450; historic doubts as to the existence of, 674.

Books, censorship of, 68.

Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, his effrontery in denying the persecutions of Popery, 540; argues the lawfulness of persecution, 542.

Bourdeaux, persecution of Protestants at, 74, 75.

Bourke, Rev. Charles, a Romish priest in Ireland, his case, 117, 118; his pamphlet noticed by the Catholic Vindicator, 634, 635.

Bower, Alexander, extracts from his Lives of the Popes, 437—440.

Bradley, Rev. Patrick, a Presbyterian minister, letter giving an account of his conversion from Popery, 377—382.

Britain, Popery not the original Christianity of, 744.

Brothels, Pope's bull for licensing, 89.

Brownlee, Dr, quotation from his letters on the Roman Catholic controversy, 63; Parable from do., 64—68.

Brunswick, duke of, his Reasons for preferring the Roman Catholic Religion, 77; notice of his "Fifty Reasons for preferring the Roman Catholic Religion to all other sects," 767, 768.

Buchanan, George, anecdote by, of a baker, painter, and priest, 269, *n.*; translation from his Franciscan by the Rev. Mr Graham, 347 and 366.

Bulls, Papal. Bull granted to the family of Kilravack, 14 and 20; do. granted to the people of Cork, 18; do. for exciting rebellion in Ireland, *ib.*; Bull for extirpating the Waldenses, 41; Pope's bull for licensing brothels, 89; Bull of the Pope against Bible Societies, 158; Bull of the Pope against "Bible Schools" in Ireland, 347; commented on, 348—350; Bull of Pope Urban VIII. granting plenary indulgence to such Irish Papists as should extirpate their Protestant neighbours, 511; Bull of Indulgence, copy of, with translation, granted to a family, conferring upon an individual the power of granting a dispensation, &c., 607. See INDULGENCES.

C

Calvin, John, his share of blame in the burning of Servetus, 543; Dr Milner's mutilated extracts from the writings of, 797, 798.

Cameron, Bishop, his examination in the case, Scott *v.* M'Gavin, 728.

Cameron, Rev. Robert, letter from, giving case of a Romish husband not keeping faith with his Protestant wife, 311.

Candles, used alike in Popish and Pagan worship, 300.

Canisius, Peter, his Catechism, 96.

Canonization, Popish, its resemblance to heathen deification, 213; process of, 215.

Carcassone, a town of Piedmont, inhabited by a number of Albigenses, 520; besieged by the Pope's legate and a vast army, 520—522.

Carlisle, Rev. James, extract from a pamphlet by, 331—334.

Catechism, different Catholic catechisms compared, 94—96.

Catholic, term CATHOLIC distinguished from PAPIST, 14 and 17 and 40; distinction between the words CATHOLIC, POPISH, and POPERY, 627, 628; meaning of the term, 811; not originally used in the Apostles' Creed, *ib.*

Catholic Emancipation, adverted to, 180; The Protestant's opinion of, 359; consequences of Papists getting into Parliament, 452; probable number of Catholic members were Catholic Emancipation granted, 456; letter on the subject of, 495; petition of an Independent Church in Cockermouth for, 574; copy of the same, *ib. n.*; remarks on, *ib.*; reasons why Papists should not hold situations of power and trust, 645, 646; the subject of, introduced, 688; exclusion from places of power not persecution, 689; acts passed after the revolution against Papists, 690; relaxation of former acts, and concessions made, *ib.* and 691; effect of such concessions, *ib.* and 693; aim of Papists to recover church lands and forfeited estates, 693—695; the primitive Christians did not aspire at civil power, 697; proofs that Papists wish to subvert the established government in church and state, 698—700; dangers of admitting Papists to power in a Protestant state, 701—704; argument for emancipation from the fact that Papists are eligible to all places in the United States of America, answered, 715—719; notice of the various motions respecting it, in Parliament, 845, *n.*

Catholic Vindicator, (see ANDREWS, W. E.) first notice of the publication so called, 143; further notice of, 178; maintains the lawfulness of breaking faith, *ib.*, 179; its opinion of the Bible, 181; its abuse of The Protestant, 193; account of the demise of the, 344—346; quoted on the subject of the sufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith, 552—555; its instances of alleged corruptions in the early translations of the Bible, 555; its defence of Amicus Veritatis from the charge of forgery, 619; its accusations against Luther on the subject of divorce, 620; commencement of regular reply to the, 623; character of the work, *ib. et seq.*; some of its accusations refuted and absurdities exposed, 624—626; it admits the use of the terms PAPIST and POPERY, 627; it asserts that Christianity owes its rise to the influence of Popery, 632; its allegation that Popery is more favourable to good morals than Protestantism, discussed, 633, 634; falsely accuses the Covenanters of under-

taking to extirpate all Papists by force of arms, 635; affirms the gunpowder-plot to be a mere invention of the Protestants, 636, 637; its remarks on the Pope crowning Napoleon, 637; its acknowledgments as to the doctrine of Papists not keeping faith with heretics, 638—642; its slanderous language against The Protestant quoted and exposed, 643; it defends the Church of Rome in withholding the Bible from the free use of the people, 646, 647; its defence of saint-worship, 654; its arguments answered, 658—662; its defence of the adoration of the virgin, 668, 669; St Winefride supposed to be a favourite saint of the, 670, 671; its manner of treating the Man-in-the-Wynd story, 673—675; its views of justification by faith, 676, 677; its defence of the Church of Rome against the charge of falsehood, 677—679; its defence of Transubstantiation, 679—681, and 682—685; reasons of The Protestant for replying to the Vindicator so fully, 681; it accuses The Protestant of forgery and misquotation, 684—688; conclusion of The Protestant's reply to, 688.

Catholicity, claimed by the Church of Rome, proved not to belong to her, 811, 812.

Catholics, number of, in England and their rank, 457, 458; number of, in Glasgow, 460.

Celibacy of the Romish priests, 77; introduction to the subject of, 480; doctrine of, as laid down by Bishop Hay, *ib.*, 481; answered, *ib.*, 482—485; the arguments of Popish writers in favour of, exposed, *ib. et seq.*; historical account of the establishment of, in the Romish church, 486, 487; immoralities occasioned by, 487, 488; anecdotes relating to, 493, *Notes.*

Censorship of books by the Roman priesthood, 68.

Ceremonies, Popish ceremonies practised at Havannah, 244.

Chaise, Father la, his project for extirpating heretics, 840—842.

Challoner's "Garden of the Soul," extracts from, 383—386.

Chalmers, Rev. Dr, his evidence of the Christian Revelation referred to, 552.

Chancery, Apostolic. See Apostolic Chancery.

Charity, estimate of, by Amicus Veritatis, 92; true nature of, *ib.*

Chastity, not inconsistent with the marriage relation, 484.

Christ, the true head of the Church, 54; the only true satisfaction for sin, 397—400.

Christianity, introduction of, into Britain, 459.

Chronicle, Glasgow, (newspaper) paragraph in, regarding Oratorio, 11 and 35; letters to the editor of the, from 'A Protestant,' 'Amicus Veritatis,' and 'Pax,' 12—32; to the readers of the, 33.

Church, Dr Milner's marks of the true, 789. See Rome, Church of.

Clarendon, Lord, extracts from his work "Religion and Policy," on the Pope's supremacy, 431, and 433—436.

Cleland, Dr. See Glasgow.

Clergy, Romish, profligacy of the, 487—492.

Cobbett, William, cited by the Catholic Vindicator, 676.

Cockburn, Mr, (now Lord Cockburn,) remarks on his speech in the Jury Trial, Scott *v.* M'Gavin, 720—737.

Cockermouth, in Cumberland, petition of an Independent church in, for Catholic Emancipation, 574 and *n.*

Commandment, the Second, omitted or altered in Catholic catechisms, 95.

Commandments, Ten, mutilated by the Church of Rome, 217.

Conciliation, the rage of the day, 832.

Concubinage, allowed to the Romish priests, 489.

Confession, auricular, subject introduced, 366; doctrine of the council of Trent regarding, 367; duties of, according to Gother, 368; of venial and mortal sins, 368—370, 375, 376; instructions and devotions for confession, 383, 384; what is required to a good confession, 385; the method of confession, *ib.*; pernicious effects of, upon the minds of priests, 389; and the people, *ib.*—392; children's confession turned to a farce, 392; Da Costa's testimony regarding confession, 393; passages of Scripture adduced in favour of confession, 394—396; subject of satisfaction for sin intimately connected with that of confession, 397.

Confiteor, copy of the, 390.

Constantinople, patriarch of, assumes the title of universal bishop, 437.

Convents, description of, in Montreal, 318, 319; notice of one in London, 741.

Conversion, account of the conversion of a family in Ireland from Popery, 478, 479; pretended death-bed conversions to the Church of Rome, 765—768; character of Popish conversions of the heathen, 824, 825; death-bed conversions to Popery, 826—830; remarks on, 830, 831.

Copinger, Bishop, his address to the Catholic clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross, 404; remarks on, 409—412, 413—415.

Cork, indulgence granted to the people of, 18.

Covenanters, falsely accused by the Catholic Vindicator of undertaking to extirpate all Papists by force of arms, 635.

Crabs, ridiculous imposition of crabs being made to represent souls freed from purgatory, 336.

Craig, Mr John, some time colleague of John Knox, extracts from the life of, 471.

Creed of Pope Pius IV., 443, 444.

Creed, Apostles'. See Apostles' Creed.

Cross, image of the, in Catholic worship, idolatrous, 301, 302.

Crucifixes, indulgences granted to Stukley's, 110, 111.

Culpa and Pœna, (guilt and punishment) distinction of Popish writers between, 43.

Cunningham, Mr, his work on the apostacy of the Church of Rome quoted, 217 and 219, *n.*

Cup, on withholding the cup from the laity in the holy sacrament, 273, 274.

Cutty Stool, practice of exhibition in the, adopted by the Scottish church for fornication, 102; subject of money taken for exemption from the, discussed, *ib.* 103, 104.

D

Da Costa, a Portuguese gentleman, his testimony regarding confession, 393.

Dallas, Mr, his defence of the Jesuits noticed, 584.

Daly, James, affidavit of, giving an account of a forcible attempt in Galway to convert a dying man to Popery, 828—830.

Daniel, allusion to his prophecy regarding Antichrist, 838, 839.

Derwentwater, Lord, anecdote of, 248.

D'Espence, Claude, a Parisian divine, quoted, 22, 26.

Dick, Rev. Dr, his Essay on the Inspiration of the Scriptures referred to, 552.

Dominic, St, worship paid to the image of, 222; account of, 223.

Douay Catechism, adverted to, 12, 13, 19; quoted, 24, 37, 42, 48; character of the, 94—96; on the doctrine of the mass, 274; Douay Catechism on purgatory, 324; discussed, 327, *et seq.*

Dromgoole, Rev. Dr, extracts from his speeches on Catholic Emancipation, 698, 699.

Drummond, Dr, controversy between him and bishop Hay on the subject of breaking faith with heretics, 136—138.

Dublin, account of a Purgatorian Society in, or society for raising money to relieve from purgatory, 331—334; card to the members of, 344.
Dulia, a kind of worship, 196.
Dupin, his testimony regarding indulgences, 21 and 22.
Durham, bishop of, controversy between the, and some English Papists, 472.

E

Education, method of, pursued in Catholic schools, 475; bull of the Pope against educational schools in Ireland, with comments, 347—350; archbishop of Tuam's charge regarding the same, 346 and 350—362.
Elizabeth, Queen of England, excommunication of by the Pope, 108, 109; the Pope's letter to the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland exciting them to rebellion against, 110; plots of Jesuits against her life, 111; Queen Elizabeth, tested on the subject of the real presence, 267.
Emancipation. See CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.
England, number of Catholics in, and their rank, 457, 458, 461.
England, Rev. Mr, his treasonable catechism on Irish history, 832—834.
Episcopalians, (Scottish) disabilities to which they were subject in the last century, 700.
Erskine, Thomas, recommendation of a pamphlet by, on the Internal Evidence of Revealed Religion, 558.
Eucharist, Douay Catechism on the, 48; Eucharist, or sacrament of the Lord's Supper, explained, 248, *et seq.*; Gother on the Eucharist, 260. See TRANSUBSTANTIATION and MASS.
Excommunication, singular case of, 52, 53; excommunication in the Romish Church, 106—110; examples of, in the cases of King John, Queen Elizabeth, and Henry VIII., 106—111; excommunication of rats, mice, &c., 112, 113; used as an instrument of oppression against private individuals, 115, 116; excommunication of the Rev. Charles Bourke, 117; copy of the excommunication of Napoleon by Pope Pius VII., 445—450.
Extreme Unction, doctrine of, as laid down by bishop Hay, 564, 565 and 570; the subject discussed, 565—571; shown to have no foundation in Scripture in the sense in which Papists use it, *ib.*, unknown to the Christians of the early ages, 571.

F

Fair-Dealing, letter from a Friend to, 362; second letter from, 400—402; remarks on, 402—404; another letter from a Friend to, 493; remarks on, *ib.*, 494.
Faith, act of, copy of the Popish, 759; called FIDES CARBONARIA or the collier's faith, 761, *n.* See BIBLE, POPERY, and RELIGION. On keeping faith with heretics. See HERETICS. Meaning of the phrase, "modes of faith," discussed, 579. Justification by faith. See JUSTIFICATION.
Fathers, remarks on the genuineness of the writings of the, 550, 551.
Feet. See WASHING OF FEET.
Fever, Typhus, case of a priest attending a man labouring under, 653; efforts of The Protestant and other gentlemen in Glasgow in subduing, *ib.*
Fillans, St, famed waters of, 322.
Flagellantes, or self-whippers, penance of the, 303.
Fornication, laws against, 103.
France, persecutions of the early reformers of, 80—82.
Franciscan, translation from Buchanan's, 347 and 366.

G

Galileo, account of his persecution by the Inquisition for teaching that the earth moves round the sun, 525—527; his abjuration of the Copernican system, 527.
Gandolphy, Rev. Mr, his defence of Transubstantiation, 683.
Gavin, Rev. Mr, extracts from his Master-key to Popery, 334, 335, 337, 390—392, 393.
Geddes, Dr, his distinction between the words POPERY and CATHOLIC, 623.
Glasgow, means by which the Glasgow Catholic chapel was built, 27; James Retby, an early reformer, burnt at, in 1422, 84; trial of the Lollards of Kyle at, *ib.*, Hieronymus Russel and Kennedy tried and burnt at, in 1538, 86; relics that formerly belonged to the cathedral of Glasgow, 241; money raised for building the Glasgow Catholic chapel, 313, 314; number of Catholics in Glasgow, 460; comparative morality of Protestants and Papists in, 672; calculations regarding the number of Catholics and contributors to the building of the Catholic chapel in, their amount of subscription, &c., 721—737; instances of converts from the Protestant to the Popish faith among the population of, unknown or very rare, 765, 766; Glasgow Cathedral, the only entire one remaining in Scotland, 812; genuine Protestant doctrine preached there, *ib.*
God, love to, the foundation of religion, 370; not held indispensable by Papists, 371—373.
Good Works, the subject of, explained, 676, 677.
Gordon, Captain, the originator of Catholic schools in Glasgow, 733, 734.
Gordon, Mr, an Aberdeenshire gentleman, converted from Popery, 389; his testimony regarding confession, *ib.* and 390.
Gother, Mr, quoted on purgatory, 325; quoted on satisfaction for sin, 399; extracts from his work on confession, 368.
Graham, Rev. John, Lifford, letter from, enclosing translation from Buchanan's Franciscan, 347, and 366; poem by, recommended, 377; his Annals of Ireland quoted, 538, 539; 'An old story versified,' by, 606.
Greenock, The Protestant read publicly in a meeting house in, 720, 721.
Gregory, Pope, the Great, condemns the title of universal bishop assumed by the patriarch of Constantinople, 436—438; countenances the treason of Phocas, 438.
Grey, Earl, speech of, in the House of Lords on transubstantiation, 265; remarks on, 266.
Grier, Rev. Richard, his work in answer to Dr Milner's "End of Religious Controversy" referred to, 719; his remarks on Dr Milner on miracles, 808.
Gunpowder-plot, said by the Catholic Vindicator to be a mere invention of the Protestants, 636, 637.

H

Halliday, B., story of, 823—830.
Hamilton, Patrick, account of his martyrdom, 85.
Havannah, island of Cuba, letter from, giving an account of Popish ceremonies practised there, 244.
Hay, Bishop, controversy with Dr Drummond on the subject of breaking faith with heretics, 136—138; extract from his "Sincere Christian" on Confession, 394—396; his arguments for Peter's supremacy, 429, 430; and for the headship of the Pope, 441—443; his doctrine on the subject of clerical celibacy, 480—485; his vindication of the Catholic clergy from the charge of licentious-

ness, 488, 489; extracts from his work on the doctrine of Extreme Unction, 564, 565, and 570.
Head of the church, subject of the, discussed, 53—55.
Headship, the church of Christ hath no visible, 430, 431.
Henry VIII., excommunication of, 110; his application to the pope to dissolve his first marriage, 616.
Henry, Dr, extracts from his History, 490.
Heresy, its undefinable nature, 524; inquisition instituted to discover and punish, *ib.* and 525.
Heretics, the subject of keeping faith with, discussed, 125—139; lawfulness of breaking faith with them proved by several authorities, 126 and 128; recognized by the Council of Trent, 127; modern Papists ashamed of the doctrine, 132 and 136; maintained by many Popish writers, 137; recent cases of, 139—142; on the doctrine of Papists keeping faith with, 638—642; law of the church of Rome with regard to, 702—704.
Hervey, Rev. James, quoted as an authority regarding holy places, 15 and 26, 27.
Heth, Thomas, a Jesuit, story of, 533.
Hibernian Society. See SCHOOLS.
Highlands, popish superstitions in the, 322, 323; letter from a Papist in the, to his son in Glasgow, 718, 719.
Hocus-pocus, a corruption of the words *Hoc est corpus* used in the Eucharist, 249.
Hodgson, Rev. Dr of Blantyre, his sermon referred to, 461 and 646.
Hogan, Rev. Wm. a priest in America, his case, 713.
Holy Places, subject of discussed, 12—15, 26, 27.
Horses, benediction of, with holy water, at Rome, 299, 300.
Host, adoration of the, 261; respect paid by the British Ambassador at Paris to the, 264; forms of prayers used at the adoration of the, 268—270; alleged miracles performed by the, 271—273; corruption of the, 295; story of a dog swallowing the, 296.
Huss, John, safe-conduct granted to, violated, 129—131.
Hyperdulia, a kind of worship, 196.

I

Idolatry, introduction to the subject of Popish, 181; (the subject continued through several Numbers, to which references are made, under *Saint-worship, images, worship of, Virgin Mary, &c.* See from pages 182—224.) Conformity of Romish idolatry with that of the ancient heathens, 297—304; worship of idols disclaimed by a Catholic correspondent (W. D.) 304—306; answered, 306—310; Papists by their saint-worship guilty of, 654—658.
Ignotus, extracts from the letters of, 304.
Images, worship of, 217; proved idolatrous, 218; authorities for, 218—220; subject of, continued, 221; miraculous power ascribed to, 222.
Incense, use of, in the Roman and Pagan worship, 298.
Index Expurgatorius of the Catholic church, 287.
Indulgences, remarks on, 12, 13; indulgences said to have been granted by Luther, 15 and 23 and 39, 40; bull of indulgences circulated by Tetzel, 18; do. granted to the people of Cork, *ib.*; do. to Ireland, *ib.*; explanation of indulgences from the modern French catechism, 19; subject of indulgences discussed, 21—26 and 42—44; indulgences granted by the Pope for thousands of years, 36; Douay Catechism on penance and indulgence, 24 and 37, 38; doctrine of, discussed, 98—102; calculated to encourage the commission of sin, *ib.*; the doctrine of Christ the reverse of this, *ib.*; difference between a popish indulgence and the practice of exacting money in the Scottish church for fornication, 102—105; indulgences granted to Stukley's crucifixes, 110, 111; indulgences to the kings and queens of France, 124; the arguments of Amicus Veritatis about indulgences and dispensations answered, 616—619.
Infallibility of the Pope, 50—52, 57, 58; Dr Porteous on, 138; on the infallibility of the Pope, 442; does not imply foreknowledge, 444.
Inquisition, the subject of the, introduced, 516; first established in the twelfth century for the extirpation of the Albigenses and Waldenses, 517; origin and growth of the, 524; the discovery and punishment of heresy, the object of the institution, *ib.*; account of its persecution of Galileo, 525; breaking up of the, at Saragosa, by the French soldiers, 528; sixty young women found in the keeping of the holy fathers of the, 529; singular narrative of one of them, 530—533; mode of recruiting the holy seraglio, 533; cases of cruelty perpetrated by the, 534, 535.
Intolerance, instances of Popish intolerance and persecution, 78—90.
Ireland, case of excommunication in, 116; character and conduct of Popish priests in, 117—120; opposition of the priests in, to the Bible, 173, 174; superstitions practised at Holy Wells in, 245—248; method of raising money among the Papists in, 314, 315; superstitions practised in, 320, 321; sums paid in, for masses for the dead, 291 and 338; interference of the Pope with the civil affairs of Ireland, 348; appeal of the Catholic Board of, to the Pope, 352; circulation of "The Protestant" in, 346 and 363; bull of the Pope against Bible Schools in, 347—350; Archbishop of Tuam's charge on the same subject, 350—362; extracts from letters on the state of, 511—515; influence of the priesthood there, *ib.*; account of the massacre of the Protestants in, 538, 539; letter from J. A. on the state of Popery in, 560—563; another letter from, describing the state of Popery in, 596—599 and 612, 614; comparative morality of Protestants and Papists in, 673; concessions made to the Papists in Ireland no effect in satisfying or conciliating them, 690—693; murderous hostility of Papists against Protestants in, 695, 696; account of a young lady in, taking the veil, 740, 741; Popery not the original Christianity of, 745; forcible attempt in, to convert a dying man to Popery, 828—830; remarks on, 830, 831; treasonable character of a "Sketch of Irish History" introduced into Roman Catholic Schools, 832—834; people of, taught from infancy to hate the people and government of England, 834; state of, 844.
Irenæus, St, The Protestant accused of mis-quoting, 686, 687.
Irishman, letter from an, 495.

J

James, Saint, account of the liturgy of, 661.
Jamieson, William, his *Roma Racoviana* quoted, 816—818.
Jeffrey, Mr, (now Lord Jeffrey,) references to his speech in the Jury Trial, Scott *v.* M'Gavin, 725, 726 and 738.
Jerusalem, the mother church of the apostles, 813.
Jesuits, secret instructions of the Society of, 141, 142; countenanced by British Papists and the Orthodox Journal, 371 and 376; Pascal's representations of their errors, 371, 372; doctrines of, relieves men from the obligation of loving God and their neighbours, *ib.* and 373—376; extract of a letter relating to them and The Protestant, 571—573; efforts of, in Lancashire, *ib.*, 574; extract from another letter relating to the, 575; letter relating to an anti-Jesuit society in Preston,

576; remarks on the proceedings of the Jesuits there, 577; impudence of the, in naming themselves from Jesus, 580; sketch of the rise, progress, character, and power of the, 580—583; Dallas's defence of the, noticed, 584; account of the decline and fall of the order, 584, 585; restoration of the order, 586; *Secreta Monita*, or secret rules of the Jesuits, 588—591; remarks on, 592; intrigues of the Jesuits, 592—594; their oath of secrecy, 595; their efforts in France, 793.

John, King, of England, excommunication of, by the Pope, 106—108.

Jones, his History of the Waldenses quoted, 520—523.

Justification by faith, 502, 503; the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation, 506, 507; the subject of, treated, 676, 677.

Justin, St, The Protestant accused of mis-quoting, 685, 686.

Juvenis, letter from, 496—499; remarks on, 499—501; second letter from, quoted and commented on, 543—551.

K

Kames, Lord, extract from his work, 296.

Kelly, Dr. See Tuam, archbishop of.

Keys, power of the—to whom did Christ commit the keys of the kingdom of heaven? 423, 424.

Kilravock, bull of the Pope granted to the family of, 14 and 20, 22 and 36.

Knox, John, his History quoted, 84.

L

Lamb, Joseph, miracle alleged to be wrought on him, 809.

Lamps, burning of, at Romish altars and images, a Pagan ceremony, 300.

Lancashire, efforts of the Jesuits in, 574—576.

Lanigan, Bishop, his five reasons for breaking faith, 140; adverted to, 179; further account of his reasons for breaking faith with heretics, 476.

Latria, a kind of worship, 196.

Lent, method of keeping, by some priests in Ireland, 515.

Liberals, remarks on the manner in which popery is treated by, 364.

Limborch, his History of the Inquisition quoted, 518, 519; his character, *ib.*; his History quoted, 525, *et seq.*

Liturgies, notice of the liturgy of St James and other pretended ancient liturgies, 661, 662.

Lollards of Kyle tried at Glasgow, 84.

London, notice of a convent of nuns in, 741.

Lord's Supper, sacrament of the, explained, 248, *et seq.* See Transubstantiation. Exposition of Christ's words on instituting the, 252—254; forms of prayers used at the, by Papists, 268—270. See Mass.

Loretto, Lady of, holy image of the, 300.

Louis XVIII., king of France, his prayer for the duke of Bordeaux, 615.

Loyola, Ignatius, founder of the order of the Jesuits, strange stories regarding him, 580; compared to Luther, 582.

Luther, indulgences said to have been granted by, 15 and 23 and 39, 40; his German translation of the Bible, 149; bull against, *ib.*; passages from his writings, 463; accused of abolishing the obligation of Good Works, 501 and 504; false accusations brought against, 504; his views on justification by faith, 505—507; his doctrine and life, 509; absurd stories in relation to his death, 510; his alleged conferences with the devil, 511; his doctrine on the subject of divorce, explained and defended, 619—621; Dr Milner's mutilated extracts from the writings of, 797, 798.

Lynde, Sir Humphrey, extract from his work *Via tuta et via devia*, 411.

Lyons, persecution at, in the twelfth century, 79, 80.

M

MacHardy, Mr, interview with The Protestant regarding the story of the Man in the Wynd, 225—232; referred to, 255, *note*; reference to, with certificate in his favour, as given in the Catholic Vindicator, 675.

Man-in-the-Wynd. See Wynd.

Manchester, liberality of Protestants there, in contributing to the building of a Catholic chapel, 578; remarks on, 579.

Marcellinus, Pope, idolatry of, 434, 435.

Margaret, queen of Malcolm Canmore, instrumental in establishing Popery in Scotland, 83.

Marriage, evil and danger of Protestants marrying Papists, 311; illustrated by cases, *ib.*, 312, 313; inconsistency of Catholics making marriage a sacrament, and denying it to the priesthood, 492. See Celibacy.

Martyrs, veneration for the memory of, degenerating into saint-worship, 663.

Mass, doctrine of the, as laid down by the Douay Catechism and the French Catechism, 274, 275; explained by Father Baker, 275; decree of the Council of Trent concerning, 276; fundamental errors of the doctrine, 277, 278; atonement of Christ opposed to the sacrifice of the, 278—281; examination of alleged Scripture authorities in support of the mass, 282—288; sums paid for masses for the dead, 291, 292; vestments used in celebrating mass, 293; rules for celebrating mass, 296

Maynooth College for educating Catholic priests, remarks on the establishment of, 614.

Mediators, popish priests affect to be mediators between God and the people, 289—291.

Melchisedec, priesthood of, argument regarding the, in favour of the mass examined, 282—286.

Middleton, Dr, extracts from his letter from Rome, showing the conformity of Popery with Paganism, 297—304.

Milner, Dr, bishop of Castabala and vicar apostolic of the midland district of England, opposed to the circulation of the Scriptures, 166—169; his work, "The End of Religious Controversy," referred to, 719; commencement of answer to, 742; general character of, *ib.*; remarks on his address to the bishop of St David's, 742, 743; his assumption of the antiquity of Popery proved to be erroneous, 744—746; his club of worthy Christians examined and analyzed, 747—749; his method of finding out the true religion exposed, 749—752; his account of the extravagances of enthusiasts whom he classes as belonging to the Protestant faith, 753; his second rule of finding out the true religion, *ib.*; his misrepresentation of the Bible as a rule of faith, 754—757; his cavil that Protestants cannot be sure of what they believe, answered, 757—761; his shuffling mode of arguing, 761; his false representation of true religion, 762; his admission of differences existing in the Romish Church regarding the immaculate conception of the Virgin, 763; his pretended death-bed conversions to the Church of Rome, 765—768; his true rule of faith discussed, 769—776; his instances of Protestants being guided by tradition, 778—783; he claims for the Church of Rome the exclusive right of explaining the Bible, 784; his marks of the true church, 789; his second mark of the true church (sanctity) proved not to

belong to the Church of Rome, 795, 796; his gross misrepresentation of Protestant doctrine, 797; his charge of Socinianism against the Church of Scotland answered, 798, 799; his erroneous exposition of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as opposed to that of Protestant churches, 799, 800; his comparison of the holiness of individuals, 801; his relation of Popish miracles, 807—811; his third mark of the true church (Catholicity) not sustained, 811, 812; his fourth mark (Apostolicity) discussed, 813 and 820—822; his views as to the authority of the Bible identified with those of Dr Priestley, 818, 819; his Apostolic Tree described, 823; his views of conversion, 824, 825; part third of his work noticed, 825; his letter on Papal supremacy, 825, 826.

Milton, John, as author of Paradise Lost, taken in illustration of the tradition of written testimony, 777; his sonnet on the persecution of the Waldenses quoted, 840.

Miracle, wonderful, recorded by St Anselm, 45.

Miracles, account of, claimed by the Romish Church, 807—811; miracles of St Francis Xavier, 807, 808; office in Rome for recording and trying miracles, 811.

Moncreif, Mr, (now Lord Moncreif,) reference to his speech in the Jury Trial, Scott *v.* M'Gavin, 720 and 732.

Money, raising of, the great object of Popery, 337, 338.

Montreal, ceremony of baptizing bells at, 316, 317; description of convents at, 318, 319.

Montserrat, origin of the convent of, 667.

Morning Post, extracts from letters in the, 262, 263.

Morrissy, Rev. L., parish priest in Ireland, extracts from his "Development of the Inquisitorial System of the Church of Rome in Ireland," 701—708; statement of his case, 706, 707; remarks on, 708, 709; further extracts, 710, 711; further remarks, 712.

Moses, discussion regarding his reception of the law of God on Mount Sinai, 647, 648.

Musselburgh, alleged miracle at, 224.

N

Nantz, revocation of the edict of, 540; its consequences, *ib.*

Neighbour, love to our, dispensed with, by the Jesuits, 373—376.

Northumberland, Earl of, excited to rebellion by the Pope, 110

Nunneries, description of, in Montreal, 318, 319. See CONVENT.

O

Oath, form of, required by James I., 121; by William III., 122; form at present (1818) in force, 123

O'Connell, Daniel, letter of, inclosing plan for raising subscriptions among the Catholics, 315; extract from a speech of his, 358; his speech against the use of the Bible in schools, 406, 407; remarks on, 407, 408, 413, 414; letter commenting on O'Connell's speech, 415, 416.

Oratorio, subjects of the, performed at the Roman Catholic chapel, Glasgow, 11; notice of the, in Glasgow Chronicle, *ib.*; animadversions on said notice in a letter from "A Protestant," 12; reply by Amicus Veritatis, *ib.*; also by Pax, 14; answers by The Protestant, 13, *et seq.*

Origen, St, The Protestant accused of misquoting, 687.

Orthodox Journal quoted, 78, 90, 112, 116, 135, 151, 154, 157, 165, 167, 170, 323; extracts from the, regarding the Jesuits, 587.

Ossian, the poems ascribed to, used in illustration of the subject of tradition, 777, 778.

Owen, Dr John, quotation from a work of his, 794.

P

Paganism, conformity of popery with, 297—304.

Papist, term of "Papist" objected to by Pax, 14; defended by The Protestant, 16 and 40; a papist's manner of spending a day, 69, 70; the term PAPIST applied to a Roman Catholic admitted by the Catholic Vindicator, 627; Dr Geddes's distinction between CATHOLIC and PAPIST, 628.

Parable of Saint Peter and Antichrist, 65—68.

Paris, notice of the massacre of the Protestants at, 537.

Parliament, consequences of Papists getting into, 452; probable number of Catholic members, 456.

Pascal, M. extracts from his "Provincial Letters" on the errors of the Jesuits, 371, 372.

Paul, St, misrepresentations of, by the Rhemish translators, 288.

Pax, letters from, 14 and 20; answers to, 16, 29 and 35.

Penance, practice of the Romish church regarding, 21; doctrine of the Council of Trent regarding, 367; taken as a satisfaction for sin, 399, 400.

Pepin, king, usurpation of, to the throne of France, countenanced by the Pope, 439; he assists the Pope to temporal sovereignty, 440.

Persecution, instances of Popish, 73—75 and 78—90; number who have perished through Popish, 353, *note*; false complaints of, by the Irish Papists, 352—354; the genius of Christianity hostile to, 516; persecution of the primitive Christians, 516; instances of persecution by Protestants, 542; the bishop of Meaux argues the lawfulness of, *ib.*; burning of Servetus by the republic of Geneva, 543.

Peter, Saint, his alleged supremacy, 57—60; question of his ever having been at Rome, 61; never Bishop of Rome, *ib.*, 76; parable of Saint Peter and Antichrist, 65—68; letter to The Protestant on the subject of his supremacy, 416—420; criticism on the words "Thou art Peter," 417; Peter's unstable and versatile character, *ib.*; also his boldness and ardour, 422; his supremacy further discussed, 420—424; no evidence of his being appointed head of the apostles, 421, 422; to whom did Christ commit the keys of the kingdom of heaven? 423, 424; table of St Peter, or chronology of his life, by the Rhemish translators, 425; no evidence of his ever having been at Rome, *ib.*, 426, 427; was not bishop of Rome, 427; place and manner of his death unknown, *ib.*, 428; the headship of Peter further discussed, 428—431; his supposed successors, 432; Juvenis on the supremacy of, 543, 544; not the rock on which Christ built his church, 629; the infirmity of his character, *ib.*

Petros, meaning of the word as applied to Simon Peter, 417, 418; Juvenis on the word, and Peter's supremacy, 543.

Philadelphia, bishop of, curious pastoral charge by the, 713—715.

Philips, Charles, passage by, on bigotry, 31; adverted to, 45.

Philopatris extracts from letters of, in the Morning Post, 262, 263.

Phocas, Emperor, procures the title of universal bishop to be transferred from the patriarch of Constantinople to the pope of Rome, 438.

Pius IV. Pope, copy of the creed of, 443, 444.

Pius VII. Pope, his excommunication of Napoleon, 445—450; remarks on, 451, 452.

Pope, authority and power of the, 46; his submission to Bonaparte, 47; infallibility of the, 50; his assumed power, 51; impious titles given him, 52; excommunication by the, 53; absurdity of calling

the pope the head of the church, 53—55; profligate lives of many popes, 55, 56; arguments for the infallibility of the pope, 57, 58; alleged genealogy of the, 76, 77; interference of the, with the civil affairs of Ireland, 348; appeal of the Catholic Board of Ireland to the, 352; letter to The Protestant on the subject of Peter and the Pope's supremacy, 416—420; (see PETER for further references to the same subject:) absurdity of the pope pretending to derive his dignity from Peter, 432; authority of the popes in and after the reign of Constantine, 435—440; the pope becomes a temporal prince, 439, 440; Bishop Hay on the headship of the, 441; question of the pope's infallibility, *ib.* 442 and 444; creed of Pope Pius IV. the standard of Roman orthodoxy, 443, 444; the pope's excommunication of Napoleon, 445—450; mode of electing a pope, 453, 454; character of a number of popes, 455, 456; remarks on the crowning of Napoleon by the, 637; letter on the supremacy and infallibility of the pope, 790, 791; depravity and profligacy of many of the popes, 804—807; letter of Dr Milner on the supremacy of the, 825, 826.

Popery not Christianity, 70; evils of countenancing, 71; Popery the religion of corrupt human nature, 72; modern popish persecution, 73—75; instances of intolerance and persecution, 78—90; conformity of Popery with Paganism, 297—304; origin of, in the self-righteous bias of the human heart, 574; the term POPERY as applied to the church of Rome admitted by the Catholic Vindicator, 627; Dr Geddes's distinction between Popery and Catholic, 628; Christianity said by the Vindicator to owe its rise to the influence of Popery, 632; the question whether Popery is more favourable to good morals than Protestantism, discussed, 633, 634; the doctrines of Protestantism older than, 651—653; the system of, supported by falsehood and imposition, 677—679; state of, in America, 715—719; question as to the toleration of Popery, 743, 744; Popery not the original Christianity of Britain, 744, or Ireland, 745; nature and authority of Popish belief, 759; unity of Papists in the matter of faith shown to be false, 763—765; means by which it will be destroyed and the probable period, 844.

Porteous, Dr, on infallibility, 138.

Preston, in Lancashire, letter relating to a society of Protestants there, 576; letter from, correcting a mistake, 588; slanders propagated there regarding The Protestant, 636.

Priestley, Dr, his views as to the authority of the Bible similar to those of Dr Milner, 818.

Priests, Popish, rapacity of the, 36, 37; authority and character of, 42; profligacy of the, 90; pernicious effects of confession on the minds of, 389; wickedness of, in the matter of confession, *ib.*, 390—392, 394; affect to be mediators between God and the people, 289—291.

Processions, similarity of popish and pagan processions, 303.

Prophecies, ancient, in the Old Testament regarding Antichrist, 834—839; other prophecies in the New Testament, 842—844.

Protestant, The, origin of, in animadversions on a paragraph which appeared in the Glasgow Chronicle regarding an Oratorio held in the Catholic Chapel, 11, 12 and 35; The "Protestant" denounced in the Popish chapel, Glasgow, 88; the publication at first discouraged by a number of Protestants, 91; its success, *ib.*, 92, 93; profits of, devoted to educational purposes, 177; notice of the Rev. Andrew Scott's action at law against, 642; scandalous language applied to, by the Catholic Vindicator, 643, 644; The Protestant accused of forging passages from Tillotson, 684, 685, and of misquoting St Justin, 685, 686; review of the Report of the Jury Trial of Mr Scott's action against, 719—738; no evidence adduced to show that Mr Scott sustained injury from, 720; injury done to the cause of Popery by, 726; combination of Glasgow Papists to defame the author of, 730; The Protestant takes an active hand in establishing Catholic Schools in Glasgow, 733, 734; his acknowledgments to correspondents, 845, and to the subscribers for defraying the expense of his trial, 846; his farewell, *ib.*

Protestants, many so called ignorant of Christianity, 71; union among, in leading doctrines, greater than the unity of the church of Rome, 792—795.

Proverbs, book of, illustration of passages in the, as applicable to Antichrist or Popery, 835, 836.

Purgatory, subject introduced, 323; anecdote of the bridge in, *ib.*; Douay Catechism on, 324; doctrine of the church on, 325; Mr Gother on, *ib.*; decree of the Council of Trent regarding, 326; not a place where sins are remitted, but where they are punished, 328; a doctrine derived from the ancient heathens, *ib.*; contrasted with the doctrine of the salvation of Christ, 330 and 339, *et seq.*; society in Dublin for raising money to relieve from, 331—334; Purgatory divided into eight apartments, 334, 335; anecdote of the king of Spain in, 335; souls delivered from, represented by crabs, 336; sermon on, 337; no evidence of, in the Bible, 339—342; proof from Apocryphal books considered, 342; CANTING the corpse in Ireland, to obtain money to relieve it from, 344.

R

Real Presence, doctrine of the, 680, 681. See TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Relics, Popish, use made of them and worship paid them, 236—240; catalogue of, 237; miracles ascribed to, 240—244; relics that formerly belonged to the cathedral of Glasgow, 241.

Religion, Dr Milner's method of finding out the true religion exposed and commented on, 749—752; the true religion not a hidden but a published thing, *ib.*; Dr Milner's second rule for finding out the true religion, 753—757; what true religion is, and why some reject it, *ib.* and 762.

Rhemish translators, misrepresentations of St Paul by the, 288.

Robber, story of a, and his fasts for the Virgin, 45.

Robertson, Dr, his account of the order of the Jesuits quoted, 581, 582.

Rome, question of St Peter ever having been at, 61; early bishops of, 62; no evidence of Peter ever having been at, 425—427; Peter was not bishop of, 427; conceit of the papists about the state of the church in, in primitive times, 433; no evidence of the bishop of, exercising jurisdiction over other churches, *ib.*, 434; account of the early Christians in, 546; letter to The Protestant regarding a statement of 6000 skulls of children being found in a pond at Rome, 738; remarks on the same, 739, 740; profligacy of morals at, *ib.*; "Rome in the 19th century," extracts from a work so entitled, 611.

Rome, Church of, corruptness of the, 55, 56; taxes and absolutions of the, 63, 64; extolled by papists, 89, 90; real character of the, *ib.*; the subject of its keeping faith with heretics, 125—139; its claim to antiquity and universality answered, 234—236; differences of opinion in the, notwithstanding its pretended unity, 467; a man cannot faithfully serve God in the, 470; evidenced in the case of Mr Craig, a colleague of John Knox, 471; comparative purity of the, in the early ages, 544—546; not the invisible church referred to in the New Testament, 625 and 630, 631; the old story of its being founded on a rock exposed, 629; law of

the, with regard to heretics, 702—704; claims the exclusive right of explaining the scriptures, 784; "the Church proves the Bible, and the Bible proves the Church," 787; Dr Milner's marks of the true Church, 789; claims of the church to unity denied, 789; union among Protestants greater than in the, 792—795; sanctity proved not to belong to the, 795, 796; Dr Milner's exposition of the doctrine of the, 799, 800; gross corruption of manners in the, especially among the clergy, 801—803; miracles claimed by the, 807—811; catholicity proved not to belong to the, 811, 812; apostolicity of the, discussed, 813—815; doctrine of the church of Rome identified with Socinianism, 815—819; possibility of salvation in the, admitted, 827; ancient prophecies in the Old and New Testaments regarding Antichrist applied to the, 834—839 and 842—844.

Romulus, worship paid to, transferred by the church of Rome to Theodorus, 302.

S

Sabbath, change of the, from the seventh to the first day considered as being founded on tradition, 778—780; circumstances relating to the observance of the, 779—781; proclamation of James I. and Charles I. for encouraging public games and sports on Sunday after church service, 781.

Sacrifice of Christ, scripture doctrine of the, 278—281 and 397—400.

Saint David's, bishop of, Dr Milner's address to the, 742, 743.

Saint-Worship, idolatry of, 197 and 209; the Catholic Vindicator's defence of, 654; the subject discussed, 655—658; origin of, 662—664.

Saints, division of labour among the Popish, 208; expense of creating, 213; known by the smell of their bones, 214; wearing out the, by persecution, 839, 840.

Salvation, the only way of, revealed to men, 386—388.

Sanctity, proved not to belong to the Church of Rome, 795, 796.

Satisfaction for sin, investigation of the doctrine of, 397—400.

Saviour, who is the saviour of sinners, question of, 233.

Savoy, duke of, his treaty with the Waldenses, 517.

Schools, Bishop Copinger on the use of the Bible in, 404; resolutions by certain Popish clergy against the reading of the Bible in, 405; Daniel O'Connell's speech against the use of the Bible in, 406, 407; the subject discussed, 407—415; letters on the same, 415, 416; correspondence between the secretaries of the Dublin School Union and bishop Troy, 474.

Scotland, Popery not established in, till towards the end of the eleventh century, 83; persecutions in, 85, 86.

Scotland, church of, subject of discipline in, discussed, 102—105; considered the purest in constitution and doctrine of all the established churches, 103; answer to Dr Milner's charge of Socinianism against the, 798, 799.

Scott, Rev. Andrew, Popish priest, afterwards bishop in Glasgow, denies that the Romish Church withholds the circulation of the Scriptures from the laity, 143, 144; alleged case of refusing to baptize a child, unless half a guinea were paid, 311, 312; his charges in other cases, 313, 314; notice of his action at law with The Protestant, 642; his connection with the Catholic Vindicator, 643; review of the report of the jury trial of Mr Scott's action against The Protestant, 719—738; no evidence adduced to show that Mr Scott sustained injury from The Protestant, 720; Mr Scott's miraculous method of keeping accounts without dates, 727—730; his statement of the number of his members inconsistent with the statement of his counsel, 731; his activity in establishing Catholic schools in Glasgow, 734.

Scriptures, injunction of "search the Scriptures," explained, 785. See BIBLE.

Secreta Monita, or secret rules of the Jesuits, 588—591; remarks on, 592.

Servetus, notice of the persecution of, 543.

Sherlock, Dr, extract from, 806, 807.

Silvester, Pope, in the reign of Constantine, 435.

Simanca, James, bishop of Bajadox, notice of, 137.

Simeon, Mr St Ange, French teacher in Glasgow, interview with The Protestant regarding the story of the Man-in-the-Wynd, 225—232; the "Pax" of the controversy, 232; referred to, 255, *n*.

Sin, doctrine of satisfaction for, investigated, 397—408.

Sins, subject of venial and mortal, 368—370.

Sixtus V., Pope, his editions of the Bible, 149; character of, 453 and 456; account of his election, 454.

Socinianism, repeal of the statute against those holding Socinian doctrines adverted to, 798; charge of Socinianism against the Church of Scotland answered, 798, 799; doctrines of the Church of Rome identified with, 815—819.

Solicitants, bull of the Pope against, 393.

Soup, recipe for making Italian, with a small piece of the Pope's shirt, 615.

Spain, hostility to the Bible in, 173; proposal in the Orthodox Journal that the British and Irish Papists emigrate to, 323; anecdote of the king of, 335; the queen of, lying in state, 337.

Spearing, Joseph, his work on Catholic Emancipation recommended, 690 and 695.

Stations, Irish, intemperance at, 560, 561.

Stillingfleet, Dr, his work "Preservative from Popery" quoted, 271.

Stoneyhurst, influence of the Jesuits' college at, 578.

Supremacy, letter on the subject of Peter and the Pope's, 416—420; the subject further discussed, See PETER and POPE.

Sym, William, clerk of the Glasgow Town's Hospital, letter from, 313, 314.

T

Tampering, question of "tampering" with the religious belief of others, 355—358.

Theodorus. See ROMULUS.

Thorpe, Rev. William, extracts from his pamphlet on the Catholic board, 352—355.

Tillotson, Bishop, The Protestant accused of forging passages from his discourse on Transubstantiation, 684—688.

Tobit, book of, notice of the, 657.

Toleration, distinction between the non-toleration of Popery and persecution, 743, 744.

Tracts, circulation of cheap tracts among Papists recommended, 177.

Tradition, claims of Papists to, as a rule of faith, 769; meaning of the word "tradition," 771, 772; vanity and uncertainty of Popish tradition, 772—776; apostles' creed considered as oral tradition, 775, 776; sense in which Protestants use tradition, 776; illustrated by the cases of Milton and Ossian, 777, 778; practices alleged to have been derived from tradition, 778—782.

Transubstantiation, subject of, 48, 49; doctrine of, discussed, 248—274; defined by the Council of Trent, 249; and by a modern French catechism, 250, 251; absurdity of the doctrine, *ib.* and 253, 254; its pernicious effects, 254, 255; the testi-

mony of a believer in, not to be relied on in any thing else, 255; pretended antiquity of, discussed and disproved, 256—259; opinions of the ancient fathers regarding, *ib.*; method of putting the faith of a priest on this subject to the test, 259, 260; use of the senses in judging of, 261; the believer in, in danger of committing fatal mistakes, 263; persecution for enforcing the belief of, 264; speech of Earl Grey on the subject of, 265, 266; subject of, again discussed, 679—681 and 682—685; doctrines of the ancient fathers regarding, 686—688.

Trent, Council of, recognizes the breaking of faith with heretics, 127; rule of regarding the reading the Bible, 145, 147, 218; decree of the, regarding the mass, 276; decree of, concerning Purgatory, 326; animadverted on, 331; doctrine of the, regarding penance and confession, 367.

Troy, Bishop, correspondence between, and the Secretaries of the Dublin School Union, 474.

Truth, letter from a lover of, in Greenock, 462.

Tuam, archbishop of, his charge to his clergy regarding educational schools in Ireland, 346; extracts from, with comments, 350—362.

U

Unction, Extreme. See EXTREME UNCTION.

Unity, not a feature of the Church of Rome, 789; union among Protestants in leading doctrines greater than among Papists, 792—795.

Vestments, sacred, used in celebrating mass, 293, 294.

Viar, St, a pretended saint of Spain, 209.

Vindicator, Catholic. See CATHOLIC VINDICATOR.

Virgin Mary, her prerogatives, 45; virtue of fasting on Saturdays in honour of, *ib.*; glory of the, by the Rhemish translators, 181, 182; worshipped, *ib.*; devotion to the, 185, 186; prayer to the, 187; hymn to the, *ib.*; another prayer to the, *ib.*; Litany of the Blessed Virgin, 188; idolatrous addresses to the Virgin, 189, 190; her title of "Mother of God" objected to, 189; exalted above Christ, 191; her miracles, *ib.* and 192; how they encourage licentiousness, 192; Christ rebukes those who would pay her undue respect, 194; vision of Mary to Thomas à Becket, 195; Orison to, *ib.*; immense number of prayers addressed to the Virgin, 196; miraculous power of images of the, 222; subject of the adoration of the, discussed, 654—662; origin of the worship of, 662, 663; titles bestowed on her, 664; virtues attributed to her, 665; story of her death and funeral, with her assumption to heaven, 665; story of her, and a wicked friar, 667; the morality of her worshippers in Glasgow, 672; differences in the Romish Church regarding the immaculate conception of the, 763—765.

W

Wafer, use of the word objected to, 14; answered, 17; consecrated, see HOST.

Waldenses, bull for extirpating the, 41; persecutions of the, 80—84; Waldenses in England and Scotland, 83, 84; dreadful persecutions of the, 517—523; Jones's History of the, quoted, 520—523; cruel persecutions of the, adverted to, 840; Milton's sonnet on the, quoted, *ib.*

Waldo, Peter, the supposed founder of the Waldenses, 80.

Wales, Beuno and Wenefride, saints of, 200; few Catholics in, 458; antiquity of its usages, 459.

Warren, Richard B. his reply to O'Connell on the use of the Bible in schools, 408; extract from, 409.

Washing of feet, question as to the abrogation of this duty as enjoined by Christ, 783.

Water, Holy, use of, in the Church of Rome and in ancient Pagan temples, 299; benediction of horses with, at Rome, 299, 300.

Watson, Bishop, erroneously quoted by Dr Milner, 758; his character touched on, *ib.*

W. D. letter from, on Popish idolatry, &c., 304—306; answered, 306—310; second letter from, 462—464; remarks on, 464—470.

Wells, Holy, superstitions practised at, in Ireland, 245—248; ceremonies practised at, in Ireland, 320, 321.

Wenefride, St, Life and Miracles of, 199 and 201—205 and 206, 207; prayer to, 216; her character adverted to, 459, 460; supposed to be a favourite saint of the Catholic Vindicator, 670.

Westmoreland, earl of, instigated by the Pope to rebel, 110.

Whitaker, quoted by Amicus Veritatis, 617; his character as a writer, 618.

White, Blanco, quoted, 68.

Wickliffe, John, his early translation of the Bible, 148; bull against, 149.

Worship, note from a correspondent regarding the proper objects of, 414.

Wynd, Man-in-the, story of him abandoning his wife because she would remain a Protestant, 127; the subject adverted to, 193; declaration of three witnesses proving the truth of the story, with remarks on, 225—232; final reference to the story of, 673—675.

X

Xavier, St, Francis, miracles attributed to, 807, 808.

Xenophon, his work referred to, 545.

Z

Zaragossa, account of the abduction of a young lady of, to the Inquisition, 533.

GLASGOW:
W. G. BLACKIE AND CO., PRINTERS,
VILLAFIELD.

REPORT OF A TRIAL

IN

THE JURY COURT, EDINBURGH,

ON THE 25TH JUNE, 1821,

FOR AN ALLEGED LIBEL:

IN THE CASE

REV. ANDREW SCOTT, ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST, GLASGOW,

VERSUS

WILLIAM M'GAVIN, AUTHOR OF A WORK ENTITLED

THE PROTESTANT, AND OTHERS.

TAKEN IN SHORTHAND.

TO THE READER.

THE publication of the following Report has been delayed much longer than was expected, solely from the circumstance of the shorthand writer's failing to extend his notes within reasonable time. The whole of his manuscript was not received till the 3d of the present month; and it comes down no farther than the conclusion of Mr. Moncreiff's speech for the defender, Mr. M'Gavin. What follows has been supplied from other sources, as the reader will see, in the connecting paragraph, page 62.

The manuscript had not the advantage of being revised by the speakers on either side, or by any of the judges. It cannot, therefore, be expected that the speeches of the learned gentlemen should possess that elegance and precision which might have been imparted to them by such revisal. It is presumed, however, that they will be found substantially correct in point of sentiment; and, in style, nearly, if not exactly, as they were delivered. This applies to the speeches of Messrs. Cockburn and Moncreiff only; for of that of Mr. Jeffrey, no distinct report could be obtained.

Persons who write shorthand are aware, that the correctness of a report will sometimes depend on its being immediately extended, while the memory can supply the meaning of an illegible, or doubtful character or mark. The Reporter, in the present instance, by his long delay, deprived himself of this advantage; and, therefore, in his manuscript, there is, occasionally, an ellipsis that required to be filled up from the sense and scope of the passage. These, however, are few, and of no great importance.

It is probable that the names of some of the pursuer's witnesses may not be quite correct in point of orthography, being taken down merely from the sound that reached the Reporter's ear.

Glasgow, Nov. 19th, 1821.

REPORT OF TRIAL

FOR LIBEL.

SCOTT *versus* M'GAVIN.

REPORT of the TRIAL before the Jury Court, 25th June, 1821, of the ISSUES in the Cause in which the Rev. ANDREW SCOTT, Roman Catholic Clergyman in Glasgow, was Pursuer; and WILLIAM M'GAVIN, Merchant in Glasgow, WILLIAM SYM, Clerk of the Glasgow Town Hospital, and ANDREW and JAMES DUNCAN, Printers in Glasgow, were Defenders.

Present,

The Right Hon. WILLIAM ADAM, Lord Chief Commissioner.

Lord PITMILLY, and Lord GILLIES, } Lords Commissioners.

Counsel for the Pursuer,

FRANCIS JEFFREY, Esq.
HENRY COCKBURN, Esq. and
A. CURRIE, Esq.
Messrs. L. & C. GORDON, Agents.

Counsel for the Defenders,

JAMES MONCREIFF, Esq.
J. A. MURRAY, Esq. and
J. S. MORE, Esq.
Messrs. W. & A. G. ELLIS, Agents.

The following persons were sworn as Jurymen:—viz.

James Fraser, Baker, Stockbridge.
Henry Banks, Tailor, Duke Street.
Allan Bell, Farmer, Craigbrae.
James Matthie, Farmer, Milltown.
John Robertson, Spirit Dealer, Frederick Street.
Francis Slate, Farmer, Sunnyside.
Andrew Dawson, Currier, Dalkeith.
John Rutherford, Baker, there.
Robert Kinnear, Bookseller, Frederick Street.
Robert Hogg, Baker, there.
Frederick M'Laggan, Baker, there.
Peter Begbie, Farmer, Cairndennis.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER.—"That the points which the Jury are to decide upon, should be before them during the whole proceedings, is a great advantage of this Court. In ordinary short cases, the Issues are read and copies are given the Jury afterwards: but, in such a long case as the present, I think it would be better, that the Jury should have the copies before them now, that they may peruse them along with the Clerk, while he reads the Issues."

(Copies of the Issues were handed to the Jury.)

The Clerk then read the following Issues.

I. It being admitted that the following words, written and composed by the defender, William M'Gavin, were by his authority inserted and published in a certain newspaper called the *Glasgow Chronicle*, on or about the 2d day of July, 1818, viz., "But this is not all; I ask A. V. if that house (meaning the new Catholic chapel) was not built in a great measure at the expense of a poor, and in some instances, a starving people? I ask him, if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? and is this what he calls the piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow? The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering;—and will he accept, as honourable to him, that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood, of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared be inscribed upon its front, and it will remain for 'ages to come' a monument of Popish hard-heartedness and cruelty." Which words, written and composed as aforesaid, are admitted to have been again printed and published by the authority aforesaid, by the defenders, Andrew and James Duncan, in the eighth number of a weekly paper called *The Protestant*, on or about the fifth day of September, 1818,—using the word "honouring" in *The Protestant*, which is printed "honour-

able" in the newspaper. And also the following words: "I did *not* point at him as the person who was exclusively employed in the work of extorting money from the poor; I did not know how many agents were engaged weekly in that pious undertaking; I do not know whether Mr Scott be the only priest that officiated while the chapel was building, or whether he be the only one that officiates in it at present. The house that is building immediately west of the chapel, and which is, it is said, intended for the *Manse*, will be large enough to accommodate a dozen of priests while they remain unmarried, as they must always do; from which I infer that he either has, or intends to have, abundant assistance in milking and managing his flock.

"It is doubtful how far he exhibits the character of a faithful pastor, while he seems to care only for himself; he asked no answer or explanations for his flock, it was for himself, as an individual. One, at least, of his flock had been severely attacked and exposed, as guilty of a piece of shameful imposition, equal to a forgery in the name of Luther. Fearing, perhaps, that this would also be applied to him, he takes care to let me know that he had no hand in the controversy. This is very well, and I hope he will thank me for making it public; but he ought to have some mercy on the guilty one of his flock. If he asked no explanation for him, he ought to demand explanation from him; he ought to put him on a course of severe penance for the good of his soul, for certainly he was guilty of a far greater crime than that of eating flesh on Friday. If no such penance is enjoined, the priest ought to be held as consenting to his crime, or thinking very lightly of it.

"I shall resume this subject in my next number, and give some examples to confirm what I wrote about money being extorted from poor persons for the purpose of building the Popish chapel."

WHETHER the foresaid words, or any part of them, are of and concerning the pursuer, and falsely and maliciously represent and hold out the said pursuer as having improperly extorted money from the poor of the Catholic persuasion, for the purpose of erecting the Catholic chapel in Clyde Street, Glasgow, to the damage and injury of the said pursuer?

II. It being admitted that the following words, written and composed by the defender, William M'Gavin, were, by his authority, inserted in the aforesaid paper called *The Protestant*, No. 9, admitted to have been printed and published by the defenders Andrew and James Duncan, on or about the 12th day of September, 1818, viz., "If it be not true that 'money was extorted for building the Popish chapel by the fear of future punishment, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them,' why is it that neither Mr Scott nor any of his people have publicly denied the charges insinuated in the obnoxious paragraph which he has quoted from my letter?" And also the following words: "Even the Papists in Glasgow are not insensible of the evidence of their own empty stomachs, and the clamours of their hungry children, when they were obliged to give weekly so many of their hard-earned pence, for the building of the chapel; and, if the facts were denied, hundreds of witnesses would rise up among themselves to confirm them.

"The chapel must have cost as much money as would have built three comfortable houses sufficiently large. It is well known that the bulk of the adherents of the Romish church here, are poor labouring people; and it is not denied that the necessary funds, with the exception of a small sum from some very liberal Protestants, were raised among the people themselves. There was a sort of poll-tax imposed upon the members, according to their real or supposed circumstances." As also the following words: "In my last number I promised to give some examples, to confirm what I wrote about money being extorted from poor persons for the purpose of building the Popish chapel." As also the following words: "But, as I shall show presently, there was a heavy tax imposed upon the people without their consent; and all who submitted to this became, in fact, the vassals or slaves of their tax-masters. They stood no longer on the high and independent ground which every British subject is entitled to occupy: their property, the hard-earned fruit of their labour, was at the arbitrary disposal of persons over whom they had no control, and who would not deign to consult them with regard to its application."

"Besides, nothing less, it seems, would suffice to gratify the vanity of him, or them, who had the charge of the money so extorted from the people, than a splendid edifice, equal at least to some ancient cathedral; or, to use the words of AMICUS VERITATIS, a house resembling 'as much as possible the majesty of that God to whose service it was to be dedicated.'" As also the following words: "Now it is a fact, that while the chapel was a-building, the people, while they yet met in their old place of worship, were assured by their ghostly father,* that such of them as fell behind in their payments, should not enjoy church privileges. What was this, but extorting money by the fear of future punishment? and, from the condition of many of those from whom it was so extorted, who can doubt that they had often scarcely food for their families, or clothes to

* "This phrase is not used as a term of reproach.—Ghostly is the old English word for spiritual; and, according to the Douay Catechism, ghostly father is the title by which the clergy choose to be called."

cover them? Every one knows in what estimation Papists regard the privileges of their church. To be denied these, is the same as to be denied the salvation of their souls: The poor therefore were told, in language sufficiently plain, that if the chapel tax was not punctually paid, they should suffer the pains of purgatory, or even hell itself.

"That this tax was *extorted*, and not always paid voluntarily, even from the fear of purgatory, is evident from the following fact:—There was a number of Papists employed, while the chapel was a-building, in one of the public works in the suburbs. These, it seems, were very unwilling to pay the tax. Application was therefore made to the manager, that he would retain, in his own hands, a portion of their weekly earnings, to assist in building the chapel; for, as the applicant informed him, he could not trust the people themselves with the payment of their dues. The proprietors of the work, much to their honour, refused to comply with the request, rightly judging that the labourer was entitled to the whole reward of his labour, without any deduction whatever. This is but one instance of the kind; but it is enough to show the manner in which money was extorted, without the consent of the people themselves, when by any means the collectors for the chapel could lay their hands on their property."

"I shall proceed to give a few more facts on this subject. The reader may rely on their authenticity.—I could, indeed, give the names of the parties concerned, but I do not choose to do so, unless I shall be judicially called upon. I have been informed that some of my Papist neighbours talk big about my having libelled them; they even speak of a legal prosecution against me, for what I have written on the subject of their extorting money from the poor; and they will *compel* me, they say, to answer Mr Scott's question, whether or not I refer to him as the person who did so? I have no doubt the Papists of the present day are very willing to employ the old Popish argument of fines and imprisonments, and worse, if they could, against all whom they cannot otherwise confute; and if they had the Inquisition at command, they would no doubt silence me. It seems there is no resource left them, but to appeal to some criminal tribunal; for they find that arguments and facts are all against them. It is my happiness, however, to live in a country in which there is no Inquisition; and, therefore, I shall, without fear, produce my facts, as I have hitherto done my arguments, leaving the reader to judge how far my assertions are proved by them:—

"A man who now lives out of the city, was assessed in a certain weekly sum for building the chapel. During the dull trade, he fell back with regard to his payments. His family, however, continued to increase, and when he went to his ghostly father to get a child baptized, he was asked, How he stood with regard to his payments? He confessed, what he could not deny, that during the hard times he had fallen behind. He was ordered to go about his business, and told, that his child should not be baptized, till he had paid every farthing that he was due. Before he was able to raise the necessary sum, the child died; and the father was left to suffer all the misery which such a circumstance would occasion to one who considered baptism necessary to the salvation of his child." And also the following words: "I can, if necessary, give the name of a poor man, who subsisted partly on charity, and partly by carrying coals, and whose very clothing, such as it was, was furnished by some benevolent individuals, from whom not less than six shillings was exacted at one time to assist in building the Popish chapel. I can give the name of another, residing in Calton, who is in bad health, and who has sent several times for his ghostly father to visit him in his distress; but the said father will not go to him, because he has fallen behind in his payments. There is no comfort, it seems, for the poor. This individual may die without confession, without absolution, and he may perish for ever; because he cannot pay a certain sum to defray the expense of the chapel."

"There are two young men, apprentices, each of whose earnings did not exceed four shillings a-week. Out of this miserable pittance, one was obliged to pay sixpence, the other ninepence, a fortnight: I believe, in the estimation of those who had lately the distribution of public bounty, in a time of great distress, four shillings a-week was understood to be the lowest sum by which a grown person could support life; what then must have been the condition of two hard-working young men, who could earn no more, and who were obliged to give so large a portion of it to defray the expense of the ridiculous gewgaws of the chapel in Clyde Street?" And the following words: "I could give the instance of a poor woman, who, though she had paid as long as she was able, yet, falling behind, she durst not gratify herself with a sight of the new chapel after it was finished. She frankly told her neighbours that she did not dare to go till she was able to pay up what she was due. She was of course deprived of all the ordinances of the sanctuary, as it is called; she was left destitute of all the consolations of her religion; she was left to live without comfort, and to die without hope, because she could not pay the chapel tax!

"The following case presents a ghostly father in a more favourable light, and exhibits one of that holy order not quite destitute of human feelings. Sometime ago this father was called to visit one of his people who was dangerously ill. One of his first questions, as

usual, was, How he stood with regard to his payments? He was answered, That owing to the state of his family he had fallen behind. The visitor seemed not a little surprised that the sick person should have the assurance to send for him, while his dues were not paid up, and reproved him very warmly for it. He then asked, If there was any money in the house? and being informed that there was only one shilling, he demanded and got it. His attention was then turned a little to the case of the sick person; but he soon resumed the subject of money, and gave back the shilling, on condition that the whole that was due should be paid as soon as possible." And also the following words: "I have more facts at the service of Mr Scott, if he shall think these insufficient to confirm my assertion. But I shall conclude this number, by asking him some questions, to which I hope he will write an answer; and if he does so, I will readily give it a place in The Protestant. Indeed, it is my earnest desire that he would defend himself and his cause; for that is in danger of becoming a tame controversy that is all on one side. I ask Mr Scott, whether he did not, on a certain day, denounce some of his people by name, before his whole congregation, for falling behind in the weekly impost?—if he did not pronounce very awful curses against the unhappy individuals, and threaten to consign their souls to everlasting punishment, if the money was not paid? I ask, if he did not refer to others, besides those whom he named, as also in arrears, and threaten them with similar judgment, if they did not speedily pay?"

WHETHER the foresaid words, or any part of them, are of and concerning the pursuer, and falsely and maliciously represent and hold out the said pursuer as having improperly extorted money from the poor of the Catholic persuasion for the purpose of erecting the Catholic chapel in Clyde Street, Glasgow, to the damage and injury of the said pursuer?

III. It being admitted that the following words, written and composed by the defender, William M'Gavin, were, by his authority, inserted in the foresaid paper called *The Protestant*, No. 72, admitted to have been printed and published by the defenders A. & J. Duncan, on or about the 27th day of November, 1819, viz., "I return now to a subject of a more private and local nature. My readers have already been informed of the numerous extortions practised upon the poor Papists in Glasgow, in order to raise and uphold the magnificent establishment in Clyde Street. In addition to my former statements on this subject, take the following case, which is officially certified by the Clerk of the Town's Hospital, and is introduced in a letter from him, as follows:" It being also admitted that the following words were written and composed by the defender, William Sym, and were inserted by the defender, William M'Gavin, in the aforesaid paper called *The Protestant*, No. 72, by the authority of the said defender, William Sym, viz.

"*Glasgow Town's Hospital,*
"*September*, 1819.

"SIR,—At the desire of the gentlemen of this institution, I transmit to you the following facts, that you may make use of them, if you think proper, in your paper, *The Protestant*. The gentlemen of the committee were much surprised at the conduct of Mr Scott in the affair, and were desirous to be personally informed of the case. A part of their number accordingly called upon the woman, when, in the presence of four individuals, she went over the facts stated in the Superintendent's report, and declared that she was ready to depone upon oath as to their verity.

"She then farther stated, that Mr Scott would not recommend her children for admission into the Catholic Schools, till she threatened, that if he would not, she would apply to get them admitted into one of the Protestant Charity Schools. And, in corroboration of the fact, regarding the *charge* made by Mr Scott, she mentioned that it was a gentleman, named Mr Kerr, whom she employed to wait on the priest, in order to obtain baptism for her child. The gentlemen of the committee also waited upon this person, who resides in High Street. I forget the number, but I was in his house. He being a Catholic also, soon suspected the drift of the inquiry; and, with their characteristic cunning on such occasions, did all in his power to elude giving the information wanted.

"He, however, distinctly *admitted*, that though he used a good deal of entreaty with Mr Scott in behalf of the poor woman, yet, that he found it necessary to pay to Mr Scott the eight shillings mentioned in the woman's story, before he would consent to baptize the child. This man's wife, who was not a Catholic, was strongly inclined to give some additional information respecting the case, but was silenced by her husband.

"The committee have frequently had occasion to believe that some of their pensioners were in the habit of contributing towards the erection of the chapel; but they thought this case too particular a one to be passed over in the customary silence. Here follows the Superintendent's report read to the committee, which he made up in his annual visitation of the Hospital poor:—

"20*th August*, 1819.—Betty Dochie, alias Widow Hanlin, 44, Bridgegate, aged 36, has three children: Helen 5 years and 3 months; Michael 3 years; and Alice 8 months. Has thirty shillings quarterly from the hospital; no other supply. She strips feathers; has three other children variously employed. Her hus-

band died in January last; had, before his death, given to Mr Scott *four pounds;* but had fallen back in his payments, in consequence of which, Mr Scott refused to recommend the children for admission to the Popish Schools. Nor would he baptize the infant, which was only two months old at its father's death, till the mother pawned a pair of blankets, for five shillings, and borrowed three shillings from a friend, and paid Mr Scott eight shillings; partly for christening the child, and partly for her husband's arrears. She says she will declare the above to be truth before God and man. I am, &c. WILLIAM SYM, *Clerk.*"

"And it being further admitted, that the following words were written and composed by the defender, William M'Gavin, and were by his authority inserted in the aforesaid paper, called *The Protestant,* No. 72, viz. 'Thus it seems we are assessed, not for the support of our own poor brethren only, but also for the support of widows and orphans of Papists, who have been impoverished by the extortion of their priest; and thus the good citizens of Glasgow, who lately made so bold a stand against being taxed for the purpose of building parish churches, are actually, though indirectly, taxed for the building and support of a Popish chapel!

"Thus far I had proceeded in composing the present Number, when I received some farther information, from the same authentic source, with regard to Mr Scott and widow Hanlin, which justice to both parties requires me to communicate. On Martinmas day, when the widow called at the Hospital for her half-quarter's allowance, she stated that, about a month before that, Mr Scott had called upon her, and that without upbraiding her for divulging the story which I have given above, he returned to her the eight shillings which he had extorted from her for the baptism of her child, &c.; and farther, that he had given her 12 lbs. of meal per week, for three weeks; and that, moreover, he had charged her to tell this to no man.

"I hope Mr Scott will believe me, when I say that this is the best thing I ever heard of him; and as I am assured that he had been informed that the widow's case had been communicated to me, he will allow me to congratulate myself, as the happy instrument, of not only relieving the widow, but also of producing a benevolent feeling in his mind, to which, perhaps, he had been too long a stranger. If Mr Scott be possessed of human feelings, he must have had more pleasure in returning these eight shillings to the poor widow, and in giving her a little meal, than in the many thousand pounds which have been extorted from persons almost as poor as she. Nay, I will venture to assert, that he never felt so much pleasure in contemplating the lofty minarets of his chapel, or the spacious rooms of his manse, with the extortions by means of which they were reared, as he felt when he put the silver into the widow's hands.

"This, however, is not the first instance of restitution that is on record. The reader will recollect a case in my ninth Number, in which a whole shilling was restored, after having been extorted from a poor sick person; and if more instances had been communicated to me, I should gladly have recorded them. It is pleasant to see that the work of restitution has begun, and proceeded so far; because this is one evidence that the extortioner has begun to repent; and though the extortion itself has produced nearly twenty thousand pounds, and though the amount of the restitution is, upon the whole, only nine shillings in money, and four pecks and a half of oat-meal, we must not be discouraged, but hope for the best, knowing that the greatest things in the world, even Rome itself, arose out of small beginnings."

WHETHER the foresaid words, or any part of them, are of and concerning the pursuer, and falsely and maliciously represent and hold out the said pursuer as having improperly extorted money from the poor of the Catholic persuasion, for the purpose of erecting the Catholic chapel in Clyde Street, Glasgow, to the damage and injury of the said pursuer?

OR,

IV. WHETHER, on or about the month of October, 1814, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Henry Courtney, labourer, lately in Anderston, and now in Cowcaddens, Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and one of the contributors to the Roman Catholic chapel aforesaid, because he, Courtney, was in arrear of his contribution, until the said Courtney should pay the said arrears to the collectors for the chapel? And whether at or about Easter, 1815, the pursuer did refuse confession to the said Courtney, because he had not paid his contribution to the said chapel?

V. WHETHER, about six years ago, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Philip M'Geechie, now in Manchester, late residenter in Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and a member of the pursuer's congregation, because the said M'Geechie was in arrear in his contribution to the said chapel?

VI. WHETHER, in the year 1814, the pursuer did apply to Mr Haughton Fleming, or to Mr Bowman Fleming, who carried on a dye-work in Hutcheson Town, Glasgow, to retain in their hands a portion of the weekly earnings of such Catholics as were employed in their works, to be applied towards building said Roman Catholic chapel?

VII. WHETHER, on or about the month of June, 1818, the pursuer did refuse to bap-

tize the child of John Drain, weaver in Duke Street, Glasgow, one of the contributors to the Catholic chapel aforesaid, because the said Drain was then in arrears of his contribution to said chapel?

(Signed) WILLIAM ADAM,
Lord Chief Com.

Damages laid at £3000.

Jury Court, May 16, 1821.

MR COCKBURN—"There is a witness in our list, who is designed Catharine Ure, instead of Christian Mure. I propose to alter this misnomer. If she had a number of other designations, I am not sure these would be an objection to her. As I am entitled to add another new witness, I suppose the other party do not object to what I have proposed."

MR MONCREIFF—"No, my Lord, we do not object."

MR COCKBURN—"My Lord Chief Commissioner, and Gentlemen of the Jury, this is an action of damages which is brought by the pursuer, Mr Scott, the Roman Catholic clergyman of Glasgow, against the defender, Mr M'Gavin, for what he conceives to be a continued and systematic course of calumny adopted against him by that defender.

"From the Issues that have been read, and put into your hands, you might at first sight, perhaps, be led to imagine there was some discussion here between the Catholics and Protestants; and, I have no doubt, the defender will endeavour, as far as he can, to make the question assume that appearance. But, I state to you precisely, this is an action purely for calumnies; and, if you be of opinion these calumnies have been uttered, and are injurious, I am sure you will not allow your justice to be misled by any prejudice against the pursuer, because he happens to be of the Catholic persuasion.

"The facts to be investigated are simple, although they branch out into ample extent.

"The Roman Catholic chapel at Glasgow, sometime ago, was found to be totally unfit for the worship of the Catholic inhabitants. It was therefore resolved to build a new chapel; and a new chapel has been built. I am sure, there can be no idea or opinion but one, as to the expediency and piety of that design. As long as we happen to have such a town as Glasgow, of which a great part of the population is Catholic,—admitting it to be our duty to reclaim as many as we can to what we consider the pure faith,—the next object is, to educate them according to their own religion. And so strong was the impression there, and over the kingdom, of the propriety of a chapel for the Catholics, that this was liberally subscribed to, not only by Catholics all over the island, but by many Protestants, and there in particular. It was patronised and liberally subscribed for by Kirkman Finlay, at that time, or soon afterwards, the chief magistrate of the city, and its representative in Parliament.

"Mr Scott, as was his duty and interest, took a warm and active part in the promotion of that object; and, the first fact I have to call your attention to, to-day, is, that during three years and a half that edifice took in erecting, after August, 1813, when it was begun, there was not a whisper breathed against his proceedings, on account of his connection with that chapel; and, it is a fact beyond all dispute, that this person, who has since found it convenient to run him down, as I shall show you soon, during the time the work was going on, never stated, either privately or publicly, any thing against Mr Scott. You will observe, that, while the acts of extortion, since laid to Mr Scott's charge by the defender, were going on,—while the parties were living, and on the spot, against whom the crime was committed,—while every thing was fresh in the memory of those against whom it was perpetrated,—Mr M'Gavin, living on the spot, and taking, as he says, a warm interest in the Protestant cause, never published or made a single charge against these Roman Catholics.

"After this virtual acquiescence by Mr M'Gavin in the propriety of Mr Scott's conduct, or at least never giving any reason to suppose he thought unfavourably of him, the chapel was finished; and the first use that it was put to (and this was not done by Catholics only, but by all in that place) was, that there was an Oratorio allowed to be held in it, in order to raise a sum of money for a charitable purpose,—I believe, for schools for the education of children of the poorer Catholics.

"As soon as this Oratorio took place, which was patronised chiefly by Catholics, there appeared in the *Glasgow Chronicle* a statement, which I should not think calculated to excite the disapprobation of any person upon earth. 'We feel pleasure in noticing the numerous and respectable auditory which was assembled at the Oratorio on Thursday last. The zeal and activity of the directors, the alacrity and pleasure with which their solicitations in behalf of a charitable and philanthropic institution were complied with, the great respect paid alike to the subject and the place, form a pleasing and characteristic feature of the age, and must afford an inexhaustible fund of pleasing reflection to the contemplative Christian. May we not hope that these reasons, and the general satisfaction afforded by the performance, will induce Bishop Cameron to grant his permission for another Oratorio at a future period? We cannot close this subject without offering our mead of praise to M. de Monti, for his extraordinary exertions, which the shortness of the notice required.'

"Let this statement be as diabolical as Mr M'Gavin may represent it to be, I now state

to you that it was not written, dictated, suggested, or seen by the pursuer of this action. In point of fact, it now turns out that it was written by one of the principal directors of that Oratorio. Mr Scott had nothing to do with it; and, although he had published it, and put his name to it, (as to taste, I know not whether the music was good or bad,) surely it was not a publication calculated to excite any animosity whatever. But there began a war in the newspapers about this Oratorio; one writer signed himself "Pax," and another, a "Friend of Truth." A war began about this Oratorio, and the building in which it took place; but Mr Scott had no concern with this discussion, any more than you or I.

"After this, Mr M'Gavin came forward, and began with this publication, which is in the first Issue in your hands, at the bottom of the first page. 'But this is not all; I ask A. V. if that house (meaning the new Catholic chapel) was not built, in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and, in some instances, a starving people? I ask him, if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow? The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering;—and will he accept, as honourable to him, that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared, be inscribed upon its front, and it will remain for 'ages to come' a monument of Popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.'

"At the time that those extravagant words were made use of, it was perfectly well known to Mr M'Gavin, as to every body about Glasgow, that Mr Scott, as was his duty, had taken a warm interest about this chapel; and when he saw this outrageous and most unprovoked attack, not upon him by name, but upon those who had promoted the erection of the chapel, you will not think the worse of him that he wrote a letter to the editor of the *Chronicle*, requiring to know whether he was alluded to in that publication. His letter was proper, as was every thing he had done as to the chapel. It was in these words:

TO
THE EDITOR OF THE GLASGOW CHRONICLE.

Glasgow, 31*st July*, 1818.

"SIR,—From your paper of Thursday, the 22d of July current, I quote the following paragraph from a letter addressed to you as editor, under the signature of 'A Protestant:'

'But this is not all. I ask A. V. if that house (meaning the new Catholic chapel) was not built, in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and, in some instances, a starving people? I ask him, if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow? The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering;—and will he accept, as honourable to him, that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared, be inscribed upon its front, and it will remain for 'ages to come' a monument of Popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.'

"It is well known to the public, and to the people of Glasgow in particular, that it was I who took the active management and superintendence of forwarding the new Catholic chapel, and obtaining subscriptions and money for it. From this circumstance, it has occurred to many, that the paragraph above quoted, pointed at and referred to me; but I have no means, in the first instance, of ascertaining the truth of this, or the intentions of the writer, except by an application to you. I have therefore to request that you favour me with the real name and address of the author of the letter, or that he, through you, explicitly state, whether he meant or referred to me, as the person who had extorted money, by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building the Catholic chapel, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them.

"It was sometime after the letter referred to appeared in your paper, before I either saw or heard of it as applied to me, otherwise I would have made this communication sooner.—I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) ANDREW SCOTT.'

"The editor of the paper, a gentleman of the name of Prentice, sent a proper, respectful, and honourable answer to this letter. He writes, 'Rev. Sir,—In answer to your letter of this morning, I beg leave to state, that I was absent at Appleby when the letter to which you refer was inserted in the *Glasgow Chronicle*. As I therefore cannot take the responsibility upon myself, I am afraid that I cannot, with propriety, refuse to give you the name of the writer,—Mr M'Gavin, of the house of Messrs. M'Gavin & Lamb.—I am, Rev. Sir, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) 'DAVID PRENTICE.'

Chronicle Office, 31*st July*, 1818.'

"So here Mr M'Gavin was given up as the author of that paper; and then Mr Scott applied to him in the same respectful and civil manner. After quoting the correspondence which he had had with Mr Prentice, he says, 'As that gentleman condescends on you, as the writer of the letter alluded to, I now request

to be favoured with your answer to my inquiry.—I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,
(Signed) ANDREW SCOTT.

6, Dunlop Street, Glasgow, 31st July, 1818.'

"If Mr M'Gavin was conscious that these words were not meant to be applied to Mr Scott; or if he was conscious that he did not mean to say they applied truly, nothing was more obvious for him than to state this fact; but, if you find Mr M'Gavin equivocating, or giving evasive answers, (his subsequent calumnies do not admit of exaggeration); if you be of opinion his answer was evasive, your conclusion must be, that, from that moment, he must have felt that he was doing wrong. After receiving this letter from a clergyman, accused of extortion and robbery, M'Gavin wrote, 'Rev. Sir,—I have received your letter of yesterday's date, with a copy of your correspondence with the editor of the *Glasgow Chronicle;* in reply to which, I have only to say, that if you, or any of your flock, feel injured, or misrepresented by any thing published in that paper by 'A Protestant,' the press is as open to you and them as it is to me. If you write a reply to the paragraph which you have quoted, I shall, if you please, give it a place in an early number of *The Protestant.*—I am your most obedient servant, (Signed) W. M'GAVIN.

37, Virginia Street, August 1st, 1818.
REV. ANDREW SCOTT.'

"In his letter, M'Gavin was thus neither denying the implication to Mr Scott, nor venturing to assert that that application was just, but giving that shuffling reply natural to a man conscious of guilt. However, as he did not give a pointed answer, Mr Scott properly wrote him again: 'Sir,—Your letter of the 1st instant is no answer to mine of the 31st July, containing a copy of the correspondence which accompanied it. I asked no answer or explanations for my flock: it was for myself as an individual; and the only question was, whether you meant and alluded to me in the paragraph of the letter referred to? In that paragraph, I did, and do still, consider myself particularly pointed at. I was no party to, nor any way concerned with, the publication of any of the letters that appeared in the *Chronicle.* I never saw them till I read them in that paper; and I consider it due to myself, and to the situation which I fill, to require an explanation from the author of the paragraph I quoted. I, therefore, still expect that your honour and character as a gentleman will convince you of the propriety of giving a direct answer to my query, viz., Whether or not you alluded to me in the paragraph referred to?

'As I will be some days at this place, where I was obliged to come this morning, please send your answer to the shop of Mr Charles J. A. De Monti, Argyle Street, and they will have the goodness to forward it, as I do not leave this till Saturday.—I am your most obedient servant, (Signed) ANDREW SCOTT.

Gourock, Aug. 3d, 1818.'

"What was the answer to this? It was the following holograph note from Mr M'Gavin: 'Mr M'Gavin has no *private* answer to Mr Scott farther than he has already given.

'*37, Virginia Street, Aug. 5,* 1818.'

"He had no private answer. I think that he ought to have had a private answer, and that no person, with the feeling of a gentleman, would have declined such answer. Although he had no private answer, yet he at that time meditated that public response, which he has since made resound all over Scotland, and in consequence of which this action was brought.

"The answer which he gave was this. He had lain by, without ever putting forth the charge of extortion during the whole time the chapel was building—he did not bring it even after the chapel was built, until he chose to take amiss this publication about the Oratorio,—and I refer to this unworthy cause of what afterwards took place, as proof that this man was not actuated by those godly purposes to which he now ascribes his conduct, but by a spirit of hostility and of pique. The public answer he meditated was this. He had formerly written the paragraph I read to you under the title of *The Protestant,* and he now advertised in the newspapers and otherwise, that the letters under the title of *The Protestant* were to be discontinued in the newspaper, but that the same, and other papers, with similar sentiments, were to form a weekly paper, to be called *The Protestant.* Accordingly there was such a publication; and I have now to call your attention to the public answer given under the title of A Protestant to this injured pursuer by the defender.

"*The Protestant,* a copy of which I hold in my hand, was printed weekly, the profits of it devoted to religious purposes. Part First contains what was published in the *Glasgow Chronicle.* So he begins this work by giving additional publicity to what he had been first challenged for. He so begins *The Protestant,* and then gives a garbled and pretended copy of what followed. Then, having got this done, in his eighth number he breaks out in the extraordinary way which you will see mentioned in the first Issue, about the middle of the second page. He says, 'I did not point at him.' You would imagine that he was going to deny Mr Scott was guilty of extortion here. 'I did not point at him as the person who was exclusively employed in the work of extorting money from the poor; I did not know how many agents were engaged weekly in that pious un-

dertaking; I do not know whether Mr Scott be the only priest that officiated while the chapel was building, or whether he be the only one that officiates in it at present. The house that is building immediately west of the chapel, and which is, it is said, intended for the manse, will be large enough to accommodate a dozen of priests while they remain unmarried, as they must always do; from which I infer that he either has, or intends to have, abundant assistance in milking and managing his flock.

"'It is doubtful how far he exhibits the character of a faithful pastor, while he seems to care only for himself; he asked no answer or explanations for his flock, it was for himself as an individual. One at least of his flock had been severely attacked and exposed, as guilty of a piece of shameful imposition, equal to a forgery, on the name of Luther. Fearing, perhaps, that this would also be applied to him, he takes care to let me know that he had no hand in the controversy. This is very well, and I hope he will thank me for making it public; but he ought to have some mercy on the guilty one of his flock. If he asked no explanation for him, he ought to demand explanation from him; he ought to put him on a course of severe penance for the good of his soul, for certainly he was guilty of a greater crime than that of eating flesh on Friday. If no such penance is enjoined, the priest ought to be held as consenting to his crime, or thinking very lightly of it.

"'I shall resume this subject in my next number, and give some examples to confirm what I wrote about money being extorted from poor persons, for the purpose of building the Popish chapel.'

"You will observe, that these words, (they seem to me at least to) contain a direct and public intimation, that Mr Scott was one at least of the persons who was guilty of robbery and extortion. The words imply, I do not say you are the only one; I am writing here as a Protestant; and although the law protects the Catholic hierarchy, (and although men of sense and liberality are agreed, that wherever a religion is tolerated by the law, it should be tolerated by all, so as to be respected by the private conduct of Protestants;) yet, I say, I am a Protestant, and I will calumniate all the body of Roman Catholics: and what I say is, you are not the only priest there who has been guilty of extortion and robbery.

"In page third of the second Issue, he gives the examples he threatens. 'If it be not true that money was extorted for building the Popish chapel by the fear of future punishment, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them, why is it that neither Mr Scott,'—(there was no necessity for naming him if he was not alluded to,)—'nor any of his people, have publicly denied the charges insinuated in the obnoxious paragraph which he has quoted from my letter?' (Concealing from the public, that this charge had been denied in private to him by Mr Scott.) 'If it be not true, I should like to see it publicly disclaimed, and if any one had sent me a disavowal, duly authenticated, I should have given it publicity. But, in fact, the thing is too notorious to be denied. It is not a thing of a thousand miles distance, or a hundred years old, else, I doubt not, it would be publicly and unanimously disavowed by all Papists, and every document produced to prove it would be pronounced a forgery. The people in Glasgow are not prepared to refuse the evidence of their own senses, at least with regard to money matters.' He goes on: 'Even the Papists in Glasgow are not insensible of the evidence of their own empty stomachs, and the clamours of their hungry children, when they were obliged to give weekly so many of their hard earned pence for the building of the chapel; and if the facts were denied,'—mark these words: the defender says, he did not accuse Mr Scott of doing any thing but using that influence which clergymen have over their flock, yet he says, 'Even the Papists in Glasgow are not insensible to the evidence of their own empty stomachs, and the clamours of their hungry children, when they were obliged to give weekly so many of their hard earned pence, for the building of the chapel; and if the facts were denied, hundreds of witnesses would rise up among themselves to confirm them.'

"'The chapel must have cost as much money as would have built three comfortable houses sufficiently large. It is well known, that the bulk of the adherents of the Romish church here, are poor labouring people; and it is not denied that the necessary funds, with the exception of a small sum from some very liberal Protestants, were raised among the people themselves. There was a sort of poll-tax imposed upon the members, according to their real or supposed circumstances. This tax was levied with no small rigour: and, during a period of great commercial distress, it must undoubtedly have pressed heavily upon many poor persons, who were not left the choice of giving or not giving, but who were taught that nothing less than the salvation of their souls depended upon their paying the tax.' They were taught that. Now there was no person there, as we shall show, except Mr Scott, to whom this passage could apply. The defender, therefore, must be held as saying, they were so taught by Mr Scott.

"Then he says—(The words are not quoted in the Issues. I quote them in explanation. At present, however, I am mistaken. You will find what I am going to read at the bottom of page third of the Issues.) 'In my last Number, I promised to give some examples to confirm what I wrote, about money being ex-

torted from poor persons, for the purpose of building the Popish chapel.' Then he says, 'I find no fault with the Romish sect for building a place of worship for themselves. They have legally as good a right to do so, as any other sect that is not established by law. Had they, of their own accord, agreed to erect a comfortable and commodious building, and had they contributed voluntarily, according to their ability, for the purpose; no reasonable man would have found fault, however much he might pity those who were so blinded by superstition, as to give their money for the support of a system which is inimical to their own happiness. Still, however, had it been a voluntary thing, they would have been acting like freeborn British subjects; and had they been content with a building merely comfortable and commodious, they would have shown themselves possessed of some measure of common sense. But, as I shall show presently, there was a heavy tax imposed upon the people without their consent; and all who submitted to this became, in fact, the vassals or slaves of their tax-masters. They stood no longer on the high and independent ground which every British subject is entitled to occupy:—their property, the hard earned fruit of their labour, was at the arbitrary disposal of persons over whom they had no control, and who would not deign to consult them with regard to its application.'

"In the private letter that Mr Scott had written to the defender, Mr Scott said, the words published, which he referred to in his letter, must have applied to him, as he had taken an active part in the building of this edifice. The Protestant says, 'Besides, nothing less, it seems, would suffice to gratify the vanity of him, or them, who had the charge of the money so extorted from the people, than a splendid edifice, equal, at least, to some ancient cathedral; or, to use the words of *Amicus Veritatis*, a house resembling '*as much as possible* the majesty of that God, to whose service it was to be dedicated.' I need not stop at present to show that this could not be a place intended for Christian worship; for it must be only an idol that can find a likeness or resemblance in wood and stone, carved according to the art of the craftsman. My present business is with the enormous expense of this building; and I do not hesitate to repeat, as an assertion, what I formerly put as a question, whether it was not built, in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and, in some instances, of a starving people? I go upon the supposition, that what was levied under the pretext of building the chapel, was actually applied to that object; for that is what many of the contributors themselves must take for granted; and so far as I know, no doubt exists with regard to the faithfulness of the application.'

"He says, at top of page fourth, 'While the chapel was a-building, the people, while they yet met in their old place of worship, were assured by their ghostly father'—(The term is probably used as having a ludicrous and contumelious appearance, though he adds in a note, 'This phrase is not used as a term of reproach. Ghostly is the old English word for spiritual; and, according to the Douay Catechism, ghostly father is the title by which the clergy choose to be called.') He says, 'Assured by their ghostly father, that such of them as fell behind in their payments should not enjoy church privileges. What was this, but extorting money by the fear of future punishment? and, from the condition of many of those from whom it was so extorted, who can doubt that they had often scarcely food for their families, or clothes to cover them? Every one knows in what estimation Papists regard the privileges of their church. To be denied these, is the same as to be denied the salvation of their souls. The poor, therefore, were told, in language sufficiently plain, that if the chapel tax was not punctually paid, they should suffer the pains of purgatory, or even hell itself.'

"'That this tax was extorted, and not always paid voluntarily, even from the fear of purgatory, is evident from the following fact:—There were a number of Papists employed, while the chapel was a-building, in one of the public works in the suburbs. These, it seems, were very unwilling to pay the tax. Application was therefore made to the manager, that he would retain, in his own hands, a portion of their weekly earnings to assist in building the chapel; for, as the applicant informed him, he could not trust the people themselves with the payment of their dues. The proprietors of the work, much to their honour, refused to comply with their request, rightly judging, that the labourer was entitled to the whole reward of his labour, without any deduction whatever. This is but one instance of the kind; but it is enough to show the manner in which money was extorted, without the consent of the people themselves, when by any means the collectors for the chapel could lay their hands upon their property.

"'I shall proceed to give a few more facts on this subject. The reader may rely on their authenticity. I could, indeed, give the names of the parties concerned; but I do not choose to do so, unless I shall be judicially called upon. I have been informed that some of my Papist neighbours talk big about my having libelled them; they even speak of a legal prosecution against me, for what I have written on the subject of their extorting money from the poor; and they will compel me, they say, to answer Mr Scott's question, whether or not I referred to him as the person who did so? I have no doubt the Papists of the present day are very willing to employ the old Popish

argument of fines and imprisonments, and worse, if they could, against all whom they cannot otherwise confute; and if they had the Inquisition at command, they would, no doubt, silence me. It seems there is no resource left them, but to appeal to some criminal tribunal; for they find that arguments and facts are all against them. It is my happiness, however, to live in a country in which there is no Inquisition; and, therefore, I shall, without fear, produce my facts, as I have hitherto done my arguments, leaving the reader to judge how far my assertions are proved by them:'—

"Then he mentions at top of page fifth: 'A man who now lives out of the city, was assessed in a certain weekly sum for building the chapel. During the dull trade, he fell back with regard to his payments. His family, however, continued to increase, and when he went to his ghostly father'—(Remember that is just a paraphrase of the name Mr Scott)—'to get a child baptized, he was asked how he stood with regard to his payments? He confessed what he could not deny, that during the hard times he had fallen behind. He was ordered to go about his business; and told, that his child should not be baptized, till he had paid every farthing that he was due. Before he was able to raise the necessary sum, the child died; and the father was left to suffer all the misery which such a circumstance would occasion to one who considered baptism necessary to the salvation of his child.'

"Then he goes on to another paragraph, which I read as explaining the Issues. This charge against a clergyman for the conduct of a father with regard to his child, in point of malignity, exceeds any thing I have ever seen in print. He goes on and gives an account of the great efficacy which the members of the Catholic church ascribe to baptism. 'This is a very serious matter in the Church of Rome. A child that dies unchristened must be lost. It is a generally received doctrine of that church, that baptism is necessary to salvation; and, in cases of extremity, where a new-born infant was likely to die before a priest could arrive, the midwife was authorised to baptize it. The sacrament of baptism is understood to regenerate the child, and to turn it from being a member of Satan into a child of God. A child that dies unbaptized can have no place in the kingdom of heaven, and cannot even have the privilege of Christian burial in consecrated ground. A medical friend has related to me the following fact, which occurred in his own practice, and which shows how acutely the feelings of even a mother are alive to this subject:—He had attended a poor woman, who found herself dying while pretty far advanced in pregnancy. She exacted of him a promise, that after her death, he would open her body, and separate the body of her child. He performed his promise, without at first thinking that she had any particular meaning in exacting it; but learning that she had been a Papist, he inquired of her friends, who were in attendance, if there was understood to be any religious meaning in what he had done?' We do not believe there is any truth in this anecdote. He goes on to say, 'They assured him that the woman could not have died in peace, had she not been assured that her unchristened child should be separated from her, for otherwise she could not have received Christian burial, and she could not go to heaven, if the unchristened body of her child remained in her. The Church of Rome cherishes such ideas of baptism, and of the absolute necessity of it, in order to the salvation of children; yet there was a priest in Glasgow, who would not baptize a child because its father was a few shillings in arrears of an arbitrarily imposed tax. Upon his own principles, the priest was, for the sake of a few shillings, guilty of the everlasting perdition of that child. The soul of one child is more precious than a thousand worlds; but Popery cares not how many thousand souls shall perish, if it can but gratify its own avarice and ambition.'

"I shall not attempt to add any force to this statement. I say but this,—if it is true, nothing is too bad for Mr Scott,—if not proved to be true, your verdict will tell us if any thing can be too bad for Mr M'Gavin. He says, 'Most sincerely do I wish that all Papists, and especially all fathers and mothers, would forsake their priests, and come to Christ, the friend of sinners, and the friend of children. If they believe in him, they shall receive all heavenly blessings for themselves; and as for their children, they shall find that he imposes no such conditions, with regard to their salvation, as the hard-hearted priests impose. Such priests care for neither parents nor children, farther than as they can extort money from them. They will let them perish if they cannot pay for their salvation.'

"Then after all this commentary, he goes on, upon page fifth of the Issues,—'I can, if necessary, give the name of a poor man'—(he will not give his name to-day, you will see)—'who subsisted partly on charity, and partly by carrying coals, and whose very clothing, such as it was, was furnished by some *benevolent* individuals, from whom not less than six shillings was exacted, at one time, to assist in building the Popish chapel. I can give the name of another, residing at Calton, who is in bad health, and who has sent several times for his ghostly father to visit him in his distress; but the said father will not go to him, because he has fallen behind in his payments. There is no comfort, it seems, for the poor. This individual may die without confession, without absolution, and he may perish for ever; because he cannot pay a certain sum to defray the expense of the chapel.'

"Then he mentions: 'There were two young men, apprentices, each of whose earnings did not exceed four shillings a week. Out of this miserable pittance, one was obliged to pay sixpence, the other ninepence a fortnight. I believe, in the estimation of those who had lately the distribution of public bounty, in a time of great distress, four shillings a week was understood to be the lowest sum by which a grown person could support life; what then must have been the condition of two hard working young men, who could earn no more, and who were obliged to give so large a portion of it to defray the expense of the ridiculous gewgaws of the chapel in Clyde Street?'

"Next page he says, 'I could give the instance of a poor woman, who, though she had paid as long as she was able, yet, falling behind, she durst not gratify herself with a sight of the new chapel after it was finished. She frankly told her neighbours, that she did not dare to go, till she was able to pay up what she was due. She was, of course, deprived of all the ordinances of the sanctuary, as it is called; she was left destitute of all the consolations of her religion; she was left to live without comfort, and to die without hope, because she could not pay the chapel tax.'

"Then he says, 'The following case presents a ghostly father in a more favourable light, and exhibits one of that holy order not quite destitute of human feelings. Some time ago, this father was called to visit one of his people, who was dangerously ill. One of his first questions, as usual, was, How he stood with regard to his payments? He was answered, That, owing to the state of his family, he had fallen behind. The visitor seemed not a little surprised, that the sick person should have the assurance to send for him, while his dues were not all paid up, and reproved him very warmly for it. He then asked, if there was any money in the house? and, being informed that there was only one shilling, he demanded and got it. His attention was then turned a little to the case of the sick person; but he soon resumed the subject of money, and gave back the shilling, on condition that the whole that was due should be paid as soon as possible.'

"Then there is a passage, which is not quoted in the Issues, and which I refer to, for explaining those passages that are quoted in the Issues.—'A friend states to me a case that came within his own knowledge, of a poor old man, who had paid liberally while the chapel was a-building; but, being struck with a palsy, he was rendered unable to do any thing for himself. He was supplied by some humane persons; one of whom advised him to go to his priest, and gave him a letter to him; but, alas! there was nothing to be had there. The priest was deaf to all his entreaties, and he might have starved for anything he would do for him.'

"Then he says, as in the Issues, 'I have more facts at the service of Mr Scott, if he shall think these insufficient to confirm my assertion;' stating those assertions, not as mere words he had heard, repeating them as facts, and throwing them in the face of the public and Mr Scott as facts, showing Mr Scott as guilty of extortion. And then he says, 'But I shall conclude this Number, by asking him some questions, to which, I hope, he will write an answer; and, if he does so, I will readily give it a place in *The Protestant*. Indeed, it is my earnest desire that he would defend himself and his cause, for that is in danger of becoming a tame controversy that is all on one side. I ask Mr Scott, whether he did not, on a certain day, denounce some of his people by name, before his whole congregation, for falling behind in the weekly impost? If he did not pronounce very awful curses against the unhappy individuals, and threaten to consign their souls to everlasting punishment, if the money was not paid? I ask, if he did not refer to others, besides those whom he named, as also in arrears, and threaten them with similar judgment, if they did not speedily pay? I request Mr Scott to answer these questions; and say, whether or not such anathemas have proceeded from his lips; and whether he thinks cursing his people, be the duty of a minister of the gospel of peace.'

"I need not explain to you, that Mr Scott did not answer those questions; because, in the first place, he thought they were not asked in the spirit of conciliation, truth, or friendship;—in the next place, he knew, that if he were to begin a paper war with such a person of hostile dispositions, he would plunge himself into wretchedness all the days of his life, as long as this war should be going on.

"Then there was a pause from September, 1818, till September, 1819; a year during which Mr Scott was silent, and trusted that the calumnies with which he had been assailed, would have died away. Such was the impression of the place, that the thing would have died away; yet, to my astonishment, after a pause of fourteen months, without any act to provoke the attack, M'Gavin, who had let the subject drop, from the IX. Number of *The Protestant*, breaks out again, in the LXXII. Number, into matter forming the third Issue. The story is awful; and I shall not read it to you. He prints a letter from Mr Sym, Clerk of the Town's Hospital of Glasgow, a defender to-day, in which Sym states a discovery of extortion by Mr Scott. M'Gavin, certain he could not be of the truth of this story, which was not true, lends himself as a party to its propagation; and he published this statement. The essence of the statement is contained in page eighth of this Issue. '20th Aug. 1819. Betty Dochie, alias Widow Hanlin, 44, Bridgegate, aged 36, has three children: Helen, 5 years and 3 months; Michael, 3 years;

and Alice, 8 months. Has thirty shillings quarterly from the Hospital; no other supply. She strips feathers; has three other children variously employed. Her husband died in January last; had, before his death, given to Mr Scott *four pounds;* but had fallen back in his payments, in consequence of which, Mr Scott refused to recommend the children for admission to the Popish Schools. Nor would he baptize the infant, which was only two months old at its father's death, till the mother pawned a pair of blankets, for five shillings, and borrowed three shillings from a friend, and paid Mr Scott eight shillings; partly for christening the child, and partly for her husband's arrears. She says she will declare the above to be truth before God and man. I am, &c.

(Signed) 'WILLIAM SYM, *Clerk.*'

"The extortion is represented as upon a woman; a woman who was receiving public charity, and obliged to pawn her blankets for five shillings, and to borrow three shillings, in order to pay Mr Scott eight shillings; and the extortion practised against her at the time she became a widow.

"Then Mr M'Gavin goes on to say, that he had heard 'when the widow called at the Hospital for her half-quarter's allowance, she stated, that, about a month before that Mr Scott had called upon her, and that, without upbraiding her for divulging the story which I have given above, he returned to her the eight shillings, which he had extorted from her for the baptism of her child, &c.; and farther, that he had given her 12 lbs. of meal per week for three weeks; and that, moreover, he had charged her to tell this to no man;' that is to say, to tell to no man Mr Scott had returned the money he had extorted.

"And then the defender goes on with the usual spirit of conciliation and charity by which he is actuated. 'I hope Mr Scott will believe me, when I say that this is the best thing I ever heard of him; and as I am assured that he had been informed that the widow's case had been communicated to me, he will allow me to congratulate myself as the happy instrument, of not only relieving the widow, but also of producing a benevolent feeling in his mind, to which, perhaps, he had been too long a stranger. If Mr Scott be possessed of human feelings, he must have had more pleasure in returning these eight shillings to the poor widow, and in giving her a little meal, than in the many thousand pounds which have been extorted from persons almost as poor as she. Nay, I will venture to assert, that he never felt so much pleasure in contemplating the lofty minarets of his chapel, or the spacious rooms of his manse, with the extortions, by means of which they were reared, as he felt when he put the silver into the widow's hands.

"'This, however, is not the first instance of restitution that is on record. The reader will recollect a case, in my IX. Number, in which a whole shilling was restored, after being extorted from a poor sick person; and if more instances had been communicated to me, I should gladly have recorded them. It is pleasing to see that the work of restitution has begun, and proceeded so far; because this is one evidence that the extortioner has begun to repent; and though the extortion itself has produced nearly twenty thousand pounds; and though the amount of the restitution is, upon the whole, only nine shillings in money, and four pecks and a half of oatmeal; we must not be discouraged, but hope for the best, knowing that the greatest things in the world, even Rome itself, arose out of small beginnings.

"'Protestants have no idea of the immense sums of money which are levied upon Papists by their ghostly instructors.'

"Those are the statements upon which this action was brought; and, before pointing out to you their peculiar character of injuriousness, I at present submit to you, as too clear to require any evidence, that the words I have read, charge Mr Scott, personally, with the crime of extortion. The defender has said, that all men who ask charity, or subscriptions for any purpose, from their friends, because they get from them, by argument and solicitation, what they cannot, or do not choose otherwise to give, may be said to be guilty of extortion. I need not say, this is a hypocritical and contemptible quibble. Mr Scott is mentioned by name, as guilty of extortion, in twenty of the passages I have read to you; and who can doubt his identity, when in the very defences to-day, those very facts are stated as true of Mr Scott? Mr M'Gavin cannot be allowed, with inconsistency to say, I do not mean you; and then to say, those facts are true of you. I am ready to poll every individual in the west of Scotland: no man, woman, or child, there, ever doubted those words applied to Mr Scott, and to him alone.

"Observe, they do not accuse him merely of one or two specific acts of extortion or robbery from widow Hanlin, the two apprentices, &c. The charge is a general charge, that, throughout the whole course of the building of that chapel, he was guilty of this as a general crime; and specific instances are given as instances, not as exhausting the charge. No honest or intelligent man can doubt that it is a general charge of calumny that is made against this person's official conduct.

"Then observe, there is no foundation in the defence M'Gavin has sometimes indicated that he was to set up, that those passages are palliated or explained away by other passages in *The Protestant.* We wish and call upon him to read those passages if he can. We are not entitled to charge him by picking out passages.

You must look at the context, at the general nature of this book. I say, instead of palliation, an additional sting is put into the charge, from where the statements proceeded from, and from where they were directed, and from the false and injurious calumnies with which all the statements are mixed up.

"And those calumnies are not stated in the way they would have been, if the defender believed them to be true, and was actuated by a sincere love of justice. If he believed Mr Scott was guilty of extortion, and could call a hundred persons to prove this, he was bound to make his complaint in a regular form to the courts of his country. Mr Scott is not entitled to swindle any man. M'Gavin was bound to ask what defence he had for his conduct. Am I entitled to charge you with swindling, and never to let you know the facts upon which I ground the charge? Year after year, and month after month, M'Gavin so charged Mr Scott before the public. He began by newspapers, then by a publication called *The Protestant*, a name sufficient of itself to attract the eye and attention in that town; and there was no device he did not adopt that was possible to give circulation to this calumny.

"Those charges are injurious—they apply to Mr Scott generally—and they are not explained away by other parts of the book.

"Then, what is the main defence which is set up against this action? The defence, which alone will occasion to you the smallest trouble to-day. I am reading that of Mr M'Gavin—for the other defenders hardly make any defence at all. 'For a considerable time past, a periodical work has been published in Glasgow, under the title of "*The Protestant*," the object of which is to vindicate the principles and doctrines of the Reformation. The pursuer, Mr Scott, or his friends, have attempted to counteract the tendency of this publication by another work, called "*The Catholic Vindicator*," in which they have endeavoured to support the system of Popery, and to asperse the doctrines and characters of Protestants.' I shall show you, by and by, Mr Scott had nothing more to do with the *Vindicator* than either you or I. 'Much personal abuse has been thrown out against the defender, Mr M'Gavin, in this work. This controversy has been carried on in this form for two or three years; but the pursuer, or his friends, who seem to be aware how little impression they are making on the public by their *Vindicator*, have magnanimously resolved to try what can be done by bringing this controversy before a court of law.' I have stated to you, there was no controversy, except where Mr M'Gavin had injuriously and maliciously calumniated Mr Scott. 'The defender, Mr M'Gavin, has already met them before the public, in the form in which it is certainly most expedient that such matters should be discussed; but, as they now wish to take refuge in a court of law, he has no objection to follow them there also. He might, upon very solid grounds, object to the relevancy of the present action;'—observe these words—but, as he observes that the summons charges '*The Protestant*' with statements that are false and malicious; and as he is prepared to support, by evidence, every statement therein made, he waves any objection to the relevancy of the summons, and is willing to join issue with the pursuer as to the facts and statements of which he has had the hardihood to complain.

"No defence can be more natural or more honourable to Mr M'Gavin than this. It is the defence which becomes him as a man, and as a gentleman. 'The stories are true,' is the only defence such a man can make; and accordingly he says he is prepared to support, by evidence, every statement that is mentioned in this *Protestant* and in these Issues.

"Under the forms of pleading in this Court, as I am sure will be shown you from the proper quarter at the proper time, when a defender says he will prove his defence, he is bound to mention his statements as specifically as if he, in reference to these statements, were the pursuer. The Court, therefore, called upon Mr M'Gavin to say what were the facts he meant to prove. He gave in a very thick and formidable paper. A great number of statements, extended to a long period of time, might have embraced half the town with the evidence. When he was required to state a little more specifically what he meant, so specifically as to be intelligible, and to give the names, times, circumstances, he attempted to do so during a year; but the whole fabric crumbled from him inch by inch, till at last the charges resolved into the four last cases mentioned in the Issues before you. You will perceive them beginning with the word 'or.' The first Issues regard the calumnies against Mr Scott, and then come the Issues in defence.

"OR,

"IV. WHETHER, on or about the month of October, 1814, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Henry Courtney, labourer, lately in Anderston, and now in Cowcaddens, Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and one of the contributors to the Roman Catholic chapel aforesaid, because he, Courtney, was in arrears of his contribution, until the said Courtney should pay the said arrears to the collectors for the chapel? And whether at or about Easter, 1815, the pursuer did refuse confession to the said Courtney, because he had not paid his contribution to the said chapel?

"V. WHETHER, about six years ago, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Philip M'Geechie, now in Manchester, late residenter in Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and a member of the

pursuer's congregation, because the said M'Geechie was in arrears in his contribution to the said chapel?

"VI. WHETHER, in the year 1814, the pursuer did apply to Mr Haughton Fleming, or to Mr Bowman Fleming, who carried on a dye-work in Hutcheson Town, Glasgow, to retain in their hands a portion of the weekly earnings of such Catholics as were employed in their works, to be applied towards building said Roman Catholic chapel?

"VII. WHETHER, on or about the month of June, 1818, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of John Drain, weaver in Duke Street, Glasgow, one of the contributors to the Catholic chapel aforesaid, because the said Drain was then in arrears of his contribution to said chapel?

"I shall tell you, by and by, our statement as to these Issues. At present I have to say, the only defence you can this day attend to is proof of those four individual cases—and it is in consequence of those four acts, that Mr M'Gavin maintains this extraordinary proposition, that he is entitled to blast the reputation, and ruin the happiness of Mr Scott during the rest of his life—and all that is in consequence of these four acts.

"Observe, there is not any of them but one that is mentioned in the libel itself. The whole of these are new cases coming to Mr M'Gavin's knowledge after he had committed the calumny, and only raked out of the filth after his controversy, and after he had been put to the wall by the Court upon his own calumnies. He has deserted, with a single exception, all his assertions;—and Mr Scott stands at present in the cruel situation of defending himself against a general calumny, upon statements which the calumniator did not know of at the time he uttered his calumny.

"The only part of the case that can require any delay or trouble to-day is, as to those cases—and, that you may understand what Mr Scott says about them, I must beg of you to attend to the general system by which the contributions to this chapel were levied.

"I have already stated to you, that I think there was no great sin in Mr Scott taking an interest about the building of the Catholic Chapel. If he had been careless about that great work, I should have thought very little of him indeed. The law does not impose a contribution for any church except the established one—it is therefore the more incumbent, as a moral duty, upon all other sects to maintain their own establishments;—and if I could name the thing that was most proper for a man in Mr Scott's situation to look to, as a moral and Christian duty, it was to forward all in his power whatever was calculated to promote the education and moral good of the Catholics in Glasgow. Mr Scott, instead of denying, glories and boasts in it,—says he felt warmly and zealously in that work, and did every thing he could for it, in consistence with the morality, liberality, and benevolence of a gentleman. And what could such a man do but push on the work with the zeal of an honest and active man? But you are surely not to mistake this for the offence of which he has been charged by Mr M'Gavin. If he has great influence, as it is said all Catholic clergymen have, over their flock, such influence, so used in a lawful way, to procure subscriptions for a church that was necessary, no man can say this was wrong.

"It was pretty well known who were Catholics, and what was their number, about this time. Mr Scott did not go about among them himself—but, all the respectable persons in his congregation, forty, fifty, or sixty, were named collectors. Each took a part of the town or congregation. You will see them here to-day. They found who were willing or able to subscribe. When they found a rich shabby fellow, they perhaps did not think it wrong to urge him, and reason with him a little on the subject of the subscription. I know it frequently happens to myself, that a collector of subscriptions for charitable or other purposes says, I have given a great deal too little, and stands and exhorts me to give more. Having ascertained, in this way, what the persons were willing or able to give, they took down their names. It was agreed the contribution should be once a fortnight—and there are books here which show the quarterly contributions made by every individual. Mr Scott was one of the collectors—not one of the principal ones. He had no particular individual charge, except of the persons in his own list.

"The general results of this collection appear to me to be very edifying, in reference to the general charge of extortion, and that religious consolations and ordinances were withheld from every Catholic in the place who did not contribute. What are the facts? I perceive the Catholics now amount to between nine and ten thousand. At the date of the contributions, they were about eight thousand two hundred and forty-five. That is a statement made by a person well versant in these matters, who took up the list. A number of them drew off, and never paid any thing. Therefore, the whole number of the subscribers to the chapel was four thousand and thirty-seven—so that there was not one half of the Catholic population of the place subscribed a single farthing.

"The total sum was from fifteen to twenty thousand pounds, and that was not all from Glasgow. The whole at Glasgow, during the three years and a half, was five thousand nine hundred and thirteen pounds, including the sum of four hundred and twenty-six pounds—so there remains as subscribed by all the Catholics in the West of Scotland, five thousand four hundred and eighty-seven pounds,

(and four hundred and twenty-six pounds) subscribed chiefly by Protestants.

"If you suppose all the subscriptions equal, dividing the sum subscribed among those who subscribed, the sum got by these extortions would amount to a penny three farthings a week. If you deduct, as you must, from the lower orders all the subscriptions above ten pounds, then it was scarcely a penny a week."

Lord Gillies—"From your data, is not a halfpenny nearer the thing, than a penny?"

Mr Cockburn—"Yes. So that the amount, at the very worst that can be stated, as to this system of extortion, is, that they paid a halfpenny a week.

"The lists are very minute—there were different classes,—some paid ten pounds, some five, and some one pound. A prodigious majority of the subscriptions were under five shillings.

"Observe that plain and glaring fact. Allowing Mr Scott to have run riot in Glasgow, like a lion seeking whom he might devour, and devouring all who came in his way,—of great influence over his flock—the calumny amounts to this, that for building a chapel necessary for his flock, the amount of the extortion was a halfpenny a week.

"Before I go on to particulars, as to those four Issues, I shall say a word or two on the way M'Gavin alleges the extortions were exacted, viz., Mr Scott's withholding the ordinances of religion. The defender asserts, that the pursuer refused to baptize, or confess, those who would not subscribe.

"Now, Gentlemen, there is a list kept of all who confess at Easter, when it is reckoned a matter of duty to communicate. I observe that in one year, about two thousand did so. And of those, how many contributed regularly to this chapel? There were three hundred in arrear,—and that is a fact which pretty well disposes of the charge, that he refused to confess persons who were in arrear.

"And then, as to the refusal to give baptism, I see there was a baptismal register for 1816, the year in which the chapel was finished. Of those whose children were baptized in that year, there were 108 who never gave, during the whole time of the subscription, five shillings; and a very considerable number, about 60, had children baptized that year, who never contributed a single farthing one way or other. So that, in that year, 108 had children baptized, who never paid a shilling; and sixty, who never subscribed any thing at all.

"Those are the facts, as to the general system of extortion; and I think Mr Scott thus stands on a very proud ground, as to this charge of extortion. I doubt if you will find any Catholic clergyman on the globe,—I doubt if you will find any Protestant, who, in such circumstances, eight or ten years after the thing took place, could produce such evidence of the general cleanness of his hands. And this is taking the case in its general aspect.

"Then we come to the specific cases. But, first, let me mention, that, of these specific cases, there was only one originally mentioned in The Protestant;—and, observe, there are many things stated in this Protestant, as to which Mr M'Gavin offers no proof to-day. Look to the Issues, and you will see Mr Scott is charged with habitually refusing to visit the sick, who did not make the payments wanted for building the chapel. You remember the case mentioned in the Issues for the pursuer, of a sick person having been required to pay a shilling, that being the whole money in his house; which, however, was returned, on condition that the whole that was due would be paid as soon as possible. Now there is not one of the defender's Issues founded upon refusal to visit the sick. And, if any thing is proved, it will be shown to you, that, of all the clergymen in the west, Mr Scott was most notorious for the regular performance of that duty.

"And, as to denouncing persons in the congregation by name, the defender has given up all offer of proof upon that charge. And he will not prove any one of the charges with the aggravations he states,—not one of the injurious commentaries with which he mixes them up. If I were to admit, that a person who got a child baptized, did pay towards the building of the chapel, that is not the impression the defender gave to the public,—he put the statement, and a commentary upon it, in the mouth of the vulgar,—there is always the charge of extortion and robbery. Those aggravations,—what the defender says as to the visitation of the sick, and the denouncing of persons in the congregation by name,—he does not ask leave this day to prove any one of them.

"What does he ask to prove? He says—his first Issue is, 'Whether on or about the month of October, 1814, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Henry Courtney, labourer?'"—

"But first let me notice the case of widow Hanlin, forming the subject of the third Issue of the pursuer, in which it is stated as having been set forth by Mr M'Gavin, that she had thirty shillings quarterly from the Hospital,—no other supply; and that Mr Scott, having first extorted four pounds from her husband before his death, had, because some farther payments had not been made, refused to recommend her children for admission to the Popish schools; and to baptize an infant, two months old at its father's death, till the mother, by pawning blankets, and borrowing money, paid him eight shillings,—partly for christening the child, and partly for her husband's arrears. We hold that the defender is not entitled to go into that case. It is not one of the cases upon which he has asked a special

Issue. But, although he is not entitled to go into it, as we know and believe he intends to make the attempt, I am bound to indicate to you, what is the truth of that statement. The truth is,—this poor man, Mr Hanlin, who is represented to have been dead at this time, was, in the first place, either not dead at all, —or, if he was, his death was not known, even to his own wife. In the next place, although in an hospital, he was a man of capital. He died worth more money than is possessed by nine-tenths of the labouring orders. When he died, we have evidence, that he had debtors in various parts of the town. He was in an hospital, not from poverty, but from the circumstances attending a fever that was raging in Glasgow; and he did die, but at the date of this transaction, his death was not known, even to his own wife. He was not of very good character—he did not live with his wife —he did not support her. A witness will tell you, Mr Scott did not know he was dead. He was understood to be better—and he died suddenly, in consequence of a drug he took by mistake. He had agreed to subscribe to the chapel, and instead of having given four pounds, he had only given sixteen shillings. He was thus greatly in arrear; and Mr Scott, about the time of the baptism of this child, did receive eight shillings. But he did not receive this from Mrs Hanlin. Hanlin himself directed a friend of his to get the money from a debtor of his; this friend paid it to Kerr, and Kerr paid it to Scott, as a contribution by Hanlin.

"First, then, there was no refusal to baptize this child of Mrs Hanlin's; who was not then a widow, or was not known to be so. Then, four pounds had not been paid, but only sixteen shillings. And Mrs Hanlin had not paid eight shillings. Mr Hanlin did it; and accordingly it is entered as a contribution by himself to that chapel.

"Soon after this, Mr Scott had gone to Edinburgh; and upon his return, he heard Hanlin was dead, and his widow at that time had got into an hospital. Mr Scott hearing the husband was dead, and the wife poor, did the meritorious, but dangerous charity,—the act of humanity, of paying back to the widow the money he had got from the husband. And, it was for this, Mr M'Gavin had the insanity to state, this was the best thing he ever knew of Mr Scott. M'Gavin stated this was done, not because Mr Scott had found the husband dead, and the widow poor; but that Mr Scott had been informed, that the widow's case had been communicated to him, Mr M'Gavin; he congratulates himself as the happy instrument, of not only relieving the widow, but also of producing a benevolent feeling in Mr Scott, to which he had been too long a stranger. He mentions, that Mr Scott had made restoration to the widow, and given her some meal per week,—and he says that he had charged her to tell this to no man.

"This story is chiefly of use in this way, that it gives a correct view of the truth of the other stories. Here was a woman living apart from her husband, who comes to get her child baptized. Her husband, about this time, gives a small payment towards the discharge of the arrears of his subscription for building the chapel,—and afterwards, from charity, the clergyman gives this payment back to the widow. Then what is the commentary? Husband dead—child wanted to be baptized—this refused — money demanded — blankets pawned to pay the money—and money afterwards returned by stealth, because the circumstances had come to the knowledge of Mr M'Gavin.

"There was a foundation for the story—there was the fact that eight shillings were paid about this time. What we complain of is, that Mr M'Gavin, instead of giving a true statement of the facts, was guilty of this piece of calumny,—of taking an insidious advantage of apparent truth, for the very purpose of rearing a structure of defamation and injurious calumny.

"Look what they say as to Henry Courtney. The Issue here is, 'whether on or about the month of October, 1814, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Henry Courtney, labourer, lately in Anderston, and now in Cowcaddens, Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and one of the contributors to the Roman Catholic chapel, aforesaid; because he, Courtney, was in arrear of his contribution, until the said Courtney should pay the said arrears to the collectors for the chapel? And whether, at or about Easter, 1815, the pursuer did refuse confession to the said Courtney, because he had not paid his contribution to the said chapel?'

"The fact here, as to confession, is, that we have the confession book, both of 1814 and 1815, by which it appears that this man Courtney actually communicated. Therefore that last part of the statement in the Issue is unquestionably false.

"Then,—did Mr Scott refuse, in October, 1814, to baptize the child of this man? All we have to say upon this, consists in a denial of the fact. He did not then, or at any other time, refuse to baptize the child of Courtney.

"Sometime after this, Courtney wished a genteel seat in the chapel, having a great taste that way; but the seat afforded him was among the poor. He took this amiss, renounced the chapel, and has been hostile since to Mr Scott.

"Such has been the foundation for Mr M'Gavin's charge, after he was obliged to get cases for his defence. What Courtney will say, I cannot tell; but Mr Scott's defence is a positive denial of the statement,—and no evidence upon earth can prove it.

"The second case M'Gavin founds upon is,

'Whether, about six years ago, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Philip M'Geechie, now in Manchester, late residenter in Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and a member of the pursuer's congregation; because the said M'Geechie was in arrear in his contribution to the said chapel?'

"In the first place, upon this case, the facts, so far as Mr Scott can recollect or gather them, were these: A long time ago, more than double six years, a person of the name of M'Kenzie, gifted with a variety of names in the course of his life, and another of the name of Robertson, came to Mr Scott, in a state of intoxication. Of course, they were refused at that time—they afterwards came back—the child was baptized; and it is positively denied, that there was any refusal, or any payment demanded, for withdrawing the refusal.

"You will find this transaction took place about 1808, and not about six years ago; and I need not tell you and the Court, that, if the defender meant to found upon cases, he was obliged to give accurate and specific circumstances.

"And then you will observe who is this Mr M'Geechie. The pursuer tells us, he is now in Manchester, and was then in Glasgow. We did what we could to find him—and nothing did Mr Scott wish, but to have him examined, not doubting his character was respectable. Accordingly most diligent search was made to find him. We sent all the way to Manchester, and at last did succeed in tracing him.

"Alas! half a dozen of different things have occurred regarding him. He was marked in the books of the Police of Glasgow, as an old offender. He was tried in the Court of Justiciary for a transportable offence, and acquitted, because the prosecutor had not taken all the *aliases* of his designation. He was latterly found in the jail of Lancaster, under a sentence of three years' imprisonment, convicted of issuing false coin. We saw at once he was inadmissible as a witness—and nothing in this case, I dare say, would induce the Crown to give him a pardon.

"So thus does Mr M'Gavin begin his cases with Courtney, who has quarrelled with Mr Scott, and then one who, he knew, could not be called here to contradict his statements.

"Then we go on to the next case, the only one mentioned in the original libel:—'Whether, in the year 1814, the pursuer did apply to Mr Haughton Fleming, or to Mr Bowman Fleming, who carried on a dyework in Hutchesontown, Glasgow, to retain, in their hands, a portion of the weekly earnings of such Catholics as were employed in their works, to be applied towards building the Roman Catholic Chapel.'

"I read what he says of this case in his libel, page fourth of the Issues. 'That this tax was extorted, and not always paid voluntarily, even from the fear of purgatory, is evident from the following fact:—There were a number of Papists employed, while the chapel was a-building, in one of the public works in the suburbs. These, it seems, were very unwilling to pay the tax. Application was therefore made to the manager, that he would retain, in his own hands, a portion of their weekly earnings, to assist in building the chapel; for, as the applicant informed him, he could not trust the people themselves with the payment of their dues. The proprietors of the work, much to their honour, refused to comply with the request, rightly judging that the labourer was entitled to the whole reward of his labour, without any deduction whatever. This is but one instance of the kind; but it is enough to show the manner in which money was extorted without the consent of the people themselves, when by any means the collectors for the chapel could lay their hands on their property.'

"In defence of this general statement, you are desired to try whether the pursuer Mr Scott applied to any of the Messrs Flemings to retain in their hands a portion of the weekly earnings of their Catholic workmen, to be applied towards building the Roman Catholic chapel. To that Mr Scott gives a most positive and triumphant denial. It happens that the defender has here condescended upon respectable names, who can be called as witnesses,—and those men will swear to you, that they never exchanged words in their lives with, and I am not sure they ever saw, Mr Scott. Mr Scott never spoke a word in his life to them; at all events, he never requested them to retain in their hand a portion of the weekly earnings of such Catholics as were employed at their work, to be applied towards building the Roman Catholic chapel. The fact is—for this story is not the pure invention of Mr M'Gavin—but what Mr Scott feels injurious to him, is, M'Gavin's taking hold of a fact, and then twisting it for an injurious purpose—Stevenson, who was manager to those Flemings, had asked Mr Scott to go to the workmen to see what they were disposed to give, and he heard the usual arguments used about the propriety of the measure. But Mr Scott never interfered in the least—he was a mere silent spectator, and never made a proposal of any such kind as that which he has been charged by Mr M'Gavin.

"I am wrong, I think, in stating he was present. I believe he was not even present when this person went to the manufactory. We must, at all events, adhere to the Issue, and find whether, in the year 1814, the pursuer did apply to either of the Messrs Flemings to retain in their hands any part of the earnings of their Catholic workmen, towards building the Roman Catholic chapel.

"Lastly, we come to the case of Mr John Drain: 'Whether, on or about the month of

June, 1818, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of John Drain, weaver, in Duke Street, Glasgow, one of the contributors to the Catholic chapel aforesaid, because the said Drain was then in arrears of his contribution to said chapel.'

"Mr Scott could never have found out any thing about this Mr Drain merely from what is stated in the Issue—but that Issue is made out of a statement by Mr M'Gavin in his condescendence. So that the case we are called upon here to defend ourselves from, is the case of that John Drain,—and that child which Mr Scott refused to baptize, and which Bishop Paterson did baptize, was baptized at a time, that gentleman will tell you, he was in France. In the next place, we have the certificate of the person who did baptize the child—and it was neither the one nor the other of the gentlemen in question;—it was neither Mr Scott nor Bishop Paterson who baptized the child—but the child was baptized at Paisley, by a Roman Catholic clergyman at Paisley, of the name of M'Lachlan.

"So you have, as witnesses for the defender, Courtney, who felt insulted by being sent to a seat among the poor of the congregation. You have a person who has been convicted at Manchester—and now you have John Drain,—and where is he? There was, a few days ago, an application for John Drain, and if he do not come before you in chains, he will appear in the custody of officers of the law. He is an old offender, well known in the Police books of Glasgow. I know he is not convicted, and therefore his evidence must be received. But we are entitled to say, Mr Scott had good reasons, independent of non-payment of contributions to the chapel, to be displeased at this person's conduct. This John Drain, I cannot tell how many wives he has living—you will hear of two that are living. There is distinct evidence of his desertion from the service of His Majesty—he has been notorious to the Police—and, lastly, he comes here with two officers. And it is of importance to Mr Scott, that Mr Scott had very good reasons for refusing the baptism, independent of the grounds stated by the defender.

"Thus, Mr M'Gavin is driven to desperation in these his defences; for in three out of four of the cases he has selected, the witnesses are inadmissible or objectionable. If he could have fixed charges of extortion by Mr Scott on persons in Botany Bay, these would have been the men he would have taken in preference to all others,—and then his apology would have been, that those men had been rendered desperate by the extortions of Mr Scott, and had, in consequence, got themselves to Botany Bay,—and, therefore, he would have said, I cannot bring them here as witnesses.

"It appears to me extraordinary, that, in a case of three years and a half of extortion, and at the end of a year of hard litigation, Mr M'Gavin has only produced four cases, and such a four,—four of the description I have stated.

"Those are the whole cases you have to try in defence of this action.

"I am much disposed, in conclusion, to maintain an argument to you,—that, even if the defender should succeed in giving an air of possibility of some foundation of fact to those cases, his defence would not be very good,—for, admitting there was a foundation in truth for those cases,—admitting that Mr Scott, acting with thousands of low people, persons capable of being corrupted by a rich defender, had been traduced by them—if such were his situation, I would say this would not allow Mr M'Gavin to publish those statements which he did publish.

"But, even were those things proved, that would not justify such a general calumny as that which has been propagated against him by Mr M'Gavin.

"But, every one of them will be disproved, or will not be proved. And, if you do not believe those cases to be proved, can you conceive a more atrocious system of calumny than that by which Mr Scott has been opposed? You will observe, in the first place, that those are all calumnies against a gentleman of the sacred profession,—against a man of that profession, which, by the manners and principles of all sensible and liberal men of modern times, is preserved from calumny, because the injury done to such a character is always the most severely felt. In the next place, the calumnies are not only uttered against a clergyman, but they have this exaggeration, that he is accused of being guilty of those extortions, by the prostitution of those very offices, which it was his duty to administer for the benefit of his congregation. If he had been accused of robbery on the highway, that would not have equalled the charge which was made against him, that he, a minister of religion, withheld the consolations of religion to the dying and to infants.

"I have no fear of your views and feelings. I hold it a serious aggravation of the calumny, that it was against a clergyman of the Catholic persuasion. I need not tell you that the Catholic religion is as much tolerated as the Episcopalian or Presbyterian. It may be right or wrong—all have agreed to treat all other sects with tenderness and deference.

"There is in Scotland a prejudice against Catholics, a prejudice which, I hope, will last as most salutary, and at Glasgow it rages most, because there the lowest description of Catholics abound, and the people notoriously live in a sort of alarm from them. Therefore it was peculiarly patriotic and proper in Mr Scott, to endeavour to reclaim them; not by teaching them, that their pastor was a rogue, despising their chapel and institutions, but teaching

them, and recommending to them, 'send your children and go yourselves to our chapel.' It was, therefore, peculiarly absurd for Mr M'Gavin to throw his firebrands into this place, knowing every publication was doing an injury, not merely to Mr Scott and the Catholic religion, but to the peace of the country, which nothing he, or any person could do, could prevent.

"Then observe, if there be any thing in his apology of his desire to resist the errors of Popery. For such resistance, there was no need of publishing his calumnies against Mr Scott as he did. The best resistance is by argument, which men can read calmly and deliberately. But he used first a newspaper, and then a pamphlet at a penny or twopence. The work itself, by Mr M'Gavin, was hung up on the statue of king William, for the sake of being read by the mob in the street; and the effect of all this was, that Mr Scott was, in many cases, made the victim of popular commotion. In the town of Greenock, for instance, there was a dissenter, who, instead of making the Scriptures the subject of his sermon, actually gave his hearers a lecture from the Protestant, insomuch that the Catholic clergyman there, was obliged to apply to the magistrates for assistance. And, after an interval of fourteen months, Mr M'Gavin resumed his calumnies.

"Therefore, I say, I never saw a libel equal in point of seriousness, to that now before you.

"His apologies for his conduct, will best come from himself. You will hear them from his Counsel. But, in case we should not have an opportunity afterwards, I shall advert a little to his defence.

"He says, his statements are true; we say, they are false. Then he says, there was a work, called *The Catholic Vindicator*, where the cause of Protestantism was attacked; and where he, Mr M'Gavin, was traduced.

"If that matter were to be gone into, which we think it cannot be, as it is not in the Issues, we have the evidence of the Editor, that Mr Scott did not edit it, did not write for it, did not encourage it, had no concern with it.

"The defender says, there was one Murphy preached a sermon hostile to him. If true, that would show he was, in addition to his religious duty, indulging a personal feeling of revenge. But, in the first place, he did not utter a word personally about Mr M'Gavin. In the next place, that does not apply to Mr Scott—he was not there, and knew nothing of it before.

"Then the defender says, (which forms another topic) he was actuated by a warm and most extraordinary love of Protestantism; and it was under the influence of that sacred impulse and feeling, that he has given vent to all this opposition of Mr Scott.

"As to the religious feelings of Mr M'Gavin, I have no reason to question them; but whether pointing out a clergyman to popular fury, is the best way of showing his zeal, I question very much. I believe it is upon this statement of his, he is mainly relying for success, or extenuation, this day. I cannot conceal from you what I think; and therefore I shall say, I believe this defence is maintained on the footing and presumption, that you are a prejudiced Jury,—not that you are so individually—but he knows that a Jury, in this country, must be composed of Protestants, and those alone; and he says, he is vindicating Protestantism against the Catholics; and he relies upon this, that we are not so reduced, that justice cannot be done in this country, even by a respectable well-educated Jury, in such a case. If the parties were exchanged, he would shrink from the case altogether.

"Having explained to you the grounds upon which this action rests, I rely upon your candour and justice, and upon your oaths, that that circumstance to which I have alluded, will make no odds in your verdict.

"I believe the defender intends to attempt to prove, that he was at least guilty of believing and of saying no more than one half of the town of Glasgow believed and said. The stories might be false; but they were generally spoken of, and believed.

"I say, first, the statement is not true, in point of fact.

"What impressions exist now, as to Mr Scott, I appeal to the pamphlet what they must be. It would be very odd, indeed, that, after such writing, Mr Scott's character should be as it was. But, I do not believe the defender will prove that, prior to the date of his publication, there was the least prejudice against Mr Scott. Then the more prejudice there is since against him, the more signal should be your damages.

"You will observe, moreover, I cannot admit, and the law does not admit, that because a man's character is affected by calumnies whispered about the street, people are therefore entitled to publish them, and give them dates and names. Here there are reports every day about characters that are doubtful, and about others that are not at all doubtful; and, as to general rumours, no man of sense cares any thing about them. But that is no excuse for a person going about getting all the stories he can, and raising up a tissue of printed and circulated stories, after which it is scarcely possible for the mind refusing belief to them.

"Therefore, whatever length this plea may go, in extenuation of damages, it is no defence at all: nor is it an extenuation; for no such report existed, till Mr M'Gavin created and gave it force.

"In these circumstances, we are entitled to signal damages from your hands. Every farthing given of the damages asked, could not re-

store Mr Scott to the respectability and comfort he enjoyed before.

"As to the other defenders, we have nothing to say at all. The Editorship and the Printing are admitted; and although the other defenders may not have been actuated by the motives of Mr M'Gavin, they are also liable in damages. Therefore, your verdict may divide the damages among them as you please; but, in justice and in law, we are entitled to have a verdict against the whole defenders."

EVIDENCE FOR THE PURSUER.

BISHOP CAMERON examined by MR JEFFREY.

Q. You are a Roman Catholic Bishop, I believe?—A. Yes.

Q. Are you the superior and ecclesiastical resident head of that establishment in Scotland?—A. In the Lowlands of Scotland.

Q. Which includes the Diocese of Glasgow?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know Mr Scott?—A. I do.

Q. He is the officiating clergyman at Glasgow, I understand?—A. He is.

Q. How long has he been there, do you recollect?—A. I do not recollect.

Q. Has he been the sole Roman Catholic clergyman there?—A. The sole.

Q. He has no colleague?—A. None.

Q. You recollect the building of the new chapel in Glasgow?—A. Perfectly well.

Q. Are you aware Mr Scott took an interest in collecting the funds by which it was partly raised?—A. Yes, he did.

Q. There also is a Manse or dwelling for the Priest, for which contributions were made?—A. There is.

Q. Has Mr Scott any fixed or vested right in that living?—A. He is liable to be moved at pleasure—he may be moved from it in a moment.

Q. At the pleasure of his ecclesiastical superior?—A. At the pleasure of his ecclesiastical superior.

Q. Has he any patrimonial interest in the seat rents?—A. He has none whatever.

Q. Has he any pecuniary or patrimonial interest in the property, either of the chapel or dwelling-house?—A. He has none.

Q. He is paid by a fixed salary?—A. He has a fixed salary.

Q. May I ask the amount?—A. I cannot exactly say—it is £50 or £60. It was originally, in his predecessor's time, £30. I thought that little, and I made it then £40. Then I brought it to £50; and I afterwards brought it, I think, to £60. I am sure it is not higher.

Q. Is the number of Catholics great at Glasgow?—A. Those who attend their religious duties are about 2,000. The number of nominal Roman Catholics, I have been told, may amount to 14,000, 15,000, or 18,000. I have heard it carried that length.

Q. Do you consider it a most laborious charge?—A. Yes,—the most laborious which any Roman Catholic clergyman in Scotland has.

Q. Do you know whether Mr Scott felt the labour too great for him, and applied to be removed from the charge?—A. I do not know that he applied for removal, and I am not conscious I have any other person, whom I could put in that place, to perform all the duties of it as he has done.

Q. The dwelling-house is larger than is necessary for the accommodation of a single Priest, I understand?—A. It was built with a view to two at least, because two are absolutely necessary, if they could be supported there.

Q. Does Mr. Scott occupy the whole of that house?—A. He does not.

Q. Was there ever any application made for his being moved to a smaller dwelling?—A. There was, from himself.

Q. And to what purpose then would the house be applied?—A. The rent was to pay the interest of debt contracted, and pay off part of the debt.

Q. The rent was not to be applied by him for his own interest?—A. Not at all.

Q. Had you any duty to perform in auditing the accounts of the chapel?—A. I had a right, which I exercised for some years while the building was going on.

Q. Were you satisfied with the collection and distribution of the funds?—A. I was.

Q. Do the rules or principles of your faith justify refusing the ordinances to those refusing to pay, or contribute, towards the building of the chapel?—A. No. Whatever temporary obligation they had made, could be no reason for refusing any of the Sacraments to any of the congregation.

Q. If a complaint had been made of refusal to baptize, would that have been proceeded upon?—A. I should have considered myself obliged to suspend the clergyman.

Q. Is it generally known among Catholics, that the officiating Priest is liable to be complained upon to his superior?—A. I suppose it is universally known, among even the most ignorant.

Q. Were any complaints ever made to you against Mr Scott?—A. Never.

Q. Never for refusal of baptism?—A. Never.

Q. Are there grounds or reasons for which clergymen are justified or directed to refuse baptism, as in the case of an improper marriage?—A. Mr Scott's predecessor was in the habit of refusing baptism of children of parents who could not show they were married; and, perhaps, that may have been done by others, though I do not know that it has. The common discipline of our church is, that, when baptism is applied for, the father, the head of the family, has it in his power to have the baptism by whom he pleases. If he be absent,

or is not a Roman Catholic, then the mother applies. Whether the child is lawful or not, we always baptize the child.

Q. I understand you to say, that in the time of the predecessor of Mr Scott, some delay or hesitation had occurred as to baptism?—A. It certainly did occur. I cannot say I did approve of it.

Q. It came to your knowledge by complaint?—A. Not by complaint. I only heard of his practice, which I did not approve of.

Q. Has there been any such refusal since Mr Scott has been incumbent?—A. I do not recollect of having heard of any.

Q. Have such as Mr Scott the power of allowing the chapel to be used to be preached in?—A. He cannot to any person not of the body of the Scotch Roman Catholic clergy. He cannot to any from France, England, or any other country than Scotland.

Q. Do you remember a person of the name of Murphy that preached there?—A. He had my authority to preach, not only there, but in any other chapel in this country. I was acquainted with him in Spain. He considered himself under obligations to me. He came to Scotland to visit me, and I gave him power to preach in Scotland.

Q. And after that permission, Mr Scott could not have refused him leave to preach in the chapel at Glasgow?—A. I do not conceive he could.

Q. You were not at Glasgow at the time he preached there?—A. No, I was not there at the time.

Q. Had you occasion to know something of a Catholic publication, called *The Vindicator?*—A. Yes, I remember of it, and seeing some numbers of it.

Q. Was that work approved of by the most respectable part of the Catholics in Scotland?—A. No,—nor has any work ever come from that author that has been approved of.

Q. I understand you did not approve of the principles and tone of that work?—A. Of nothing from that man. He has been the author of a periodical paper, which, I believe, no Roman Catholic clergyman in Scotland has subscribed for,—and of the four Vicars Apostolic in England, there is only one who took in any one of his papers, or subscribed for them. That is, Dr Milner.

Q. Do you happen to know whether Mr Scott approved of the *Vindicator?*—A. I am convinced he did not approve of it. I was against it, and against the controversy.

Q. Do you know he ever contributed to it?—A. I do not suppose he ever did.

Q. You have no reason to suppose he ever did?—A. No; on the contrary, I should think he did not.

Q. Do you know that there is a regular baptism-register kept in such a charge at Glasgow?—A. There ought to be.

Q. Such register is kept by your directions?—A. Yes.

Q. It is part of your duty to see it is complied with?—A. It is my duty.

Q. Is that the form in which such registers are kept? (A book was handed to the witness.)—A. This is the book, and this is the common form of the register. I see two certificates entered by myself.

Q. And it has the appearance of a regular register book of baptisms?—A. I know it is one. I know the handwriting of Mr Scott and my own.

Q. Is it his duty to keep the book?—A. It is his duty.

Q. And you observe some entries in your own handwriting, which you put in when you baptized children?—A. I must have done so. I do not recollect the circumstances at this time.

Q. Are you aware it is the practice to keep lists of the communicants at Easter?—A. It is.

Q. There is more solemnity in your church attached to that festival than to any other in the course of the year?—A. There is.

Q. And upon that occasion, it is the list that shows the persons that were in communion?—A. It is.

Q. Is it a part of the duty of the clergyman to keep those lists in his own hands?—A. No, I do not conceive it is. The list is only for himself, to know which of his people are attending to their duty. It is not part of his duty to submit it to his superior.

Q. Is it consistent with your knowledge, that the former chapel was a great deal too small?—A. It was a great deal too small. The present is small enough, and perhaps too small.

Cross-examined by Mr MONCREIFF.

Q. You said, in regard to the accounts for the erection of this chapel, that you had a right to control the accounts, and did so for some period?—A. I did, for several years, see them.

Q. They were sent you?—A. No;—I inspected them there, and put my name to them.

Q. What kind of accounts were they?—A. I do not understand the question.

Q. Was there a book of accounts?—A. There was.

Q. Did you put your name to that book?—A. I did, for some years.

Q. Did you put your name more than once?—A. I must have put my name two or three different years, or perhaps oftener. I do not recollect particularly.

Q. In this book, was an account kept of disbursements and receipts?—A. It was not kept in a commercial way. It showed what was spent, and what was got in, and how it was got in,—what was borrowed, &c.

Q. Did it appear, from the book, at what time the sums were received and given out?—A. It

must have appeared when they were given out. They did not come in regularly. When there was not money, there was a necessity to borrow.

Q. What like a book was that in appearance?—A. I cannot answer that question. I do not recollect at all. It is some years since I was there; and, from age and infirmity, I cannot rely upon my memory so much as to describe it to you.

Q. When you put your name to this book, did you put any docket upon it; did you write any thing?—A. I must certainly have done that; I must have given a declaration that I had examined the accounts, and that I approved of them. I do not recollect in what form this was done; but I must have done it.

Q. In whose possession was this book at the time you went over it?—A. In Mr Scott's.

Q. You mentioned, you knew Mr Murphy, and gave him authority to preach?—A. I did.

Q. Did you mean, he might have gone and insisted on leave to preach?—A. Very far from it.

Q. I suppose you meant, if Mr Scott asked him, he was in safety to do it?—A. That is what I mean.

Q. Do you remember what year it was when you last inspected that book?—A. I have no recollection of that whatever.

Q. Was the chapel finished by that time?—A. I think not; but I cannot say any thing upon that subject, as I do not recollect the particular time.

Q. You mentioned, when the baptism-register was shown you, you saw certificates written by yourself; did you observe what time that was?—A. When the book was in my hand, I believe, I observed; but I cannot repeat it now. (The book was again handed to the witness.) July 4th, and July 5th, 1813.

Mr JEFFREY—"I do not know that it is quite correct in my learned friend to examine as to the contents of the book. I conceive, he is not entitled to make a witness speak from memory to a written record."

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. Did the book contain the list of the whole of the private contributors, or only some of them?—A. Not any of them. I think I saw lists of them also, but on separate sheets.

Q. Did the books you mention contain an account of the progress of the seat rents?—A. I had a right to ask about them. I did—and I was informed of them,—but I do not recollect the amount.

(A list of private contributors having been handed to the witness.) Q. Is that the kind of separate papers you mentioned?—A. Yes.

Q. You saw no list of those who did not subscribe?—A. No, I did not.

Q. You have seen *The Protestant*?—A. I have, occasionally.

Q. You are aware of the particular passages, or most of them, which have given occasion to the present action?—A. I could not, upon oath, or any way, say positively as to them.

Q. I ask, whether the observations there, as to the conduct of those collecting the money, were understood by you as applying to Mr Scott?

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"When you read that paper, whom did you consider the observations applied to?"—A. I considered that paper a personal attack on Mr Scott

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. Do you mean to say, you understood the whole of that Protestant an attack on Mr Scott?—A. I have seen very little of it. Those are works I find very little amusement or instruction from.

LORD GILLIES—"Bishop Cameron, your examination being concluded, if you wish to remain in Court, take this seat on the Bench."

(Bishop Cameron took a seat on the Bench accordingly.)

Mr COCKBURN—"We called Bishop Cameron, as soon as I opened the case, not to detain him waiting in the witnesses' room.

"The copy of the work is admitted and given in, and we give in the defences and the libels. We also give in the *Chronicle* and papers where the controversy took place.

"We have given in the *Chronicle*—we now give in the letter written by Mr Scott to Mr Prentice, dated 31st July, 1818, requiring to know the name of the author. We give in Mr Prentice's answer.

"We give in the letter from the pursuer to the defender, requiring to know if he was the person alluded to in the paragraph quoted from the *Chronicle*.

"Then the defender's answer, 1st Aug. 1818. Another letter from the pursuer to the defender, dated Aug. 3d, requiring a direct answer to his query, with his answer.

"We gave in a copy of *The Protestant*, as originally published; but I now give in another edition, of a similar form, 3d edition of that work, No. 15 of Process.

"I give in the answers to the condescendence. There was one passage I read, and there is an article here, No. 9, I wish to read. 'The defender, upon inquiry, has discovered that there is a mistake in the statement of a child having died who was refused baptism. He believes that, in the case referred to, the child did not die, though, in that case, the child was very unwell, and apparently dying, which occasioned that mistake; and, so far as this circumstance may affect either the cause or the controversy in general, he acknowledges the fact.'"

JAMES O'CONNAR examined by Mr COCKBURN.

Q. What are you?—A. A cloth-lapper, in Glasgow.

Q. Are you a member of Mr Scott's congregation ?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you one of the members appointed to collect contributions to the new chapel ?—A. Yes.

Q. You have attended chapel regularly for some years ?—A. Yes.

Q. When that chapel was set a-going, was there a division of the congregation into districts for the collection of the contributions ?—A. Yes.

Q. Were there books as to the contributions ?—A. Yes.

Q. What kind of books ?—A. They were small books.

Q. Was this the kind of thing ? (A book was handed to the witness)—A. Yes,—they were of that size.

Q. Look inside.—A. This was the kind of books.

Q. Had you any instructions from Mr Scott how to proceed ?—A. Yes,—to take the names of those residing in the districts professing the Catholic religion, and to inquire what they would contribute for the purpose of building the chapel. He told me not to call on any person where there was sickness, and not to take from those who were low in circumstances.

Q. Was there intimation of this kind given to the congregation at large ?—A. It was in his house.

Q. But was there to the public ?—A. None, as to sickness. It was in consequence of my mentioning to Mr Scott, that there was a person sick in my district, that he gave me the instructions I have mentioned.

Q. And you also got instructions not to take from those who were poor at the time ?—A. Yes.

Q. Was that instruction given from the pulpit ?—A. I do not recollect. I never exacted;—sometimes they gave me, and on a Sunday.

Q. Was it, as far as you know, a voluntary contribution ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did Mr Scott ever threaten the refusal of ordinances ?—A. Never.

Q. It is Mr Scott's duty to visit the sick ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he decline that duty, except to those who subscribed to the chapel ?—A. No.

Q. Do you know instances of his visiting those who did not subscribe ?—A. To my knowledge, he visited those who did not subscribe, and those who were in arrear in payment of their contributions.

Q. And he came freely to them ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever receive instructions from Mr Scott to ask masters to retain the wages of men, in order to get their subscriptions ?—A. Never.

Q. Did you ever know that done ?—A. I never did.

Q. Did you ever hear Mr Scott request persons to get their children baptized, without reference to their subscriptions ?—A. Yes,—both in public and privately.

Q. Did you ever hear of a work called *The Protestant*, that was published in Glasgow ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever read it ?—A. A good deal of it at first. I purchased about thirty-seven numbers of it, and I afterwards got a reading of it from others.

Q. Did you apply it to Mr Scott ?—A. He was mentioned by name in some numbers, and alluded to in others. I considered the allusions were to him.

(A book of lists were shown to the witness.)

Q. Is that one of the lists ?—A. There have been collections entered there. I think it is.

Q. I observe all this crossed down here—do you know what this denotes ?—A. Some persons called once a fortnight, sometimes once a month, once a week, &c. Those columns denote different portions of time.

Q. What was the general time ? — A. I called once a fortnight.

Q. Was that the general time ?—A. I believe it was the most general time.

Q. Suppose there had been an arrear for a fortnight ?—A. I put in a figure for the sum I received. (Witness gave explanation as to the book.)

(Book handed to the Bench.)

Cross-examined by Mr. MONCREIFF.

Q. How many collectors were there ?—A. I do not know.

Q. Can you say nearly what number there was ?—A. There was a great many in the town and suburbs.

Q. Nearly how many ?—A. I should suppose more than twenty.

Q. Was there fifty ?—A. I cannot say whether there was or not. I cannot swear how many.

Q. You have said, that you have known Mr Scott visit the sick, and families where subscriptions had not been given, and families where arrears had not been paid up ?—A. I have known Mr Scott to visit in both cases.

Q. Do you mean in your own district ?—A. In my own district.

Q. You have heard Mr Scott recommend baptism in the chapel;—how long since it was built ?—A. Both before and after. I have been there eight or ten years. I have heard him frequently exhort the people to come forward and get their children baptized.

Q. Did you ever, upon any occasion, hear him state persons to be in arrear, from the pulpit ?—A. No,—I never did.

Q. Are you sure ?—A. Not for their being in arrear only,—it was for other actions. I have heard him mention names of persons who had given scandal. I have heard him mention persons who were spending their money and

drinking it foolishly, and say, those not paying to the chapel were those who were giving scandal.

Q. When was it you heard him say this?—A. In the course of the collection;—it was begun in 1813, and finished in 1816.

Q. Did he mention particular names?—A. I do not recollect the exact names.

Q. When he mentioned names of persons, did he allude to them only, or others?—A. He made no allusion to others.

Q. When you gave in the books, did he mark the money paid?—A. I read over the names and the money received, and he marked them for himself. I retained the book.

Q. Did he give you any acknowledgment for the money you had given in?—A. He did not. I marked the date in my book of receiving the money.

Q. Would you know it if you saw it?—A. I have my book here. I never gave it in.

Q. You had that book, and marked the dates of collecting. Tell us the times of making the collection from that book?—A. If you allow me to look at the book.

Lord Chief Commissioner—Q. That is not a book written since?—A. I carried it with me when I collected the money.

Mr Moncreiff—Q. Tell us as to the period. The place I am looking at just now, runs from the 9th of March, (carried forward from another part,) 1816?—A. That is the list—30th Nov. same year, was that I collected.

Q. Did you not collect any more after that?—A. Never for the chapel.

Q For any thing?—A. Yes,—a few shillings for the building of the house. I do not recollect so well as to that. I did not get much. I collected something in the summer of last year, I believe, to pay up the arrears of debt,—whether for the house or chapel I do not know. The only sum was two shillings last year.

Q. Were the other collectors going on at the same time?—A. I was told they were, in the summer, when the work people would be employed,—the month of June.

Q. Had you books before that?—A. I had similar to this one. I brought money forward in this one.

Q. Have you that other one with you?—A. I have a sheet which contains the names and the sums. There is nothing in the book—there is not a name in it. This is all that was in it,—that was torn out. I had taken the two last leaves out of the book, which lessened this. There is no other writing in the book than that which I have.

Mr Jeffrey—Q. You began at 1813?—A. Yes.

Mr Moncreiff—Q. Will you be so good as put in those books and papers?

(They were given to the Clerk of Court.)

Lord Chief Commissioner—"You asked the witness as to *The Protestant*, but without referring to the particular passages upon which you found. You ought to prove that the witnesses understand that the passages referred to, were meant to be applied to the pursuer."

Mr Cockburn—Q. There is no other Roman Catholic clergyman in Glasgow?—A. None that take charge of the congregation.

Q. Is there any other of the name of Scott?—A. None.

Q. You took in the first thirty-six numbers of *The Protestant?*—A. Yes.

Q. And you said there were certain passages of it that applied to Mr Scott?—A. Yes.

Q. Injuriously, and against Mr Scott?—A. Yes.

Q. There are a parcel of passages there—look at them.

(The Issues were handed to the witness.)

Lord Chief Commissioner—"From the practice of keeping witnesses out of Court, there is some disadvantage. The first and whole gist of the matter is, that what is charged as libel, must, in the understanding of mankind, known to the person libelled, be held as meant of that person. The witnesses, therefore, as they come up, having heard the libel, and being asked, whom they understand it referred to; they say it did, or did not, refer to the person in question; and that evidence goes to the Jury. Now, as the witnesses are not here, some method must be taken, to put before them that as to which they are to be asked questions."

Witness—"I have looked at two passages, in which Mr Scott's name is not mentioned; but I think that it is Mr Scott that is meant and referred to. 'Now it is a fact, that, while the chapel was a-building, the people, while they yet met in their old place of worship, were assured by their *ghostly father*,'—(the following is at the bottom of the page: 'This phrase is not used as a term of reproach. Ghostly is the old English word for spiritual; and, according to the Douay Catechism, ghostly father is the title by which the clergy choose to be called,')—'that such of them as fell behind in their payments, should not enjoy church privileges. What was this, but extorting money through the fear of future punishment? And from the condition of many of those from whom it was so extorted, who can doubt that they had often scarcely food for their families, or clothes to cover them? Every one knows in what estimation Papists regard the privileges of their church. To be denied these, is the same as to be denied the salvation of their souls. The poor, therefore, were told, in language sufficiently plain, that, if the chapel tax was not punctually paid, they should suffer the pains of purgatory, or even hell itself.'

"I think Mr Scott was alluded to as the ghostly father in that passage.

"And the other passage is—

"'A man, who now lives out of the city, was assessed in a weekly sum for building the chapel. During the dull trade, he fell back with regard to his payments. His family, however, continued to increase; and when he went to his ghostly father, to get a child baptized, he was asked, How he stood with regard to his payments? He confessed, what he could not deny, that, during the hard times, he had fallen behind. He was ordered to go about his business; and told that his child should not be baptized, till he had paid every farthing that he was due. Before he was able to raise the necessary sum, the child died; and the father was left to suffer all the misery, which such a circumstance would occasion to one, who considered baptism necessary to the salvation of his child.'

"I understand those passages to apply to Mr Scott.

Mr MONCREIFF—"Look at the passages on the first page of the Issues, beginning, 'But this is not all. I ask A. V. if that house (meaning the new Catholic chapel) was not built, in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and, in some instances, a starving people?' Suppose you saw that passage, and no other, would you understand that to apply to Mr Scott?"

Mr JEFFREY—"Is Mr Scott there accused of extortion—'I ask him if money was not extorted, by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow?'"

WITNESS—"I consider the passage as applying to Mr Scott. It goes on: 'The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering; and will he accept, as honourable to him, that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared, be inscribed upon its front, and it will remain for "ages to come" a monument of Popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.' That I consider as applying to Mr Scott. I know no other person it could apply to, but him, if there was wrong.

"May I now go? I have instructions from my employers, to return as soon as the examination should be over."

JAMES BOWMAN examined by MR JEFFREY.

Q. You belong to the congregation of Catholics in Glasgow?—A. Yes.

Q. How long have you belonged to that congregation?—A. Upwards of twenty years.

Q. Do you remember the old chapel?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it large enough to hold the congregation?—A. By no means.

Q. Do you remember the new chapel a-building?—A. Yes.

Q. Was part of the funds raised by contributions from the people?—A. Yes.

Q. Were there collectors of the contributions appointed?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you one?—A. Yes; but I did not collect long.

Q. Was the scheme of collecting, in that way, announced by Mr Scott, or any body, to the congregation at large?—A. It was, by Mr Scott.

Q. He told of the scheme of collectors?—A. Yes.

Q. Were instructions given to those collectors?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember the nature of them?—A. To see what Catholics were in the districts, and call upon them for what they might be pleased to give.

Q. Was there any thing said about the class of persons from whom the contributions should be taken, or from whom they should not be asked?—A. I do not recollect.

Q. Any thing about the sick?—A. I never understood persons in distress of any kind were to give any thing

Q. Was any thing said by Mr Scott about that?—A. I remember getting that instruction from himself.

Q. Did you ever hear Mr Scott say, or was it any part of his instructions to you, that persons should not be admitted to church privileges who would not contribute?—A. Never.

Q. Do you know, whether in point of fact, those who did not contribute, were admitted to church privileges?—A. I know perfectly well many, who did not contribute, who got church privileges.

Q. And the same was the case as to those who subscribed, and failed to pay?—A. So far as I know.

Q. Are you a regular attender of church?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever hear Mr Scott threaten or denounce any consequences, spiritual or temporal, upon those who would not subscribe?—A. Never.

Q. There were no threats?—A. No threats.

Q. In so far as you were instructed, or carried through the subscription, was it compulsory, or voluntary?—A. I neither had instructions to compel any one, nor did compel any one.

Q. Do you recollect when the chapel was finished?—A. In December, 1816.

Q. And then the seats were let?—A. Not till February after.

Q. Did those who subscribed the most, get a preference in choosing seats?—A. Yes; if they were present.

Q. Were any seats reserved for those who

did not contribute at all?—A. Yes; a hundred.

Q. To ascertain those who did contribute in 1816, was any summation or abstract made of the amount of such subscriptions?—A. I was employed to do that myself.

Q. Mr Scott superintended?—A. Yes.

Q. Was that done with a view to give a preference as to the seats?—A. Yes.

Q. What were the classes?—A. Those who subscribed ten pounds and upwards, were in one class. Another class of subscribers, was of those who gave from ten to seven pounds. Then there was a class of those from seven to five pounds;—then from five to four pounds;—from four to three pounds;—from three to two pounds;—from two to one pound;—from one pound to ten shillings;—from ten shillings to five shillings. None were entitled to preferences who subscribed under five shillings.

(Books were handed to the witness.)

WITNESS—My summing up is here.

Q. You summed up at the end of each of those articles?—A. I did.

Q. When those abstracts were made from these summings up of yours, were they exhibited, or left to be examined?—A. They were all open during the letting of the seats.

Q. Where?—A. They were lying in the middle of the chapel.

Q. Was notice given that they were there?—A. Eight or twelve days before.

Q. And of course any body might inspect them?—A. Yes. Some weeks were allowed to give a chance to those who had ever given any thing to the building of the old chapel; as what was given to the old chapel was taken to account.

Q. And the benefit that was given was, that they were to be preferred in the getting of seats?—A. Yes.

Q. And the seats were at last let upon that principle?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever hear any complaint of persons not having enough put down for them, and not getting their seats?—A. Never upon that ground. The calling of the names took longer than was expected; many were passed over; they complained for three years and a half.

Q. That many got before them for being present?—A. Yes.

Q. You were employed to sum up, and make the abstracts,—did you attend during the whole of the letting of the seats?—A. Yes.

Q. And you have heard no one complain of being stated short of what he subscribed?—A. I never heard one complain of it.

Q. You were lately required to look at the abstracts you had made; and were required to arrange them in other abstracts?—A. I was.

(After looking over some productions presented to him.)

WITNESS—This is my hand—This is another in my hand—This is a third in my hand.

Q. Those you made from the same books in which you saw your own summations?—A. Yes.

Q. And those are correct abstracts?—A. Yes.

Q. You did your best to make them so?—A. I did; and I believe them to be correct.

Mr JEFFREY—By far the largest class of subscribers is that of those who, in the three years, paid no more than five shillings?

WITNESS—We did not give a preference to any subscribers under five shillings.

Mr JEFFREY—Q. One of those is an abstract, entitled, "Note from the Baptismal Register," by which it appears 108 had been baptized in one year, some of whose parents had paid for the chapel, and others had not. You made that by comparing the Abstract Lists with the Baptismal Register?—A. I did. I think I counted fifty-nine one year, that had children baptized, that had never paid a farthing.

Mr JEFFREY—Difference between 59 and 108, 49 in all.

I wish to lay before the jury the tenor of one of those Abstracts. This is the general Abstract of sums collected from the commencement down till March, 1817.

£10 and upwards	27
£10 to £7	45
£7 to £5	61
£5 to £4	168
£4 to £3	248
£3 to £2	401
£2 to £1	749
£1 to 10s.	692
10s. to 5s.	597
Under 5s.	1049
Number of contributors,	4037*
Those who have contributed nothing,	480
Total number in the books,	4517

Which comes down to from ten pounds to one pound;—from one pound to ten shillings;—from ten shillings to five shillings. The number of those who subscribed under five shillings, was a thousand and forty-nine persons. The total number of subscribers was four thousand and thirty-seven. But there were persons who had contributed nothing. The

* From another production it appears, that the sum contributed by these 4037 persons, during the time specified, was £5487 9s. 9d.; which, together with £426 3s. makes the sum of £5913, (throwing out the shillings,) mentioned by Mr Cockburn, in page 17, near the bottom. The £426 3s. is upon a separate list. It is the amount of what was subscribed in large sums, partly, or chiefly by Protestants, including Mr Finlay's 50 guineas. The other sum of £5487 9s. 9d. was raised in small sums, according to the above scale, from under five shillings and upward. There seems to be some confusion in reporting the conclusion of the last paragraph in page 17. It is supposed, it should be read thus: "So there remains, as subscribed by all the Catholics in the West of Scotland, £5487, *and* £426, subscribed chiefly by Protestants." This explanation seems necessary to make the passage intelligible.

defaulters must have been extremely numerous in the three years and a half. There is also an Abstract of those who have contributed to the Roman Catholic Establishment in Glasgow, since the opening of the new chapel, to December, 1820, under their respective sums; and likewise of those who are in the lists, but have contributed nothing during that period. Extracted from the Collection Books.

20s. and upwards,	95
20s. to 15s.	49
15s. to 10s.	319
10s. to 5s.	608
Under 5s.	1625
	2696*
Those who have paid nothing,	1261
Total,	3957

Q. You have seen a publication called *The Protestant?*—A. I did read it regularly for twelve months.

Q. There is a paper I hand to you, that contains certain quotations from it. Look at that passage, said to have been inserted in the *Glasgow Chronicle*, and reprinted in *The Protestant.* I ask, whom did you understand to be the person accused of robbery and extortion in that passage?—A. I understood the Rev. Andrew Scott.

Q. There are various other passages, mentioning "ghostly father;" whom did you understand by that?—A. Mr Scott.

Q. Was there any Catholic clergyman in Glasgow, but Mr Scott?—A. None resident there.

Cross-examined by Mr MONCREIFF.

Q. Were you twelve months a collector?—A. It might be a little more, or a little less.

Q. What year was it?—A. At the commencement.

Q. You were not a collector in the year 1816?—A. I was not.

Q. How did you come to be employed to compare the list of baptisms with the list of contributors?—A. I was told that it might be of use, in case of any prosecution.

Q. When was it?—A. Within twelve months last past.

Q. Who desired you to do it?—A. Mr Scott.

Q. It was at the beginning of the collection you were employed as a collector; when was it?—A. 1813.

Q. How did you come to give up your collection?—A. My business called me from town.

Q. Where were you?—A. About four miles from Glasgow.

Q. Did you not resume the business of collecting, when you came back?—A. I did not.

Q. Then you do not know personally what was done in the collection after that?—A. I do not.

Q. Did you ever see a pamphlet, called *The Catholic Vindicator?*—A. I have.

Q. Had you any concern with it yourself?—A. None.

Q. Were you a member of a committee of management?—A. I was a member towards the end of it. I signed a paper to bear part of the expense if any loss was incurred.

Q. When was that?—A. Just before it was given up entirely.

Q. Did you get that paper regularly?—A. I did.

Q. Did you find any thing in it reflecting on Mr M'Gavin?—A. O! very much.

Q. You know there was a committee in Glasgow managed that paper?—A. O! yes; I believe there was.

Q. Did you know any of the members?—A. Yes, I knew several.

Q. Were they members of Mr Scott's congregation?—A. Yes.

Q. Have they any office in the congregation?—A. No office there.

Q. Were they elders or deacons?—A. There are none in the Catholic Church, that I know of.

Q. Were any of them collectors?—A. They might be—I do not know whether they were or not—I dare say they were.

Q. Did you ever see any placard put up about Mr M'Gavin?—A. Yes, I have seen hand-bills announcing *The Catholic Vindicator.*

Q. Did they mention Mr M'Gavin?—A. I do not think it named him.

Q. Did it mention *The Protestant?*—A. It certainly mentioned *The Protestant;* there is no doubt of that.

Q. When you made your collection, did you give in the money to Mr Scott?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he mark it in a book?—A. He did.

Q. How often did you give it in?—A. Once a fortnight.

Q. Was any note made of the times you gave it in?—A. Every one was marked in the proper column.

Q. Was there a date of year and month?—A. I do not recollect the date. Some of them were numbered.

Q. Did you get any acknowledgment of the sum?—A. No acknowledgment, but causing it to be marked in his book.

Q. Have you that book?—A. I have not;—the person after me got that book.

Q. Did you ever see a placard like that?

(A placard was shown to the witness.)

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"How do you mean to apply it?"

Mr MONCREIFF—"There are different ways

* It appears by another production, that the total sum subscribed by these 2696 persons, from March, 1817, to December, 1820, was only £687 18s. 3d.; making the total amount of subscriptions, down to the end of 1820, only £663l. 11s.

of applying it. I am cross-examining their witness."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"Very well."

WITNESS—"I have seen something like that."

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. Do you see "*The Protestant*, a defender of adultery?"—A. I do.

Q. About what time was *The Vindicator* given up?—A. I do not recollect. After it had continued about twelve months.

Q. When did you subscribe?—A. It might be a little before it ceased.

Q. Can you give the names of the members of that Committee that you know?—A. I never was at any of their meetings. I only knew them by report.

Q. Did they ever tell you themselves they were members of the Committee?—A. I dare say they did.

Q. Who did so?—A. A brother of mine.

Q. What is his name?—A. A—— Bowman.

Q. Do you remember any more?—A. I do not recollect any more.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Q. It appears, from your evidence, there were fifty-nine who had children baptized, who had never paid any thing to the chapel?—A. Yes.

Q. And that there were forty-nine persons who had paid?—A. Yes.

Q. Had you access to know, that at the time of the baptisms, Mr Scott knew part were subscribers and part not?—A. I have no doubt he knew.

Q. How?—A. He was personally known to most of his people.

Mr COCKBURN—"There was a declaration taken in London, from the editor and publisher of *The Vindicator*, William Eusebius Andrews, which I wish read."

(One of the Clerks of Court read the Commission, and another the Report. The Commission and Report are here given in the order in which they were read.)

"George the Fourth, by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, to James Chalmers, Esquire, of the city of Westminster, Solicitor, whom failing by absence or otherwise, to Charles Berry, Esquire, of the said city, Solicitor, greeting: Know ye, that we, in confidence of your prudence and fidelity, have appointed you, and by these presents do give unto you severally, full power and authority to examine William Eusebius Andrews, Printer in London, a witness, to be adduced for the pursuer in the Issues directed in the cause in which the Reverend Andrew Scott, Roman Catholic Clergyman in Glasgow, is pursuer, and William M'Gavin, merchant in Glasgow, William Sym, Clerk in the Glasgow Town's Hospital, and Andrew and James Duncan, Printers in Glasgow, are Defenders, to be tried before our Lords Commissioners of the Jury Court in civil causes, in that part of Great Britain called Scotland, pursuant to an Act of Parliament, passed in the fifty-fifth year of the reign of His late Majesty, entituled, 'An Act to facilitate the administration of justice in Scotland, by extending trial by Jury to civil causes;' and of another Act, passed in the fifty-ninth year of His late Majesty, entituled, 'An Act to amend an Act, passed in the fifty-fifth year of His present Majesty, entituled, An Act to facilitate the administration of justice in that part of the United Kingdom called Scotland, by extending trial by Jury to civil causes.' And therefore we command you, the said James Chalmers, Esquire, and you, the said Charles Berry, Esquire, in the event foresaid, That, on or before the twentieth day of June instant, at a certain day and place, to be appointed by you, or such of you as may act in virtue hereof for that purpose, you, or either of you, cause the said witness to come before you, and then and there examine him, upon the interrogatories settled and attached to this commission, on his oath, to be taken before you, according to the form of the oath first indorsed hereupon, and that you reduce such his examination to writing, on paper or parchment; and when so taken, send the same, without delay, to the Lords Commissioners of our Jury Court at Edinburgh, closed up under your seal, together with the said interrogatories, and this writ to be deposited with one of the Clerks of the said Jury Court, in the Register House, Edinburgh. And we further command you, and either of you, who may propose to act in pursuance hereof, that before you act in, or be present at the swearing or examining said witness, you take the second oath hereupon indorsed. And we farther command, that all and every the Clerk or Clerks employed in taking writing, transcribing, or engrossing the deposition, or depositions, of said witness, shall, before he or they be permitted to act as such Clerk or Clerks as aforesaid, severally take the third oath hereupon indorsed. And we also give you full power and authority to administer such oath to such Clerk or Clerks.

"Given under the Seal of our Jury Court, for the Trial of Civil Causes, at Edinburgh, the eighth day of June, in the second year of our reign, 1821.

(Signed) J. OSBURN BROWN.
2d Clerk of the Jury Court."

First oath to be administered to the witness.

You swear by God, and as you shall answer to God, at the great day of judgment, that you will true answer make to all such questions as shall be asked you; and that the evidence which you shall give, shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

N. B. This oath to be adapted to the religious persuasions of the respective parties taking the same.

Second oath, by the Commissioner, to be

taken before the Chief Magistrate of the place where the Commission is opened.

You swear by God, and as you shall answer to God, at the great day of judgment, that you will, according to the best of your skill and knowledge, truly and faithfully, and without partiality to any or either of the parties in this cause, take the examination and deposition of William Eusebius Andrews, the witness to be produced and examined by virtue of the Commission within written, upon the interrogatories attached thereto, or other questions arising therefrom. (Signed) J. O. B.

Third oath, by the Clerk or Clerks appointed to take down the evidence, to be taken before the Commissioner.

You swear by God, and as you shall answer to God, at the great day of judgment, that you will truly and faithfully, and without partiality to any or either of the parties in this cause, take and write down, transcribe, and engross the depositions of all and every witness and witnesses produced before and examined by the Commissioners, or any of them named in the Commission within written, as far forth as you are directed and employed by the said Commissioners, or any of them, to take down, write, or engross the said depositions.

(Signed) J. O. B.

The following is the oath taken by Mr Chalmers.

At Westminster, the fifteenth day of June, in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty-one. In presence of Edward Markland, Esquire, acting Magistrate of the Police Office, in Queen Square, Westminster, appeared James Chalmers, of Abington Street, Westminster, the person hereby named, Commissioner by the Jury Court in Scotland, and made oath in the form prescribed, by the terms of this Commission, page sixth.

(Signed) JAS. CHALMERS.

Sworn before me, at the Public Office, Queen Square, Westminster, this 15th day of June, 1821.

(Signed) ED. MARKLAND, J. P.

The following is the introduction to the Report, in return to the above-mentioned writ or Commission.

At London, the eighteenth day of June, in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty-one—

In prosecution of his Majesty's writ, bearing date the eighth day of the present month and year, addressed to James Chalmers, Esquire, of the city of Westminster, Solicitor, giving authority to him to examine William Eusebius Andrews, printer in London, a witness adduced for the pursuer in the Issues directed in the cause, in which the Reverend Andrew Scott is pursuer, and William M'Gavin, and others, are defenders, the said James Chalmers, having previously made oath, as directed by the writ or commission, made choice of George Alexander Mazzoni, his Clerk, to take and write the deposition of the witness, and administered to him the oath prescribed by the writ; and, being attended by David Robertson, of Sackville Street, Solicitor for the pursuer, and John Richardson, of Fludyer Street, Solicitor for the defender and also by the witness, William Eusebius Andrews, who swore the oath directed by the writ to be administered to him, in the precise terms thereof, the said James Chalmers did proceed to the examination of the witness, and caused his answers to the several interrogatories to be taken down as followeth.

Signed) JAS. CHALMERS, *Comr.*
GEORGE A. MAZZONI, *Clerk.*

One of the Clerks of Court then read the interrogatories singly, and another of the Clerks of Court the answer to each of the interrogatories, as it was read, as follows:

Interrogatories to be administered to William Eusebius Andrews, printer in London, a witness to be produced, sworn, and examined on the part and behalf of the Reverend Andrew Scott, Roman Catholic clergyman in Glasgow, pursuer, in a certain cause now depending in the Jury Court, at Edinburgh, against William M'Gavin, merchant in Glasgow, William Sym, Clerk in the Glasgow Town's Hospital, and A. and J. Duncan, printers in Glasgow, defenders, before
of the same Court, pursuant to an order of the same Court, made on the 23d day of May, 1821, in the second year of the reign of King George the Fourth.

In primis. Do you know the parties, pursuer and defenders, in the title of these interrogatories named, or either, and which of them; and how long have you known them, or either, and which of them? Declare the truth and your knowledge therein.

Appeared William Eusebius Andrews, printer in London, a witness adduced for the pursuer, on the cause mentioned in the Commission, who, being solemnly sworn, purged of malice and partial counsel, examined upon the interrogatories pressed in the Commission.

1st. In answer to the *first* interrogatory, depones, That he recollects to have seen the pursuer, Mr Scott, twice, but cannot recollect how long ago. That he does not know any of the defenders: depones, That he has written against one of the defenders, M'Gavin, and that he is not personally acquainted with the pursuer, farther than as above deponed to.

2*do.* Was the witness the author, printer, and publisher of a periodical work called *The Catholic Vindicator?*

2d. To the *second* interrogatory, depones and answers in the affirmative.

3*tio.* Did the witness subscribe his name and address to each of the numbers of this work, while it continued to be published, and write the text in the first person?

3d. To the *third* interrogatory, depones and

answers, That he did subscribe his name to each of the numbers, and wrote the text in the first person, but that his address was printed in terms of the Act of Parliament as the printer.

4*to*. Where was this work printed, and when was it commenced, and when was it discontinued?

4th. To the *fourth* interrogatory, depones and answers, That the said work was printed in London: That the work was commenced on the fifth day of December, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighteen, and it was discontinued on the fourth day of December in the following year.

5*to*. Was the witness resident in London, and did he compose his said periodical work there, during the time it continued to be published?

5th. To the *fifth* interrogatory, answers and depones in the affirmative.

6*to*. Did the witness, at any time, receive any paragraph or communication to be printed and published in *The Catholic Vindicator*, from the Rev. Andrew Scott, pursuer in this cause, or of which he understood Mr Scott to be the author,—or had the witness any correspondence with Mr Scott in reference to its publication or circulation?

6th. To the *sixth* interrogatory, and every part thereof, depones and answers in the negative.

7*mo*. Had the witness an opportunity of knowing from his booksellers, or those who attended to the circulation and sale of *The Catholic Vindicator*, — that this periodical work was encouraged by the pursuer; or did he, on the contrary, understand that the pursuer had discouraged it?

7th. To the *seventh* interrogatory, answers and depones, That he has heard from persons concerned in the circulation and sale of "*The Catholic Vindicator*," that the pursuer, Mr Scott, had spoken favourably of it as a work of controversy; but before the work was concluded, the deponent understood Mr Scott to have endeavoured to injure the circulation of it,—but the deponent declines, and does not consider himself obliged to name the persons from whom he so heard; but that both the reports came from the same quarter.

8*to*. Had the witness access to know, whether or not the pursuer, Mr Scott, was one of the subscribers for the numbers of *The Catholic Vindicator*, while they continued to be published?

8th. To the *eighth* interrogatory, depones and answers, That he does not know that the pursuer, Mr Scott, was one of the subscribers for the numbers of *The Catholic Vindicator*, while they continued to be published.

Lastly,—That it shall be competent to the Commissioner, to put any question, or questions, to the witness, touching the matter in the cause, besides what they have been interrogated into, by the interrogatories and cross-interrogatories; and to require the witness to make such addition and explanations as he shall think necessary. That it shall be competent to the Commissioner to ask the witness whether he knows of any other matter, or thing, touching the matters in question in the cause, besides what he has been interrogated into. If yea, to declare the same, fully and at large, as if he had been particularly interrogated thereto.

Being interrogated by the Commissioner, at what time it was he saw Mr Scott, as above deponed to, depones and answers, That it was during the time that the publication was going forward, and, as he supposes, about the middle or towards the close of it.

Cross interrogatories to be put to William Eusebius Andrews, printer in London, In the action at the instance of the Rev. Andrew Scott, Roman Catholic Clergyman in Glasgow, *against* William M'Gavin, &c.

In primis. Was *The Catholic Vindicator* meant and intended to be an answer to *The Protestant*, or to certain numbers of it? and if so, specify the numbers.

1st. To the *first* of the cross interrogatories depones, and answers, That the work called *The Catholic Vindicator* was meant and intended to be an answer to a work entitled *The Protestant* generally, and not to any particular number.

2*do*. Were you solicited by others to write or publish such a work, and by whom? In particular, were you solicited to begin, or afterwards to carry on, this work by any Catholic or Catholics in Glasgow?

2d. To the *second* interrogatory depones and answers, That he was solicited to write and publish *The Catholic Vindicator*, but declines saying by whom—only, that he was not so solicited by the pursuer, Mr Scott, but he was so applied to by certain Catholics in Glasgow.

3*tio*. Did any of the Catholics in Glasgow agree to purchase, or to circulate a certain number of the said work; or did they come under any obligation to induce you to commence, or to continue the carrying on of this publication: and if so, name the person, or persons, and produce any agreement, or letters relative to such agreement or obligation?

3d. To the *third* cross interrogatory, depones and answers, That certain Catholics in Glasgow, did agree to take a certain quantity of copies of each number of the work, in order to indemnify the deponent, against any particular loss by the publication in Scotland; but the pursuer, Mr Scott, was not one of these; but the deponent declines to answer who they were, considering it as a private transaction.

4*to*. If Mr Andrews, in answer to Query 7th

of the Interrogatories in chief, shall answer that the pursuer discouraged the publication of *The Catholic Vindicator;* let him be asked, in what manner, and by whom the pursuer expressed such discouragement, and in what terms he did so; and if by letter, produce the letters referring to that matter.

4th. To the *fourth* cross interrogatory, depones and answers, That he received a letter when the publication was going forward stating, that Mr Scott had expressed himself in strong terms against the deponent; and had said, that *The Catholic Vindicator* must be discouraged, else the Catholics would be implicated in the opinions of the deponent: That the deponent has the letter; but, considering it a private communication, he declines to produce it.

5*to*. Was *The Catholic Vindicator* encouraged and approved of, by a respectable part of the British Catholics? If so, name those by whom such approbation was given; and state how it was so given?

5th. To the *fifth* interrogatory, depones and answers, That *The Catholic Vindicator* was approved of by respectable English Catholics; but the deponent cannot say that it was encouraged, as it did not succeed. And the deponent declines to name those persons.

6*to*. Does the witness know, that the publishing of the different numbers of *The Catholic Vindicator* was announced by hand-bills in Glasgow, with certain references to the Work, called *The Protestant*, and the author of that Work? Was this done at his desire, or with his concurrence?

6th. To the *sixth* cross interrogatory, depones and answers, That he believes the publication of the different numbers of *The Catholic Vindicator* was announced by hand-bills in Glasgow; because the deponent printed those hand-bills, and sent them down with the Work to Glasgow; and that those hand-bills contained references to the work called *The Protestant*, and to the author of that work. All which is truth, as he shall answer to God.

(Signed) WILLIAM EUSEBIUS ANDREWS.
JAS. CHALMERS, *Comr.*
GEORGE A. MAZZONI, *Clerk.*

This and the four preceding pages contain the Return to the writ or commission, mentioned in the first page, or introduction.

(Signed) JAS. CHALMERS, *Comr.*
GEORGE A. MAZZONI, *Clerk.*

Mr JEFFREY—'To the answer to the fourth query, I wish the attention of the Jury to be directed; and I request it be read again.'

4*to*. "Where was this Work printed, and when was it commenced, and when was it discontinued?

4th. "To the *fourth* interrogatory, depones and answers, That the said Work was printed in London. That the work was commenced on the fifth day of December, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighteen; and it was discontinued on the fourth day of December in the following year.

JOHN LOCHRIE examined by Mr COCKBURN.

Q. You were one of the collectors of contributions for building the Roman Catholic chapel at Glasgow?—A. I was.

Q. How long was you a collector?—A. I cannot pointedly recollect.

Q. Was it during the whole time of the building of the chapel?—A. It might be so.

Q. Did you receive instruction from Mr Scott, when you were appointed a collector?—A. I cannot say particularly. I got general instructions to go to those of the same religion about me, who were willing to contribute.

Q. Did you get instructions to urge persons to subscribe?—A. Not any.

Q. Did you ever hear Mr Scott in church point out any who did not subscribe?—A. Not any.

Q. Do you attend church?—A. Pretty often.

Q. Where was your district of collection?—A. Eight miles from Glasgow.

Q. Did Mr Scott ever visit persons in your district who did not subscribe?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever hear him refuse to baptize any children because their parents did not subscribe?—A. Never.

Q. Did you know him baptize in such circumstances?—A. Often.

Q. Had you ever instructions to abstain from asking contributions where there was sickness?—A. I considered I had power to do in that, as I might think proper.

Q. Did you often take from such persons?—A. No. Instead of asking from them, I contributed to their support.

Q. Did you ever know of masters being applied to and asked to keep the wages from their men for the contributions to the chapel?—A. Never.

Cross-examined by Mr MURRAY.

Q. How long were you a collector?—A. The most of the time the chapel was a building;—even before it was begun.

Q. To whom did you pay your collections?—A. I gave them to Mr Scott.

Q. When did you give him them?—A. When it was convenient for me to come into town.

Q. At what periods did you collect?—A. When convenient for contributors to pay me, which was according to circumstances; as for instance, according to the kind of work in which they were employed.

Q. You did not collect at any regular periods?—A. None whatever.

Q. Were there any particular days upon which you collected?—A. There were no particular days.

Q. Nor for paying to Mr Scott?—A. Nor for paying to him.

Q. Did Mr Scott mark the money you paid to him ?—A. I did not see. I did not know what he made of it.

Q. Was any thing marked in your book when you paid ?—A. I may say I had no book, I had a paper in which I marked the names of those who paid me.

Q. Do you know whether the other collectors had books ?—A. I do not know whether they had or had not.

JOHN HENNIKER examined by Mr COCKBURN.

Q. You are a merchant in Glasgow, I believe ?—A. I am

Q. A member of Mr Scott's congregation ?—A. I am.

Q. You did not come to Glasgow till after the new chapel was built ?—A. Just the day it was opened.

Q. Have you ever heard of a work called *The Catholic Vindicator?*—I have.

Q. Have you ever heard Mr Scott speak of that work ?—A. I have heard him disapprove of it very much.

Q. Did you ever know whether his disapprobation had any effect upon the sale of that work ?—A. I could not answer that question.

Q. Did you hear him disapprove of it more than once ?—A. I have heard him express disapprobation of it at my own house and other houses where I have been.

Q. Did you ever hear him approve of it ?—A. I heard him recommend purchasing up the work with a view to prevent loss to those engaged in it.

Cross-examined by Mr MONCREIFF.

Q. What did Mr Scott say when you heard him disapprove of this book ?—A. He neither approved of the book nor of the person who wrote it; he disapproved as much of the person who wrote it as of the pamphlet.

Q. Was it in the chapel he gave this recommendation to buy it up ?—A. Yes, it was.

Q. Were you one of the Committee for the management of *The Vindicator?*—A. The original committee of *The Vindicator* put my name in afterwards. They were in difficulty, and I wished to get them out of it. But I was not responsible for *The Vindicator*. I disapproved of it from the very commencement.

Q. Can you fix any date to the time when Mr Scott recommended the buying up of *The Vindicator ?*—A. I have no recollection.

Q. How long was it after you came to Glasgow ?—A. (A short pause, no answer.)

Q. How long before *The Vindicator* was given up ?—A. Some time.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Q. You said you came to Glasgow at the time the chapel was opened ?—A. I went to London, and came back after that.

Q. Was *The Vindicator* published before or after you went to London ?—A. I should imagine that it was published about the year —— I have no recollection.

Q. Do you think it was before December, 1818 ?—A. I should imagine not.

Q. Then what time were you made a member of the committee to purchase it up ?—A. I should imagine, end of 1819 or 1820.

Mr COCKBURN—Q. You say Mr Scott expressed some opinion about *The Vindicator* at the chapel, it was not given out to the congregation ?—A. It was after some of the congregation were gone; it was after the service was over.

Mr MURRAY—Q. When did you return to Glasgow ?—A. I think I was married about 1818, and it was a short time before that; I think, April, 1818. I have resided in Glasgow since April, 1818.

Q. How long after that may it have been you heard Mr Scott recommend the purchasing of *The Vindicator ?*—A. I should imagine that it was later than Dec. 1819. I cannot be positive.

Q. That was after *The Catholic Vindicator* was published ? Had it been given up at that time ?—A. No, it had not.

Rev. Mr GORDON examined by Mr COCKBURN.

Q. You are a Catholic clergyman in Greenock ?—A. I am.

Q. Do you know Mr Scott of Glasgow ?—A. I do.

Q. Did you know a work called *The Catholic Vindicator ?* Have you ever heard of it ?—A. I have.

Q. Have you ever heard Mr Scott express an opinion upon that work ?—A. Upon several occasions.

Q. A favourable or unfavourable opinion ?—A. Unfavourable.

Q. Did you ever hear whether he encouraged or discouraged that work ?—A. I always understood that he discouraged that work.

Q. Do you know Mr Murphy ?—A. I do; I have known him long. I knew him many years ago.

Q. Do you remember the time he preached in the Roman Catholic chapel at Glasgow ?—A. I think it was about two years ago. I was often in his company at the time.

Q. Do you know *The Protestant ?*—A. I do.

Q. Do you understand certain parts of that work to contain an attack upon Mr Scott ?—A. I do certainly.

Q. Did you ever read that work ?—A. Parts of it.

Q. Did you ever read passages you considered to apply to Mr Scott ?—A. In some passages his name is mentioned.

(Some of the passages libelled on were handed to the witness.)

WITNESS—This upon the first page, when I read, I understood to apply to Mr Scott.

Q. Had this work a considerable circulation about Greenock ? Was it publicly commented on ?—A. I understood it was, in a meeting-house.

Q. Whose meeting?—A. The Rev. Mr Wilson's.

Q. Were ever any particular words put upon your own chapel?—A. Yes.

Q. What were they?—A. "Down with Popery" or "black Popery"—I do not remember which.

Q. Was that during the time *The Protestant* was going on?—It was.

Q. And was there ever any thing done to put down black Popery—or did the populace ever give any insults to you about that time?—A. They called after me "Roman Catholic Priest"—I do not know if that is an insult or not.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Q. What is the meaning of this?

Mr. COCKBURN—We leave the Jury to infer what effect this *Protestant* would have upon Mr Scott.

Cross-examined by Mr MURRAY.

Q. Can you name the year when "Down with Popery" was put upon the wall of your chapel?—A. It was about the time of that publication.

Q. Had you ever seen any such thing before?—A. Upon the walls of the chapel? Never.

Q. Upon other walls in Greenock?—A. I do not recollect I ever did.

Q. Do you swear you do not recollect?—A. I certainly swear.

Q. Had you ever seen such words written before?—A. I have seen those words written; I have seen them, not upon a wall, but often, as in a public Newspaper.

Q. Did any body ever call you Roman Priest before?—A. Yes, about the time the chapel was building

Q. That was before *The Protestant* was published?—A. It was, certainly.

Q. So they called you Roman Priest before and after the publication?—A. The cry was revived about the time of the publication of *The Protestant*.

Q. Do you say that Mr Scott discouraged *The Catholic Vindicator* at its commencement?—A. He expressed his regret at it—he did not wish such a thing to be—he did not like the thing at all.

Q. Did you hear him talk of it afterwards?—A. Upon several occasions.

Q. What did he say?—A. He always talked of the work as a thing of which he disapproved.

Q. In what respect?—A. The writer of it not being a man that did justice to it, but arguing in a manner he would not do. He spoke of it as calculated to be productive of no good.

Mr COCKBURN—"The Court and Jury will attend to what we understand to be the first case put in defence, that of Mr Courtney. You will observe, that the Issue consists of two parts; one a refusal to baptize; and one a refusal to confess at Easter, 1815. The refusal of baptism is stated to have been given in October, 1814.

"I beg leave to give in the regular books kept on the occasion. In the communion books, both of 1814 and 1815, you will find this person entered."

Mr MONCREIFF—"Those are not evidence."

Mr COCKBURN—"I beg to give them in—we shall make them evidence. We must get on by degrees."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"We should make the bar acquainted of what occurs to us as the regular course of proceeding in such a case.

"You are in a perfectly regular course of proceeding in the way you are adopting now, in meeting by anticipation the defender's Issues. I conceive a pursuer has in his option to do that if he think it the best course of proceeding; and, therefore, if you think so in this case, the Court will leave that to the discretion of the bar. But, when the party has adopted that course of proceeding, and meets the matter by anticipation, it is understood that that constitutes their case upon the merits of those points; but it is not understood that that would constitute the case of the other side of the bar.

"The Court cannot decide for the parties; but it would be quite unfit that the Court should let the bar go on without this explanation.

"The alternative is this. You are at liberty to go into a general answer of justification by anticipation, but you cannot, after their evidence, renew a general answer to their evidence. That is what I mean.

"In those Courts where this mode of trial has been long adopted, this has been uniformly the course of proceeding; and it does not appear to me to touch upon the law of Scotland. Therefore, when a party chooses to bring justification by anticipation, he may do so, but he is precluded afterwards from bringing more general evidence in justification."

Mr JEFFREY—"We are much indebted to your Lordship for suggesting the course which may be followed on an occasion which is novel in the practice here. We think we shall not endanger our cause by going on as we proposed, on the understanding that if any objection to evidence brought forward by them I trust we shall be indulged."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"I thought it advisable to tell you what we have done."

Mr COCKBURN—"We have given in these two lists, then, in Courtney's case."

Mr MONCREIFF—"In what way is this to be evidence?"

Mr COCKBURN—"We cannot prove they are the communion lists without putting them down as such; and that is all we have yet done."

The Clerk of Court then read the fifth Issue. "Whether, about six years ago the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Philip M'Geechie, now in Manchester, late residenter in Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and a member of the pursuer's congregation, because the said M'Geechie was in arrear in his contribution to the said chapel."

JAMES ANDERSON examined by Mr JEFFREY.

Q. Are you Clerk of the Justiciary Court? Every body knows you are.—A. I am.

Q. Did you attend the spring Circuit at Glasgow in 1813?—A. The record is here.

Q. Is there any record of the trial of Philip M'Kenzie?—A. Philip M'Kenzie.

Q. Is he designated by any other name?—A. No.

Q. Mention the date?—A. 22d April, 1813.

Q. Of what was he accused?—A. Of the crime of theft by means of housebreaking.

Q. And what becomes of him?—A. The verdict recorded is, "The Jury were then enclosed and returned the following verdict. At Glasgow, the twenty-second day of April, 1813 years, the above assize having enclosed, made choice of the said W. M. Stirling to be their Chancellor, and the said Matthew Montgomerie to be their Clerk, and having considered the libel raised and pursued at the instance of his Majesty's advocate, for his Majesty's interest against Philip M'Kenzie, pannel, the interlocutor of relevancy thereon pronounced by the Court, and that no evidence has been adduced in proof of the libel; They all in one voice find the pannel not guilty of the crime libelled. In witness whereof, their said Chancellor and Clerk have subscribed these presents, as written on this and the preceding page in their names, and by their appointment, place and date foresaid.

(Signed) W. M. STIRLING, *Chancellor.*
MATT. MONTGOMERY, *Clerk.*"

"The Lords in respect of the foregoing verdict assoilzie the pannel simpliciter and dismiss him from the bar."

(Signed) GEO. FERGUSSON.

Q. Is there any thing more in the record as to the proceedings?—A. The record bears, "The Advocate Depute having called John M'Kersie, one of the Police watchmen of the City of Glasgow, the first witness in the list annexed to the Indictment; the counsel for the pannel objected to this witness, as no person of that name was contained in the copy served on his client; and the said copy being produced, it appeared that an error had been committed at the Sheriff Clerk's Office, by inserting the name of William M'Kenzie in place of William M'Kersie; and he being the principal witness, the Advocate Depute declared he could not prove the Indictment.

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. But the name of the person accused — what is it? — A. Philip M'Kenzie.

Mr MONCREIFF—That is no evidence.

Mr JEFFREY—That is no evidence yet.

Mr MONCREIFF — Does he plead "Not Guilty?"

LORD GILLIES—He must have done so, from the proceedings which you have heard read.

HUGH ROBERTSON examined by Mr JEFFREY.

Mr JEFFREY—The Jury will recollect the article of the condescendence which was read.

Q. Is your name Hugh?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you reside in Glasgow?—A. I have resided in the same place for thirty years.

Q. Well, that is long enough—Did you know a person some years ago of the name of Philip M'Kenzie?—A. I have seen the man at different times.

Q. Did he ever go by another name?—A. I knew him by the name of M'Geechie, not M'Kenzie.

Q. He sometimes took the name of M'Kenzie?—A. I heard so afterwards.

Q. Do you remember if the person you allude to was tried at the Circuit Court at Glasgow?—A. The same man.

Q. Do you remember about what time?—A. I do not.

Q. How long ago was it?—A. It was a long, long, long time ago.

Q. Have you ever seen him since his trial?—A. Never; nor for a long time before it.

Q. Did you ever go with this man to the Reverend Mr Scott to get a child baptized?—A. Yes; we went from a public house where we were drinking together.

Q. Was that before, or long before the time of his trial?—A. Yes, I think it was before—it was before it.

Q. You said you have not seen him since his trial. If you have not seen him since the trial, you could not have gone to Mr Scott's since. By what names did he pass at the time you knew him in Glasgow?—A. M'Geechie or M'Kenzie.

Q. Did he pass by both names?—A. I think he did.

Q. Did you ever go with any other person than this man to the Reverend Mr Scott?—A. Never upon any other occasion.

Q. And you are the only Hugh Robertson at your place of residence?—A. There was another in it once, but there is none but me now.

(The witness was withdrawn.)

Mr JEFFREY—"I submit, that, from this testimony, all the parties are excused, and the other party is prevented from examining as to this matter farther; for the libel is, that within *six* years, this transaction took place. If we have identified M'Geechie with him who is upon the justiciary record; and if we have proved that this witness did accompany him upon one occasion only to Mr Scott, and that before the trial, the matter cannot be longer made the subject of evidence; for it was two

years beyond the time in the libel. What is sworn to, bars both parties from farther investigation."

Mr MONCREIFF—"This is extraordinary. Am I not to cross-examine the witness? How does Mr Jeffrey know what would be the result of my cross-examination?"

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"If Mr Jeffrey thinks he has made out what he wants, he need examine no farther than he thinks proper. But that will not preclude the other party from their cross-examination."

Mr JEFFREY—"Then I shall go on with the examination."

(The witness was brought back.)

Q. Do you remember whether the time when you went to Mr Scott's was before the Catholic chapel was begun to be built?—A. It was a long time before it.

Q. I think you say you and this Philip M'Geechie had been drinking — were you sober?—A. I was not.

Q. Was he sober?—A. He was not.

Q. Do you recollect what passed at Mr Scott's?—A. We were both drunk.

Q. (The question was repeated to the witness.)—A. I beg pardon, I am dull of hearing.

Q. (The question was again repeated.)—A. When he went in, Mr Scott seemed to know him, and he asked what came of him this long time, and he spoke to him about his being so long away, not being in the Church for two years. He told me so himself before he went. And Mr Scott spoke to him, and gave him a good advice.

Q. Was the child carried there?—A. No, it was not there.

Q. There were just you and Philip. Was any thing said about baptizing the child?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you recollect what it was?—

(Here a short pause ensued.)

LORD GILLIES—"If you do not recollect, say so."

(The witness still continued silent.)

Mr JEFFREY—"Do you, or do you not recollect what passed? If you recollect, tell us what passed—If you do not recollect say so."

(The witness made no answer.)

LORD GILLIES—"Do you recollect or do you not recollect what passed?"

(The witness continued silent, looking towards Mr Scott.)

Mr JEFFREY—Had you any thing to drink this morning, Sir?

(Witness continued looking towards the pursuer.)

A MACER—"Will you have a drink of water?"

(Witness continued as above.)

Mr MONCREIFF—Look at me if you please—Were you at the trial of M'Geechie?—A. No.

Q. You did not see M'Geechie at the trial?—A. No; I was not at the trial.

Q. You are not quite sure whether it was before or after the trial you went to Mr Scott?—A. It was before.

Q. How long?—A. I could not tell.

Q. You went with him to Mr Scott, and Mr Scott gave him a good advice—What happened after that?—What did M'Geechie say?—A. When I met him in the public house, first and foremost, we had so much drink. He proposed to me to go to speak to Mr Scott, to speak to him about the christening of a child he had to baptize. He told me that he was not at Mr Scott's for these two years, and he would wish me to go along with him. He proposed to give me so much porter.

Q. What did Mr M'Geechie say to Mr Scott?—A. He went in and he told him that he had a child to baptize.

Q. What did Mr Scott say then?—A. Mr Scott asked him what came of him a long time, and spoke to him about his neglect of divine worship.

Q. Did he speak of any thing else?—A. And gave him a good advice, and told him before baptizing the child five shillings must be given towards the chapel,—"None of it goes to my private pocket, not a farthing." I then, like a drunk man, as I am at present, began to teach Mr Scott his duty.

LORD GILLIES—Have you been drinking any this morning?—A. I am drunk with something, I do not know what it is.

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. You have not been drinking?—A. I am drunk with something. It is appearing in this Court before a———

Q. How long have you been in the room with the other witnesses?—A. Since *ten* o'clock.

Q. Had you any thing to drink there?—A. Nothing but small beer.

LORD GILLIES—"He stated before he had nothing but spirits."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"Recollect yourself before you give any answer. Turn to me, and I will tell you, if you should be hurried, to take time to recollect yourself."

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. You say Mr Scott said M'Geechie should pay five shillings, and it was not to go to his private pocket; did M'Geechie then pay the five shillings?

(The question was objected to by the other side of the bar.)

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"You must not lead upon a cross-examination."

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. I asked whether he paid the five shillings. Then I ask what did M'Geechie say?—A. M'Geechie said no more. It was I who began to speak, and to teach Mr Scott his duty.

Q. What did you say?—A. I told Mr Scott that ——— I do not remember the particular

story—Mr Scott told me to go home and mind my business.

Q. You have not told us what you said to Mr Scott?—A. I said the child ought to be baptized, whatever difference there might be betwixt the parents and the church.

Q. Did he agree to baptize it? A. I said

Q. Did Mr Scott agree to baptize the child, without getting the five shillings?—A. Mr Scott said he had to pay the five shillings; and there was no more passed upon that subject but what I advanced. There was another word passed, I said that ———

Q. After what you said to Mr Scott, did you come away, or did any more pass?—A. I mentioned, like a drunk man, that this child might die, and its soul might go to hell. That is all that past.

Q. What did Mr Scott say, when you said that?—A. That is none of my business. That is the word that he said.

Q. Has any body threatened you, as to the evidence that you might give here?—A. There are so many altogether—

Q. In Glasgow?—No, nowhere.

Q. When did you see Mr Scott last?—A. Except on the street, not since then.

Mr JEFFREY—Q. Are you a Roman Catholic, or a Protestant?—A. I am of the Church of Scotland.

Q. You said, Mr Scott wanted five shillings for the chapel, and you said it was before the chapel began to be built:—then, for what was the money wanted?—

(The witness gave no answer.)

Q. Was there a Chapel building at Paisley at that time?

(The witness gave no answer.)

Q. Was it before the new chapel began to be built?—A. I cannot tell for what it was.

FELIX DONELLIE, examined by Mr COCKBURN.

Q. Do you know a man of the name of M'——? (From the notes it is not clear which of the names were mentioned.)—A. I do.

Q. Had he ever any other name?—A. Never that I knew him by. Since these twelve months I heard him called M'—— I have been asked if I knew him by that name.

Q. Do you know that he was brought to trial some years ago?—A. I think about seven years ago.

Q. Do you remember about what time of year?—A. I think at Lammas, or in the summer time.

Q. Have you seen him lately?—A. Yes, on the sixteenth of this month in Lancaster prison.

Q. That is the man you spoke of, what was he doing there?—A. He was put in there for passing bad money.

Q. How do you know that?—A. I went to inquire about him, and I have papers in my pocket to show—

Mr MONCREIFF—"That will not do."

COURT—"It will not do."

Mr COCKBURN—Q. Did he tell you he was committed for passing bad money?—A. He told me they had taken him, and found a quantity of bad money on him, and that he was condemned in a fine of twenty pounds,* and to three years imprisonment.

(The witness took a paper out of his pocket.)

Q. Whom did you get that from?—A. In Chester from the Justice's Clerk.

Q. Have you any more papers?—A. Yes.

(The Witness produced some written papers.)

Q. Did you see this gentleman sign the paper?—A. Yes.

Mr COCKBURN—"The papers are according to the forms of the English law. In order to put this matter in shape, I observe, this witness has sworn he saw the gentleman sign the paper. And there is his own signature. He also saw M'Geechie in jail, and he has told you what passed about his conviction. I now tender that as evidence of Mr M'Geechie's imprisonment."

Q. Were you directed to go to identify M'Geechie?—A. Yes.

Mr COCKBURN—"I have made the tender. It will be for the other party to offer any objections."

(One of the productions was handed to the Lord Chief Commissioner.)

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"That is a regular conviction, which, if regularly proved, would be regular evidence."

WITNESS—"He ordered his Clerk to put the seal to it, which was done in my presence at Preston."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"The way this evidence stands, is this. The witness went to Lancaster and found this man, and so far there is an identification that the same person who was tried at Glasgow, is in the jail at Lancaster; and the witness has told you what that man stated as to his imprisonment. That is *prima facie* evidence he is in the jail of Lancaster for that offence. It is for the other party to rebut that. Now that precludes all necessity for deciding any thing upon documentary evidence. The one is an objection arising out of a form—the other is how far it is regularly acceptable."

Mr MONCREIFF—"I object to the receiving of that document. As to any thing else I shall go on to the examination."

Mr JEFFREY—Q. The person you saw at Lancaster, was the person you knew at Glasgow under the name of M'——?—A. Yes.

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. Did you hear any person call him M'Kenzie?—A. I have. And he writes himself M'Kenzie.

Q. Were you present at the trial?—A. No, but he himself next day told me he got clear,

---

* Or to find security to this amount.

and he told me how he got clear, viz. from a wrong word in his indictment.

Q. Did he tell you what the wrong word was?—A. No, Sir.

Q. What time of the year was this trial?—A. I think at Lammas, or after it. It was not in the winter time.

Mr JEFFREY—Q. You knew this M'Kenzie before the time of his trial?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever hear him mention any thing of going with a child to baptize, to the Rev. Mr Scott?—A. Yes.

Q. Before his trial?—A. Yes.

(The examination was objected to by the other side of the bar.)

Mr JEFFREY—"I know it is not evidence to the fact itself, but it is to the point of time, to M'Geechie's having gone to Mr Scott previous to the trial, to which the witness spoke."

Q. Was it before the trial?—A. Yes, a good while.

Q. Did he mention any person went along with him?—A. Robertson.

Q. And you are sure it was before the trial? A. I am sure it was before the trial.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Q. When you went to the jail at Lancaster, you found a person answering to the name of M'Geechie, or M'Kenzie?—A. I asked for M'Keegan.

Q. When you asked for him, whom did you find?—A. The man was brought down. When he was brought down, I stated he was the person for whom I inquired. One of the gentlemen who went with me asked him if he knew me, and he came forward and shook hands with me.

Q. That person came down to you on your asking for M'Keegan?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you learn he had gone under any other name at Manchester?—A. I heard he had gone under the name of M'Kenzie.

Q. Was the person who came and shook hands with you, the same person who came to you the day after he had been tried?—A. The same person.

Q. Did any thing more pass between him and you at the jail?—A. I asked him if he recollected any thing at the time about the baptism. He said he went to speak to Mr Scott about it, and Mr Scott would not baptize, till he would come forward to his duty, as he had not come forward for some time before.

Q. Was the person you had the conversation with, a person who went into the jail at Lancaster, by the name of M'Kenzie?—A. Yes.

Mr MONCREIFF—Dou you remember the year of the trial you spoke of?—A. I do not recollect the year. There was a man of the name of Ferguson, tried the same day, who died.

Q. How did he die?—A. He was hanged. M'Keegan was the next that came up for trial.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—How many years ago was it?—A. I think better than six.

Mr COCKBURN—"The Record shows the man spoken of was condemned the same day M'Kenzie got off."

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. Was it before the trial that this man spoke to you about having gone to Mr Scott?—A. Yes it was.

Q. Are you sure of that?—A. I am positive it was before. He mentioned that Robertson went along with him.

Mr COCKBURN—"I am now going to the case of Fleming."

EDWARD NOON examined by Mr COCKBURN.

Q. You are a dyer, I believe?—A. Yes.

Q. Was you ever in the dye-work of Mr Fleming at Hutchesontown, Glasgow?—A. Yes.

Q. How long ago?—A. Six years ago.

Q. How many workmen were there at the time?—A. John Dalzel for one;—

Q. How many?—A. About eight.

Q. Were those all Catholics?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there a Mr Stevenson?—A. Yes.

Q. He was in company with the Flemings?—A. Yes

Q. Do you remember the Catholic chapel being built?—A. Yes.

Q. You just gave what you chose of contribution towards building?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever wait upon Mr Scott and pay him any thing?—A. Yes.

Q. How much?—A. Five shillings.

Q. Had you any talk with him about the rest of the workmen?—A. I told him we had a mind to pay a little more.

Q. You were under collectors at that time?—A. A part of us were under collectors. We got notice from Kain and Hyde, that we were to pay that money.

Q. Who were they?—A. Manufacturers.

Q. Did you ever see Mr Scott with any of those persons coming into the work?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr Scott and Mr Stevenson by themselves?—A. They never said any thing in my hearing.

Q. Were the Messrs Flemings there?—A. There was none but John Stevenson himself.

Q. What took place when they came?—A. I do not know.

Q. Was Mr Scott ever at the work but on that occasion?—A. Never that I saw.

Q. And you say he did nothing?—A. Nothing, that I saw.

Q. Was he looking through the works?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever hear him make any application to any body, to stop your wages?—A. Never.

Q. Was any of your wages ever stopped to contribute to the chapel?—A. No; full wages were paid by the master.

JOHN M'DIARMID.

Q. Are you a dyer?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you ever with the Flemings at Glasgow?—A. Yes.

Q. How long since?—A. In 1813.

Q. Were you there after that?—A. Yes.

Q. For some years ?—A. I was three years altogether.

Q. Were you a subscriber to the Catholic chapel ?—A. I was.

Q. A voluntary one ?—A. Yes.

Q. Was ever any part of your wages stopped for it ?—A. Not a farthing.

Q. Did you ever see Mr Scott at the Flemings' work ?—A. Only once.

Q. Upon that occasion did he say any thing to the men ?—A. He only went through the work.

Q. Did he ever apply to have your wages stopped ?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Did you pay your subscription to the collector ?—A. Yes.

Q. What was his name ?—A. Rodger Queen.

Q. Did you call upon Queen with the money ?—A. Yes.

Q. How much was it ?—A. A shilling in the fortnight.

Mr COCKBURN—"I am next going to the case of Drain. The statement given in the answers to the condescendence about this case of Drain, is, that this was the man, whose child was apparently dying, when he applied to Mr Scott for baptism; and who, on being refused, went to Paisley and got it baptized by Bishop Paterson.

The Issue is, "Whether, on or about the month of June, 1818, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of John Drain, weaver in Duke Street, Glasgow; one of the contributors of the Catholic chapel aforesaid, because the said Drain was then in arrears of his contribution to said chapel."

BISHOP PATERSON.

Q. You are a Catholic Bishop I understand ?—A. Yes.

Q. You have occasionally done duty at Paisley ?—A. Yes.

Q. You have baptized children there ? A. O Yes.

Q. Did you leave that residence and go abroad at any time ?—A. Yes, in 1817.

Q. How long did you remain abroad ?—A. About a year, I think.

(Some letters were handed to the witness.)

Q. Are those in your own handwriting, Sir ?—A. Yes.

Q. Read the dates of them ?—A. One is dated, Paris, 2d June, 1818. The second is from London, 27th August, 1818.

Q. You recollect being at those places at those dates ?—A. Yes.

Q. And you had not been at Paisley in the *interim* ?—A. No; I was at Paisley, but long after that time. I mean to say that I left Paisley in 1817, and I never returned there to officiate afterwards.

Q. What time did you leave it ?—A. About Easter.

Q Did you keep a register of baptisms there at that time ?—A. Yes.

(A book was handed to the witness.)

Q. Can you say from that book what was the last entry you made in it before leaving Paisley. What is the date of your last entry ?—A. I do not see any after the 24th of March, 1817.

Q. And did you ever make any entry since that time ?—A. Not that I recollect.

(A particular page was pointed out to the witness.)

Q. Look at the top of that page, and have the goodness to read what is written there.

(Witness read a record of the baptism of a child of John Drain, dated July 30th, 1818, signed, JAMES M'LACHLAN.)

Q. Do you know Mr M'Lachlan ?—A. Yes.

Q. He was officiating there ?—A. Yes.

Q. And that is his handwriting ?—A. I think it is.

Q. If persons supposed guilty of bigamy or adultery were living together, would you baptize their child before they separated ?—A. I conceive it a duty not to baptize till separation is insisted on, unless there is imminent danger of death.

Mr MONCREIFF—"This case of Drain we intend to prove as it stands in the Issues. They have read the answers to the condescendence, and they have examined Bishop Paterson. What I want is, that it should be arranged in some way that the Bishop should be at hand."

(It was agreed that Bishop Paterson should remain in Court.)

CHRISTIAN MURE.

Q. Do you know a man of the name of John Drain ?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you ever married to John Drain ?—

Mr MONCREIFF—"They are not entitled to put that question."

(The witness was withdrawn.)

Mr MONCREIFF—"There are several objections. In the first place, I have to observe to your Lordships, that they are pursuing here, the course they have followed throughout the case, by bringing forward evidence of special facts, of which there is not the slightest notice upon any part of the record, and upon which it was impossible for the defender to come prepared.

"This John Drain, as the husband of another woman than the witness, had a child actually baptized, and they propose to prove the bastardy of that child. And by what sort of evidence do they mean to establish that fact ? Do they bring documentary evidence ? Did they state the fact which they mean to prove in their evidence ? Do they bring forward the evidence of any clergyman, or any witness who was present at the alleged marriage ? They call a woman, and they wish to prove by herself she was married to John Drain, who is at this moment habit and repute husband to another woman. Can they do this without notice to us ? to Drain ? to the

other woman? It is not evidence at all, to allow a woman to prove a marriage in her own favour. Are they entitled to prove what they want? I apprehend the objections are of a very serious nature, and if they intended to prove any such fact, they ought to have given notice of their intention, and to have brought very different evidence than that of the woman herself."

LORD GILLIES—"There is no *prima facie* evidence that the child was illegitimate."

Mr COCKBURN—"We have the two wives, each with her certificate of marriage in her pocket."

Mr MONCREIFF—"That is different when they make that the substantive fact."

Mr COCKBURN—"I want to prove that Mr Scott had good reason to refuse baptizing the child. The other party may prove the refusal—and I am entitled to prove a good cause for it, as well as they are entitled to prove a guilty one."

Mr MONCREIFF—"We come to the matter of fact that he did refuse the baptism; and let them prove what he assigned as his reason for doing so. If they found upon a record, they should produce it. They have no right to make such a production as they propose to offer."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"The question is, whether this woman is entitled to prove her marriage."

Mr JEFFREY—"If she was standing in the Commissary Court, insisting in a marriage against an unwilling husband, the case would be different from the present. But in a question where she has no interest, and where her interest cannot be affected by what takes place, we submit the fact, as it is one to which she is a competent evidence. We do not mean to rest the fact on her bare statement; we shall produce a document which she has a right to retain, which we did not know of till lately, a regular certificate of her marriage; and we can establish by other witnesses she lived openly for some time in the character of this man's wife. And are we to be barred in this proof at the very commencement? Nobody can stand up for Mr Drain and say you must not fix a wife upon him. We want to prove *habili modo* this person is known to be living in bigamy. Both wives are proposed to be brought forward as witnesses; and the historical fact is of importance to this case."

Mr MONCREIFF—"It is not a correct way of proceeding. She was not admissible in the beginning of the trial. This is the person as to whom they asked our consent to pass from an objection as to her designation. It was impossible for us to have made any inquiries from the mode in which she was designed. It was impossible we could be prepared for such evidence."

Mr COCKBURN—"She might claim the rank although she could not bring sufficient proof to establish her marriage."

Mr MONCREIFF—"We do not believe what is stated on the subject."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"Any evidence is admissible or not, according to the circumstances to which it is to apply. The question is, whether in truth or in fact, John Drain's child was refused to be baptized, until payment of the arrears of his contribution to the chapel; or whether there was another probable reason for the refusal of the baptism. You have it in evidence, and even if you had it not in evidence, it is obvious to common sense, if a person comes in a doubtful shape as to whether his marriage is legitimate or not, the fact would be investigated. Then you are to establish by evidence, such evidence as is applicable to that subject matter, whether there was enough to induce refusal of baptism in the case in question. If a woman were to come forward and say, that child is the child of a person who was married to me, would a clergyman not take that fact into consideration, and are we not in such circumstances to take into consideration what makes out that justification? We are not here in a situation to call upon the party to produce the best evidence the case admits of, to make out a marriage, but only such evidence as makes out a belief on the part of the clergyman, that it was his duty in these circumstances to refuse baptizing the child.

"As to the designation of the woman, her name and her residence are established."

Mr MONCREIFF—"I object to the evidence upon three grounds. First because it is not competent to prove by a woman's evidence her marriage, when it appears that the man whom she claims as her husband is married to another woman. Secondly, because it is incompetent to prove a special fact, as a crime against John Drain in this case. The third ground is, that we were entitled to notice of any such fact, and that she should have been designed either as the wife, or as claiming to be the wife of John Drain."

(The witness was brought back.)

Q. Were you ever married to this John Drain?—A. Yes.

Q. When was that? What year?—A. Six years past; in March, 1815.

Q. Who married you?—A. I have the lines in my pocket.

Mr MONCREIFF—"I object to that as evidence."

WITNESS—"It was John M'Leod, Minister in Glasgow, Minister of the Chapel of Ease.

Q. Had you been cried in the Church before this?—A. Yes; in the Barony.

Q. Had you any children by this John Drain?—A. Yes.

Q. How many?—A. One.

Q. How long did you live with him?—A. Fourteen weeks.

Q. Were you ever divorced from him?—A. No; he went off.

Q. Did he go with any body?—A. He went away with one Bell Scott. It is reported to me that he is with one—— (Name not distinctly ascertained from the short hand notes.)

Q. He does not live with Bell Scott now?—A. No.

Q. Who gave you this, (the certificate of marriage,) was it the Minister or who?—A. Yes.

Mr COCKBURN—"I propose to produce the certificate."

Mr JEFFREY—"We have as much right to have it produced, as they had to the production of what was in Bowman's possession."

(Here there was a short discussion whether the certificate should be received.)

Mr MONCREIFF—Q. Where do you live now?—A. Kailyards. I live with my brother.

Q. In whose house?—A. A house of my brother's, at Kailyards, in Old Monkland.

Q. You do not live near Airdrie. How far from Airdrie is your residence?—A. Near four miles.

Q. In what parish?—A. Old Monkland.

Q. What name do you go by?—A. Christian Mure; or by that of my husband.

Q. Are you called Mrs Drain?—A. Yes.

Mr MONCREIFF—"I am entitled to say this designation was intentional, for the purpose of concealment, and I submit that the deposition ought to be cancelled."

Mr COCKBURN—"It is too late at any rate."

LORD GILLIES—"Is there such a place as Kailyards where the witness resides, and that near Airdrie?"

Mr JEFFREY—"The town of Airdrie is in the parish of Old Monkland; and could any different description of the witness have been better?"

Mr MONCREIFF—"Yes; if they had designed her, as claiming to be the wife of John Drain."

Mr COCKBURN—"Then how would you have designed Isabella Scott?"

Mr MONCREIFF—"I take a bill of exceptions that she is not sufficiently designed. We do not object to the Christian name."

LORD GILLIES—"Your objection is, that Kailyards is not near Airdrie?"

Mr MONCREIFF—"And that she is not designed as wife of John Drain, or claiming to be such; and that she is falsely designed as residing near Airdrie."

LORD GILLIES—"I hold four miles to be near Airdrie. Libberton near Edinburgh would do as a designation of residence."

Mr MONCREIFF—"The cases are very different."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"It appears on the cross-examination of the witness, and not before, that she lives four miles from Airdrie."

Mr STEPHEN GRAY.

Q. Are you Depute Clerk of the Peace of the Lower Ward of Lanarkshire?—A. I am.

Q. Have you the record with you?—A. Yes. (A particular part of it was pointed out to the witness.)

Q. Explain to the Jury what that is?—A. That is a complaint by the Procurator Fiscal to the Justices, that John Drain and Isabella Scott had been irregularly married; and he wants the fines imposed. John Drain and Isabella Scott declared they had been irregularly married, and were fined in one hundred merks Scots.

Mr. COCKBURN—"I am not sure whether the evidence on our part is closed or not. We think there are no Issues put in here for the defender, but the four which I have now gone over; and the question I have now to ask is, whether they hold they are entitled to go into any special evidence as to the case of Hanlen. If we are to reprobate on that case, then that is enough."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"Till they come forward with their case, we cannot call upon them to say what they will do. You put in books Nos. 14 and 15 relating to communion, which I have marked as proposed to be delivered in."

Mr JEFFREY—"As to those books, Bishop Cameron stated such books are kept by the clergy, and, therefore, they could not be certified or proved by the clergyman who is a party here. We conceive we do all we are bound to do in putting them in."

Mr MONCREIFF—"They cannot be received."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"Though you cannot prove them by the pursuer himself, you may prove they are regularly kept books as such books are kept."

Mr MONCREIFF—"I do not admit any thing."

Mr COCKBURN—"Then we shall prove the handwriting by the two witnesses who are in Court."

(Bishops Cameron and Paterson stated their belief that the books were in the handwriting of Mr Scott.)

Mr MONCREIFF—"I submit those books cannot be received in evidence."

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"The bishop stated they are for the private satisfaction of the clergyman, and the two stated their belief as to his handwriting."

Mr MONCREIFF—"Bishop Cameron did not say that it was part of the duty of the clergyman to keep those books, and they are not submitted to his superiors. We object to the evidence."

(The Judges deliberated for a few moments.)

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"The opinion of the Court is, they cannot be received in evidence."

Mr COCKBURN—"We give in the defences

and answers to the condescendence of the other defenders."

Mr MONCREIFF—"Gentlemen of the Jury, I have to address you on the part of the defender, Mr M'Gavin, and the two other defenders, Messrs Andrew and James Duncan, who are printers of this work called *The Protestant*.

"Mr M'Gavin stands here charged as having been guilty of falsely and maliciously printing the statements which are contained in those Issues, to the damage and injury of the pursuer; and in the very outset, I pray you to take notice, that the whole pith and marrow of the case lies in the charge, that whatever Mr M'Gavin did, he did not only *falsely* but *maliciously*. I may perhaps take the liberty of observing, that on the face of those Issues that charge is refuted to any person of common sense; because you find embodied in one of those Issues, quite conclusive and unanswerable evidence, that, as to a part at least, and that is sufficient to the purpose, it is admitted Mr M'Gavin had reasonable, and, at all events, apparently conclusive information.

"The charge as it is stated, hangs upon three or four passages of a work published by Mr M'Gavin through a series of years; three or four passages picked carefully and detached from the whole context and history of the work. They place those passages before you, and they ask you, whether they do not imply a false and malicious charge against the pursuer.

"There was a little art in the way of presenting that article to you, by reading from a few loose leaves as if that were the work of *The Protestant*. Those few passages before you were picked out of two octavo volumes, which had been written by this gentleman upon the subject to which the work relates; and it must be quite evident to you that no man can do justice to such a case, or judge whether this was done maliciously by Mr M'Gavin or not, unless he have made himself acquainted with the general scope of the whole work. But I need not tell you that words which, taken by themselves, may appear to have one effect, may, when connected with the progress and general scope and object of the work, convey an entirely different impression to the persons who consider it as a whole.

"And this is not a miscellaneous work where things detached are treated of. The passages which relate to Mr Scott (as they say at least, and as to which, presently) are passages which occur in the middle of arguments tending to general objects; and the whole book is upon a subject, in treating of which, Mr M'Gavin might not have thought proper to allude to Mr Scott at all.

"I am well aware, that from the nature of the trial in which we are engaged, a peremptory diet when you must make up your minds from the evidence before you, and from such observations as his Lordship may address to you, there is an impossibility of your giving the matter that attention which I say it requires, because I am aware you cannot have an opportunity of perusing the work in which those passages occur. My friend told you, my client is entitled to found upon the whole work. That observation was made, but on the other side, I say it is utterly impossible for any man to judge properly of those Issues without sitting down to peruse the work regularly.

"But, notwithstanding this, it is an indispensable part of my duty upon this occasion, to endeavour to bring before you the origin of this work, and the progress of it to the end of it, or rather the present state of it, and to show you in what manner Mr M'Gavin was led into those observations upon which this demand of damages is given.

"Mr M'Gavin is, as we shall prove to you, a person very well known in the place where he himself resides. You have heard a great many harsh statements made against him to-day, a great many inferences of his intentions and motives; but I state to you that where he is known, he is known well as a person utterly incapable of that malice which is here ascribed to him; and a person who devotes his time and money to a great extent to the promotion of the interests of his fellow-countrymen, and is in the habit of doing so, not only for his Protestant brethren, but for the people of the Roman Catholic persuasion also.

"Mr M'Gavin is a Protestant; he is a pretty zealous one; I hope that will never be considered a reproach in this country. It happened that this chapel was built by certain means which have been partly explained to you, and it has been stated that the first use to which it was put, was for an Oratorio,* a musical meeting, a performance of music relative to a very sacred subject, and of that meeting I believe the profits were intended to be applied to the benefit of certain schools for the Catholic children.

"It has been stated, that, before that time, Mr M'Gavin had never spoken a word against Mr Scott; and that has been founded on as a circumstance against him. I found upon it as in his favour; that, up to that moment, Mr M'Gavin had neither written nor spoken a word against Mr Scott.

"The paragraph in *The Glasgow Chronicle* of 23d May, 1818, which refers to the meeting, is in the following terms: 'We feel pleasure in noticing the numerous and respectable auditory which was assembled at the Oratorio on Thursday last. The zeal and activity of the directors, the alacrity and pleasure with which their solicitations in behalf of a charitable and philanthropic institution were complied with,

* It was so stated by counsel on the other side, but it is a mistake. The chapel had been used for public worship more than a year before the Oratorio.

the great respect paid alike to the subject and the place, form a pleasing and characteristic feature of the age, and must afford an inexhaustible fund of pleasing reflection to the contemplative Christian. May we not hope, that these reasons, and the general satisfaction afforded by the performance, will induce Bishop Cameron to grant his permission for another Oratorio at a future period? We cannot close the subject, without offering our mead of praise to Mr de Monti for his extraordinary exertions, which the shortness of the notice required.'

"It is not a matter of great importance (that I admit) in what terms an advertisement of that kind is expressed; but it struck the eye of Mr M'Gavin, and, if that was of little importance in itself, it was of at least as little importance to Mr Scott that Mr M'Gavin should write a few lines to the Newspaper. 'There are two or three words in your paper of last Saturday, on which I beg leave to animadvert a little. They are in the paragraph relating to the Oratorio in the Catholic chapel:—'The great respect paid alike to the subject and the place.' That was the beginning of the thing. It is not alleged there is any libel there. Mr M'Gavin goes on. 'I hope that the highly respectable company which assembled in the Catholic chapel last Thursday, paid great respect to the subject that was said or sung there that day. I can conceive no subject so important and interesting to a devout mind. It embraces nothing less than the salvation of the world, by the incarnation and death of the Son of God. I think it impossible that any Christian should make this a subject of amusement; and it was right to regard it with all possible respect and devotion. But it appears to me somewhat strange, that they should have paid the like respect to the place. Does the writer of the paragraph really believe that the building is as much to be respected, or to be regarded with the same kind of respect, as the most solemn passages of the word of God? Does he in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic chapel are more holy than the materials of its neighbour, the Town's Hospital; or of its other neighbour, the Glass Bottle Manufactory? I know there is a Church, every stone of which is holy; but this is neither the High Church of Glasgow, nor St George's, nor the Tabernacle, nor yet the Catholic chapel in Clyde Street.'

"That is the scope of the first letter which he wrote, and it is all the substance of it. He did not impute what he animadverted upon to Mr Scott,—he did not impute it to a Catholic;—and he states, he did not believe at the time that it was a Catholic who wrote the advertisement upon which he commented; and he was rather correcting the error of Protestant brethren, than entering into any controversy with Catholics.

"It is of importance that the matter began in this way; and you will see how it went on. Mr M'Gavin did no more till he was forced to do it. A person, an overzealous friend, perhaps some friend of Mr Scott's, a gentleman in Glasgow, begins a controversy by sitting down to write a letter in answer to this letter of Mr M'Gavin's, in which he proposes to 'expose the weakness and futility of censorious bigotry.' The Catholic doctrine is, that there is something sacred in the place as well as in the subject. This writer says, 'I saw the paragraph which your correspondent alludes to, and am certainly astonished at the handle which he has made of it: paying respect to the house of God seems to have given him very great offence, and drawn from him a question as ridiculous as it is shameful:—Does he (the writer of the paragraph) in fact believe that the stones and timber of the Catholic chapel, are more holy than the materials of its neighbour, the Town Hospital; or of its other neighbour, the Glass Bottle Manufactory? According to the same principle, I suppose your correspondent would assert, that the ground whereon Moses stood, when he beheld the burning bush, was not more holy than the Green of Glasgow; or that the temple of Jerusalem, which I believe was partly composed of 'stones and timber,' was not more sacred than the theatre: yet we are informed, in the sacred Scriptures, that our Saviour was so offended at the disrespect paid to his house, that he not only reproached the buyers and sellers therein, but even personally chastised them.'

"That was entering into one of the very arguments constantly resorted to by the Catholics against the Protestants, in order to maintain the sacredness of the place; it was going into the controversy by one of the arguments that were subsequently triumphantly refuted by Mr M'Gavin in his after-writings. Amicus Veritatis proceeds, 'Were we to analyze all things that have been called holy, we would find them to consist in substance of mere matter: but the union or combination of matter, its application to pious purposes, and its consecration to Almighty God, certainly is not unworthy of being 'called holy,' and consequently deserving of a more sacred regard than the property of a glass blower, or even a Town's Hospital.'

"This led Mr M'Gavin to write an answer to that letter, and that letter also was upon general matter, not in the least in allusion to Mr Scott or his chapel. It is entirely upon the general question as to the sacredness of places, going back to the illustrations against him, and doing his best to refute them.

"I told you I would not go over these things minutely, but I think it of importance to give you a general summary of what happened; and it is of importance to know that five or six different letters were writ-

ten before any allusion was made to Mr Scott.

"In that very letter Amicus Veritatis says, 'Thank Heaven! the phantoms raised by bigotry and by prejudice have fled before the light of reason, the darkness which for a time overspread our horizon, is dissipating into the more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy.' And Mr M'Gavin goes on to state, 'It is amusing to hear a Catholic charging his Protestant neighbour with bigotry, and thanking heaven that the darkness which for a time overspread our horizon, is dissipating into the more chastened ray of liberality and philanthropy. I suppose the time here referred to, is that which has elapsed since the Reformation; and of course the light which is now about to rise is that of the dark ages.'

"This was not enough. Amicus Veritatis was not sufficient for the controversy with Mr M'Gavin, and another stepped forward under the name of Pax, and he makes a new attack; and then Mr M'Gavin makes an answer, partly to the one, and partly to the other. He could not exhaust what occurred to him in one letter, within the limits of a Newspaper, and therefore he takes another day to go on.

"Mr M'Gavin had mentioned the subject of indulgences, and there was a new controversy raised. They denied that it ever had been a Catholic doctrine, that the Pope, or any other under him, could give indulgence for the commission of sin. That opened a new field certainly—they raised it, and entered into it with great zeal;—and when Mr M'Gavin cited an example of an indulgence granted to an ancient family, they put to him to name the person who had it, and the person who had seen it.

"This subject of indulgences produced a great deal of discussion. Pax wrote one letter about them—then Amicus Veritatis another; and Mr M'Gavin wrote one from which I shall read a passage. He is writing on the subject of plenary indulgences, and he takes the liberty of quoting from a catechism which had come into his hands, which he understood to be a Catholic catechism of authority, though translated by a Protestant, of which an objection was made afterwards. He made these remarks; and I trust there is not one of you who will believe that when Mr M'Gavin wrote that passage, he was under the influence of any feeling or spirit of malice. It was against that doctrine of indulgence he was writing, according to his understanding of it;—and here is what he says; 'Perhaps some of your Protestant readers will not, at first sight, perceive the enormous wickedness of this; but I appeal to every serious and enlightened Christian, whether he can imagine greater wickedness than an attempt to do what God has declared that it is impossible that a creature can do, and what he declares to be already perfectly accomplished, not by a mere creature, but by his own Son? The revelation of divine mercy by Jesus Christ, and the command to believe in him, is virtually a command to cease from every attempt to satisfy divine justice for ourselves, or to make our peace with God; but the Church of Rome sets its miserable votaries to a work which it is not only impossible for them to do, but the very attempt to do which is an act of rebellion against God. To satisfy divine justice! The man who attempts to do this, or who thinks he can do it, must have as low ideas of the divine Being, as the man who sees and worships his God in a stock or a stone, or any other work of his own hands. Hence the connection of this doctrine of indulgences with the worship of saints and images, and the uniting the merit of the saints with that of the Saviour, which shows that the poor Papist looks upon God as such a one as himself. Christ has satisfied Divine justice by the sacrifice of himself once for all; and every man that believes in him becomes interested in that sacrifice: the justice of God is satisfied with regard to him; the anger of God is turned away from him; he needs no other sacrifice or satisfaction; and instead of attempting to satisfy divine justice by his own penances, or the divine law by his own doings, he is taught, from a principle of love and gratitude, as a saved sinner, to live a life of humility and obedience to his heavenly Father. This is the true Catholic: this is a member of the Church universal, which unites the earth to heaven.'

"I make no apology for reading that serious matter to you, because I apprehend it is deeply interwoven with this case. It was under the impression of errors thus forced upon him by writers who took notice of his unimportant observation about the place;—it was from that that Mr M'Gavin began to write seriously in the Protestant.

"Up to that time, not a word was pretended to be said against Mr Scott. My friend (Mr Cockburn) passed over all the intermediate time that I have noticed.

"Having written this, Mr M'Gavin was immediately assailed by Pax, who wrote another letter; and he says in that letter: 'I feel myself forcibly called upon to notice his letter of Saturday last, which, if I had no other, is a convincing proof of the truth of my remarks. He argues, as yet, on mere supposition, unsupported by a single fact, and is silent on those truths opposed to his fallacious assertions.'

"My client then wrote a pretty long letter,—three of those close leaves in reply to Pax. It is a theological argument altogether, and there was not a word about Mr Scott.

"He was still answered by another letter by Amicus Veritatis, who continued to assert, 'That it never was the doctrine of the Catholic church, that a Pope or a Bishop could grant an indulgence to commit sin;' and proceeded to say, 'With what a face of effrontery can

your correspondent come forward and declare to the public, that such are the principles of a body of men who have been celebrated for every Christian virtue; and who publicly abjure, upon their most solemn oaths, the abominable principles imputed to them.'

"My client wrote still another letter in answer to Amicus Veritatis, but he stated in it that he had not exhausted the subject, because they had alluded to Mr Hervey as an authority, and he wished to make some observations upon that.

"It was while the controversy was thus going on, provoked as Mr M'Gavin was, that he wrote the first letter that is founded upon, dated 26th June, 1818. He had been going on writing from the twenty-third of May,—four months before that letter made its appearance at all. That letter begins with a consideration of the matter referred to, and then it introduces the first sentence which is founded upon in these Issues, by the following reference to a previous statement that had been made by his adversary, Amicus Veritatis. He says, 'Amicus Veritatis says, "Your correspondent might have been more sparing in his reproaches against the Catholics in Glasgow, for the manifestation of their piety and public spirit; and for raising a building which for ages to come will adorn and ornament our city." I have no objection that our city be ornamented with stately buildings by those who can afford to do it; but I would rather that all the houses in Glasgow were as plain as they were a hundred years ago, than that our poor population should be deprived of one necessary of life, in order to build palaces. I acquit myself of having reproached the Papists on this subject. I stated a plain fact, that while they were lavishing thousands of pounds on the decorations of what they foolishly call the house of God, they were suffering their poor to grow up and perish in ignorance. If they feel themselves reproached by this, it is the fact that does it, not I.

"I must read to you another passage which they have left out of their Issues, to show that Mr M'Gavin never objected to the design of erecting a new chapel to the Catholics; that he was no enemy to the pious design of providing to those poor Catholics a proper place of worship. For you will find in one of the very Numbers from which a charge is made, he expresses himself as strongly upon the subject, as Mr Scott himself could. It is the Number upon which the main stress of this case is laid; and they quote the first part of the paragraph, and then they leave out the intermediate sentence, which totally changes the matter. He says, 'In my last Number, I promised to give some examples to confirm what I wrote about money being extorted from poor persons, for the purpose of building the Popish chapel. I find no fault with the Romish sect for building a place of worship for themselves. They have legally as good a right to do so, as any other sect that is not established by law. Had they, of their own accord, agreed to erect a comfortable and commodious building; and had they contributed voluntarily, according to their ability, for the purpose, no reasonable man would have found fault, however much he might pity those who were so blinded by superstition, as to give their money for the support of a system which is inimical to their own happiness. Still, however, had it been a voluntary thing, they would have been acting like freeborn British subjects; and had they been content with a building merely comfortable and commodious, they would have shown themselves possessed of some measure of common sense.' Therefore, it was not upon that score that Mr M'Gavin ever made any attack upon the principles or practice of any of them.

"Having introduced the subject in this way, by alluding to the previous passage of Amicus Veritatis, this passage certainly occurs: 'But this is not all:—I ask A. V. if that house was not built, in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and in some instances a starving people? I ask him if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the "piety and public spirit of the Catholics in Glasgow." The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering; and will he accept as honourable to him that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood, of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared be inscribed upon its front; and it will remain for 'ages to come,' a monument of Popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.'

"Then he goes on,—'Idolatry in every form is cruel. That Popery is idolatry, is clearly proved by Mr Cunningham of Lainshaw, in a late publication, which I strongly recommend to such of your readers as wish to know what that system really is. A. V. has discovered the spirit of idolatry in the letter which I am at present answering. He says, 'Were we to erect a house for the glory of our Creator, why should it not, as much as possible resemble the majesty of that God to whose service it was to be dedicated?' Now, what must that God be, to whose majesty any material building can be a resemblance? Certainly not that God who dwelleth not in temples made with hands, and whose glory fills the universe. It must be an idol of A. V.'s own fancy.'

"Can you, as an honest jury, in judging of this question, whether Mr M'Gavin wrote this intermediate passage maliciously; can you separate it from the context, the subject, the controversy, and its nature? It is impossible—you must read the whole together—for it is

your duty to dive into the motives and views of Mr M'Gavin, in writing. You must judge whether he did it, *bona fide*, believing that he was maintaining a case of momentous importance. Beginning, as I explained to you he did, and forced to go on, you will judge whether he introduced that passage, *bona fide*, in the first place, believing it true, and in the next, that it was of vast importance in its tendency.

"You will see, that it had no allusion to Mr Scott. Gentlemen tell you, they cannot understand it could apply to any other person than to Mr Scott. In that passage, there was no allusion to Mr Scott, nor mention of the ghostly father; there had been no allusion to the clergyman and chapel, except as to what had been first said as to the place; and it could not mean that which my friend wishes you to think it means, imputation of an intentional crime committed by those persons.

"Those persons who have told you, it could not but refer to him; those were the very persons employed to collect the funds for this chapel, who have been examined. A great deal of money might have been extorted in that way, that Mr Scott never knew of. In this charge, there was no allusion made to Mr Scott; and if they had no other articles of charge against Mr M'Gavin, could they make out from that, that he could mean no other person than Mr Scott? Mr M'Gavin had not seen all those books in the manner you have seen them; he had not heard the instructions of which I shall speak afterwards. All he knew was, that vast sums of money had been raised, and raised, I shall show you, from a poor population, and, in many instances, from a starving population. That he knew by means which I state to you, but he knew no more; and I appeal to you, whether you can say, upon your oaths, that in writing that passage, he was actuated by malice towards Mr Scott.

"You were told, there is inconsistency in denying the statement, and saying it is true. There is no inconsistency. I say, that, in writing that statement, he did not allude to any one; he was speaking of a system, a principle which is at the bottom of their faith, and it was to that he was directing himself generally. Was there any inconsistency in this, and in making statements afterwards, which he believed to be true, and then offering to prove them?

"This letter was written on 26th June, 1818. Mr M'Gavin continued to go on in the controversy. Amicus Veritatis and Pax continued to write in a series of subsequent letters. Mr M'Gavin in one place says, 'Pax accuses me of trying, by reproaches, "to unsheath the sword; but it has long since rusted in its scabbard, and will not yield to the ungenerous tug." And he prophesies, that "in a little, it will be found rotted to the hilt." What sword does he mean? If it be the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, I hope it will never be sheathed, that it will never rot, and that it will never cease to be wielded by the friends of truth, so long as error exists in the world. If he mean the sword of persecution, and that I try to unsheath it, he slanders his neighbour, and lays himself open to more severe reproof than I choose to administer. I have no hostility against him; I pity him as the unhappy victim of error and imposition; and the worst thing I wish him is, that he would be convinced of his errors, and renounce them. But I declare the most determined hostility against the whole system of Popery; not against Papists, but against their errors, which are their own greatest enemies. Like Mr Cunningham of Lainshaw, to whose work on this subject I referred in my last, I believe it is not in the power of the devil to invent such another system of delusion, and wickedness, and opposition to the religion of Christ. This was the mightiest effort of the wicked one, to deprive the world of the benefit of Christ's incarnation and death, and to keep the human race in bondage to himself. He has been deplorably successful; and the ruin of millions of souls has been the consequence. It is because I wish well to the persons of Papists—it is because I wish nothing less than their present and everlasting happiness, that I wish them delivered from the bondage of error, and the dominion of their priests,—and that the priests themselves were delivered from the slavery of the prince of darkness.'

"And in that letter, he makes his statement, to which I call your particular attention. There is a question you know has been a good deal agitated, whether the statutory disabilities affecting the Roman Catholics should be repealed. There is great difference of opinion on the subject, and we know that those who are of opinion those disabilities should continue, have never ceased, and have never hesitated to make the most direct attacks, upon the whole principles and practice of the Roman Catholics, down to the present day, and you never heard that employing the strongest language against them was a ground for damages. In that case, you would have had claims of damages enough.

"At this time, Mr M'Gavin had adopted what is called the liberal opinion, and it was in favour of the Catholics on that subject. He says, 'I consider every species of civil disability and disqualification on a religious account, persecution; and I am sorry that in this otherwise free and happy country, so many are subjected to it, and the Papists among the rest. Persecution is disgraceful to those who inflict, but honourable to those who suffer it. It throws around them the charm and glory of a relationship to apostles, and prophets, and men of whom the world was not worthy. Popery is not worthy of such honour. I would never persecute Papists.'

"He was of opinion that the disabilities ought to be abolished, not because he thought the principles and practice of the Papists of the present day were not grievously erroneous,—because, holding the faith he held, he must have believed, and must still believe, that every error of that kind is destructive to the individual who holds it,—certainly, without believing there could be no good men and Christians among Catholics,—but that such opinions are dangerous to them, he, and every Protestant must believe.

"In this letter Mr M'Gavin stated he was a subscriber to the Catholic schools. So far he bore them no malice. He was giving his means for the benefit of those very schools, for the benefit of which the Oratorio had been held in the chapel. He says, 'Nobody can hinder them from continuing Papists if they please; and even in this case, I wish to do them good. I wish to see them all well educated, and respectable members of society. I have, therefore, been a subscriber to their schools, and intend to remain so. Whatever creed they shall profess, it is better to have a reading, well informed, than an ignorant population. While, therefore, I intend to continue the controversy with my two opponents, I hope none will accuse me of hostility to the Catholic schools; and I hope the exposure which I have made, or may yet make of the errors of Popery, will not induce any to withdraw their support. The worse the system is, there is the more need that the people be instructed in the art of reading, that they may have access to the source of knowledge, and be able to judge for themselves.'

"Those two writers, Amicus Veritatis and Pax, raised various other subjects of controversy, and one of them was this—they attacked the much celebrated, and hitherto believed to be pious, Luther. They accused him of the foulest crimes, and I shall show you, that some of them (officious friends no doubt, and I do not accuse Mr Scott) some of them circulated, along with charges against Mr M'Gavin, charges against Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, and others, of adultery, forgery, encouragement of adultery, every thing in short that was calculated to excite and provoke all the feelings of indignation, of which Mr M'Gavin was possessed, from the knowledge he had, and the information he had, of the authors of the Reformation.

"This correspondence went on, till Mr M'Gavin saw he could not treat his subject at sufficient length in the Newspaper; and he determined on the beginning of a periodical work called *The Protestant*, for the purpose of refuting the statements that had been made in favour of the Catholic faith, and of endeavouring to defend the Protestant faith. There were, accordingly, various subjects brought into notice, besides those I have mentioned. Transubstantiation was treated at great length; the infallibility of the Pope, and that matter as to the charge against Luther, was brought on the board.

"In the second Number of that work, Mr M'Gavin had occasion to detect a very gross misrepresentation which had been made by one of those writers; nothing less than charging Luther with the offence of encouraging adultery, which he made by pretending to quote Luther's own words, putting a point where there ought to be a comma, and leaving out a part of the sentence, which was necessary to the understanding of his meaning. Mr M'Gavin says, 'I shall give the whole sentence as it stands in Luther, that the reader may see how much he has been abused by modern Papists. 'Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla, ita tamen ut antea iterum et tertium uxorem admoneat maritus, et coram aliis ejus etiam pertinaciam detegat, ut publice et ante conspectum Ecclesiæ duritia ejus et agnoscatur et reprehendatur.' This is a part of Luther's third reason of divorce. He is maintaining that, in certain circumstances, it is lawful for a man to put away his wife and take another,—'yet so that before this, the husband admonish his wife, not only once, but a second, and a third time, and also expose her obstinacy before others, that publicly, and in presence of the church, her obstinacy may be known and reprehended.' But A. V. stops at the word *ancilla:* for a comma he substitutes a period, and omits all the rest of the sentence, which makes Luther appear to teach, that without ceremony, a man may take his handmaid instead of his wife." "The third reason of divorce is, when one party withdraws from the other, and will not perform due benevolence, or refuses to dwell with the other: in this case a husband may tell his wife that he will take another, but not privately, or on his own authority; but repeated admonition must be given to her before the church, as Luther's words are literally translated at the bottom of the second page; that is, she must be divorced before the husband is warranted to put her away,—or, in other words, that a regular process of divorce must be led before he can marry another. I see nothing in this contrary to the word of God, and I believe it is perfectly consistent with the law both in England and Scotland."

"I take notice of that, because it was immediately upon that letter appearing that Mr Scott came forward. The second Number of *The Protestant* was published on the 25th of July, 1818; and it was upon the 31st of July that Mr Scott for the first time, thought he was attacked in the passage founded upon in the first Issue, and which I read to you a little while ago. Upon the 31st of July, and not till then, did he think himself attacked. The letter complained of had been published in the *Chronicle* on the 2d of July. It was repub-

lished in *The Protestant* in the first Number, and no notice was taken of it. It had not occurred to Mr Scott there was any thing against him, nor for so long a time did he ask if he was alluded to. You will find in the ninth Number his letter on the subject. It is at page 61st of the first Vol.—'To the Editor of *The Glasgow Chronicle*.—Sir,—From your Paper of Thursday, the 2d of July current, I quote the following paragraph from a letter addressed to you, as Editor, under the signature of 'A Protestant:'—

"But this is not all:—I ask A. V. if that house" (meaning the new Catholic chapel) "was not built in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and in some instances, a starving people? I ask him if money was not extorted by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building that house, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them? And is this what he calls the 'piety and public spirit of the Catholics of Glasgow?' The Almighty hates robbery for burnt-offering; and will he accept, as honouring to him, that which has been wrung from the sweat, and sinews, and blood, of his own miserable creatures? Let the means by which this house was reared be inscribed upon its front, and it will remain, for 'ages to come,' a monument of Popish hard-heartedness and cruelty.

"It is well known to the public, and to the people of Glasgow in particular, that it was I who took the active management and superintendence in forwarding the new Catholic chapel, and obtaining subscriptions and money for it. From this circumstance it has occurred to many, that the paragraph above quoted pointed at and referred to me; but I have no means, in the first instance, of ascertaining the truth of this, or the intentions of the writer, except by an application to you. I have therefore to request that you favour me with the real name and address of the author of the letter, or that he, through you, explicitly state whether he meant or referred to me, as the person who had extorted money by the fear of future punishment, for the purpose of building the Catholic chapel, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them.

"It was some time after the letter referred to appeared in your paper before I saw it, and still longer before I heard it applied to me, or I would have made this communication sooner. —I am, Sir your most obedient servant,

(Signed) 'ANDREW SCOTT.

'6, *Dunlop Street*,
Glasgow, July 31, 1818.'

"First, it was some time published before he heard of the letter. You will judge of the probability of that, considering the publicity with which the controversy had been going on. And, after he did see it, Mr Scott himself says, that it was some time longer before he heard it applied to him. Mr Scott himself was not aware that it applied to him. Then with what face can Mr Scott say, that every person who looked at the passage must have known that it applied to him and to no other mortal? I submit to you, it is conclusive upon that subject, that he did not so apply it, and that it is not the natural inference. Besides it was some time, by his own admission four weeks, before any friend had said to him that it applied to him. I apprehend those who have sworn today, it could have no other meaning, must have seen it, and yet they never thought of applying it so at that time.

"Upon being told to apply to Mr M'Gavin, he writes to him and requests the favour of an answer to his inquiry. My friend, Mr Cockburn, said, that when this was fairly put to Mr M'Gavin, he shuffled, and that he must have known in his heart that he was doing wrong. But there was no shuffling. Mr M'Gavin says, —'Rev. Sir, I have received your letter of yesterday's date, with a copy of your correspondence with the Editor of the *Glasgow Chronicle;* in reply to which I have only to say, that if you, or any of your flock, feel injured or misrepresented by any thing published in that paper by 'A Protestant,' the press is as open to you and them as it is to me. If you write a reply to the paragraph which you have quoted, I shall, if you please, give it a place in an early Number of *The Protestant*.—I am, your most obedient servant.

'37, *Virginia Street*,
August 1, 1818.
'REV. ANDREW SCOTT.'

"I ask what could a man do more than that, except Mr Scott had expected my client to say, I abandon all the controversy and contradict all I have said about the building of your chapel? He could not say more than that he would publish an answer in his very paper. I say that was fair, and no shuffling. Mr M'Gavin, it seems, shuffles, because he would not say he applied what he had said to Mr Scott. He applied it to no man. It was a general fact,—and that was the answer Mr M'Gavin made.

"Then there was another letter from Scott, in which he says,—'Sir,—Your letter of the 1st instant is no answer to mine of the 31st July, containing a copy of the correspondence which accompanied it. I asked no answer or explanations for my flock: it was for myself as an individual; and the only question was, whether you meant and alluded to me in the paragraph of the letter referred to? In that paragraph I did, and do still, consider myself particularly pointed at. I was no party to, nor any way concerned with, the publication of any of the letters that appeared in the *Chron-*

icle. I never saw them till I read them in that paper; and I consider it due to myself and to the situation which I fill, to require an explanation from the author of the paragraph I quoted. I therefore still expect that your honour and character as a gentleman will convince you of the propriety of giving a direct answer to my query, viz. Whether or not you alluded to me in the paragraph referred to?'

"He did not say in a former letter it applied to him. I do in my conscience believe the main purpose of writing was that Mr M'Gavin should make it public, and for the reason that in Number second, which immediately preceded, he had detected gross misrepresentations as to Luther, which would have been highly discreditable in Mr Scott, who would therefore naturally wish to put an end to any doubt of the possibility of his having written that passage.

"Something was said as to Mr M'Gavin having garbled his correspondence. I do not know what is meant. The letters are printed at length. Mr M'Gavin says, 'To the above I replied in a few words, that I had no *private* answer to Mr Scott farther than I had already given.' That was his whole note.

"It is said, Why not give a private answer? I answer, Mr M'Gavin saw that the intention was to convert that which had been a public controversy between him and two anonymous writers into a personal altercation between him and Mr Scott. He did not wish to put it upon that footing. He had not published any thing against Mr Scott personally. If any thing applied against him, the fault was not that of Mr M'Gavin. The answer he gives is, 'Mr M'Gavin has no *private* answer to Mr Scott farther than he has already given.'

"He went on in the second Number. He did not stop on receiving the letter. He was in the middle of a discussion which he did not choose to break. He went on till he came to the eighth Number, which is that containing the letters. It is curious that even that eighth Number does not relate to Mr Scott nor to his chapel at all,—Mr M'Gavin was so full of his general subject. It begins, 'In my last Number I said it was very uncertain whether the apostle Peter had ever been at Rome. I do not say it is certain he never was there; for I admit there is a very early tradition of his having been in that city. It is however merely tradition; and no man is under any obligation to believe it. If it had even the authority of authentic history,—if it were a fact as well established as the murder of Julius Cæsar by Brutus, which it is not,—it would still be a matter of mere history, and not the subject of faith in a religious sense. I should believe it just as I believe the fact of Cæsar's murder; but rest no religious principle or practice upon it.

"'The bible is sufficient for every purpose of Christian faith and practice; and what I find not written in the sacred volume, however true it may be as a matter of history, or however plausible as a speculative opinion, I hold it of no account whatever in determining any point in religion,' &c.

"And then he says,—'I have said much more on this subject than was necessary in merely replying to the letter of Pax; but, as I had my hand in the work, I thought a few hours could not be employed to better purpose than in giving a short sketch of the arrogant claims of the Romish Church, and of the arguments by which they are supported. This is a subject deeply interesting at the present time,' &c. &c.

"And then he says,—'It does not at present occur to me that I have any more to say in reply to Pax. I think I have answered every thing in his letters that required an answer, that is, almost every sentence of them. I have, however, a great deal of work before me in performing the like duty towards Amicus Veritatis, whose letters in the *Glasgow Chronicle* are almost as full of errors and misrepresentations as of sentences. I expect these letters, along with my own, will be republished in a few days, after which the reader will have it in his power to form a better judgment of my reply. In the mean time, I shall indulge myself and the reader with a little miscellaneous matter.'

"And then he publishes the letters. He says,—'The first week after the publication of my second Number, which contained my exposure of the Popish imposition in the matter of Luther, the Rev. Mr Scott addressed a letter to the Editor of the *Glasgow Chronicle*, requiring my name and address, which having been communicated, he sent me a copy of the said letter, with one addressed to myself. I expect he will thank me for giving these letters publicity, as they seem evidently intended for the public eye; and I should have done them this honour sooner, had I not been unwilling to break the connection of more important matter.'

"Then he gives the letters, and he says,—'And now, since I am before the public, I will give him the answer which I did not choose to give privately:—I did *not* point at him as the person who was exclusively employed in the work of extorting money from the poor. I did not know how many agents were engaged weekly in that pious undertaking. I do not know whether Mr Scott be the only priest that officiated while the chapel was building, or whether he be the only one that officiates in it at present. The house that is building immediately west of the chapel, and which is, it is said, intended for the *manse*, will be large enough to accommodate a dozen of priests, while they remain unmarried, as they must always do; from which I infer that he either

has, or intends to have, abundant assistance in milking and managing his flock.'

"You see how Mr M'Gavin was drawn on. He had published nothing but two lines in the middle of a letter, alluding to Mr Scott, till he comes down to the eighth Number—there is the distance of time from the 26th June to the 18th of September. Three months he had not written a single word about Mr Scott, nor about his chapel, and all that time the thing had been acquiesced in—and now he inserts those letters, and at the end he says, 'He did not point at Mr Scott as the person who was exclusively employed in the work of extorting money from the poor.' It was a possibility he might have been concerned, but Mr M'Gavin never said so, nor did he mean it. He levelled it against no individual, but made the remark generally.

"No doubt, in the next Number, the ninth, he goes on to make a statement of particular cases. I mention that the whole of the paper is exceedingly garbled indeed, by the manner in which it appears in those Issues—for there are a great many long paragraphs and passages which explain away the meaning, and most of all do away the idea of personal malice against any individual whatever.

"It begins in this manner:—'If it be not true, that "money was extorted for building the Popish chapel, by the fear of future punishment, from persons who had scarcely bread for their families, or clothes to cover them," why is it neither Mr Scott, nor any of his people, have publicly denied the charges insinuated in the obnoxious paragraph, which he has quoted from my letter? If it be not true, I should like to see it publicly disclaimed; and if any one had sent me a disavowal, duly authenticated, I should have given it publicity. But, in fact, the thing is too notorious to be denied. It is not a thing of a thousand miles' distance, or a hundred years old, else, I doubt not, it would be publicly and unanimously disavowed by all Papists, and every document produced to prove it would be pronounced a forgery.'

"I think that was a very reasonable remark. That matter had stood three months before the public—for neither Amicus Veritatis nor Pax said a word upon the subject.

"My friend, Mr Cockburn, says, Mr M'Gavin concealed the private contradiction Mr Scott had afforded him. Mr Scott did not contradict it in any manner—he did not deny it—he inquires whether it was pointed at him, implying it might be true though not pointed at him — and Mr M'Gavin begins No. IX. under the impression produced by their own conduct. For three months it stood uncontradicted.

"Was Mr M'Gavin entitled, or not, to believe there was some reality in what was said, when he found himself so left without receiving contradiction? It confirmed what impressions he had before.

"Then he had other information,—and he goes on to state that, 'The chapel must have cost as much money as would have built three comfortable houses sufficiently large. It is well known that the bulk of the adherents of the Romish Church here are poor labouring people; and it is not denied that the necessary funds, with the exception of a small sum from some very liberal Protestants, were raised among the people themselves. There was a sort of poll-tax imposed upon the members, according to their real or supposed circumstances.' The Issues stop at that word 'circumstances,' but the book goes on. 'This tax was levied with no small rigour; and, during a period of great commercial distress, it must undoubtedly have pressed heavily upon many poor persons, who were not left the choice of giving or not giving, but who were taught that nothing less than the salvation of their souls depended upon their paying the tax. Some who were actually exempted from the king's cottage tax, on account of their extreme poverty, were paying four times as much for building the chapel.'

"Then there was another long paragraph not inserted—and then there is the paragraph which I read: 'I find no fault with the Romish sect for building a place of worship for themselves. They have legally as good a right to do so as any other sect that is not established by law. Had they, of their own accord, agreed to erect a comfortable and commodious building, and had they contributed voluntarily, according to their ability, for the purpose, no reasonable man would have found fault, however much he might pity those who were so blinded by superstition, as to give their money for the support of a system which is inimical to their own happiness. Still, however, had it been a voluntary thing, they would have been acting like free-born British subjects; and had they been content with a building merely comfortable and commodious, they would have shown themselves possessed of some measure of common sense. But, as I shall show presently, there was a heavy tax imposed upon the people without their consent; and all who submitted to this became, in fact, the vassals or slaves of their tax-masters. They stood no longer on the high and independent ground which every British subject is entitled to occupy: their property, the hard-earned fruit of their labour, was at the arbitrary disposal of persons over whom they had no control, and who would not deign to consult them with regard to its application.

"'Besides nothing less it seems would suffice to gratify the vanity of him, or them, who had the charge of the money so extorted from the people, than a splendid edifice, equal at least to some ancient cathedral; or, to use the words

of Amicus Veritatis, a house resembling, "as much as possible, the majesty of that God to whose service it was to be dedicated." I need not stop at present to show that this could not be a place intended for Christian worship; for it must be only an idol that can find a likeness or resemblance in wood and stone, carved according to the art of the craftsmen. My present business is with the enormous expense of this building; and I not hesitate to repeat as an assertion, what I formerly put as a question, Whether it was not built, in a great measure, at the expense of a poor, and in some instances, of a starving people? I go upon the supposition, that what was levied under the pretext of building the chapel, was actually applied to that object; for that is what many of the contributors themselves must take for granted.' And then he says, 'And so far as I know, no doubt exists with regard to the faithfulness of the application.

"'Now it is a fact, that while the chapel was a building, the people, while they yet met in their old place of worship, were assured by their ghostly father—(this phrase is not used as a term of reproach. Ghostly is the old English word for spiritual; and, according to the Douay Catechism, ghostly father is the title by which the clergy choose to be called)—that such of them as fell behind in their payments, should not enjoy church privileges. What was this, but extorting money by the fear of future punishment? and, from the condition of many of those from whom it was so extorted, who can doubt that often they had scarcely food for their families, or clothes to cover them? Every one knows in what estimation Papists regard the privileges of their church. To be denied these, is the same as to be denied the salvation of their souls: the poor, therefore, were told, in language sufficiently plain, that if the chapel tax was not punctually paid, they should suffer the pains of purgatory, or even hell itself.'

"But I shall not fatigue you by reading the passages in the Issues, which have been frequently read.

"My learned friend read also a passage on the top of page 70, and stopt also in the middle of it:—'The Church of Rome cherishes such ideas of baptism, and of the absolute necessity of it, in order to the salvation of children; yet there was a priest in Glasgow, who would not baptize a child because its father was a few shillings in arrears of an arbitrarily imposed tax. Upon his own principles, the priest was, for the sake of a few shillings, guilty of the everlasting perdition of that child. The soul of one child is more precious than a thousand worlds; but Popery cares not how many thousand souls shall perish, if it can but gratify its own avarice and ambition.

"'Most sincerely do I wish that all Papists, and especially all fathers and mothers, would forsake their priests and come to Christ, the friend of sinners and the friend of children. If they believe in him they shall receive all heavenly blessings for themselves; and as for their children, they shall find that he imposes no such conditions, with regard to their salvation, as the hard-hearted priests impose. Such priests care for neither parents nor children, farther than as they can extort money from them. They will let them perish, if they cannot pay for their salvation; but Christ has a tender and compassionate heart. He has set open the door of mercy, that whosoever will may enter in and enjoy all the blessings of salvation, without money and without price. He has not made baptism, nor any thing else that man can do, necessary to the salvation of children. His own righteousness is sufficient to present them, as well as their believing parents, without spot before the throne of God.'

"There is an earnestness in the introduction of such statements, which makes it utterly impossible for any man, acquainted with such subjects, to suppose the passages written from private malice, unless he believes the author to have been the greatest hypocrite that ever existed,—and Mr M'Gavin we shall prove to have such a character as to save him from such suspicion. He so writes in the middle of the offences charged against him in this ninth Number, having in his mind the deep importance of the general subject. You see this,—and that he began from the first by accident, and went on with the sincerity of a man truly impressed with the subject, putting away all minor considerations, and not weighing all the words in illustration which he introduced. In the instances referred to, he asserts that sort of compulsion which proceeds from the principles of the Roman Catholics;—and how far we shall prove the cases, it will be for you to consider.

"But now I must beg your attention very particularly to this passage:—'I have more facts at the service of Mr Scott, if he shall think these insufficient to confirm my assertion. But I shall conclude this Number by asking him some questions, to which I hope he will write an answer; and if he does so, I will readily give it a place in *The Protestant*. Indeed it is my earnest desire, that he would defend himself and his cause; for that is in danger of becoming a tame controversy that is all on one side. I ask Mr Scott, whether he did not, on a certain day, denounce some of his people by name, before his whole congregation, for falling behind in the weekly impost?—if he did not pronounce very awful curses against the unhappy individuals, and threaten to consign their souls to everlasting punishment, if the money was not paid?—I ask if he did not refer to others, besides those whom he named, as also in arrears, and threaten them with similar judgment if they did not speedily pay? I request Mr Scott to answer these questions; and

say whether or not such anathemas have proceeded from his lips, and whether he thinks cursing his people be the duty of a minister of the gospel of peace ?'

"This was published in the Number of the 12th of September, 1818. My friend, in his statement, passed over at once what it is important to notice. He said the matter lay over for fourteen months. But I ask you what is the inference ? That very argument in the ninth Number lay unanswered. That subject lay without the smallest interference for fourteen months. Mr Scott had written to Mr M'Gavin, desiring to know whether the assertions were directed against him — and Mr M'Gavin had given the public the only answer he had thought proper to give, that he did not intend to point at Mr Scott exclusively,—but still he went on to state the grounds upon which he had made the statement, and asserted he believed the statement true.

"In one of those papers he says, 'I shall proceed to give a few more facts on this subject. The reader may rely on their authenticity. I could indeed give the names of the parties concerned ; but I do not choose to do so, unless I shall be judicially called upon. I have been informed that some of my Papist neighbours talk big about my having libelled them ; they even speak of a legal prosecution against me, for what I have written on the subject of their extorting money from the poor ; and they will *compel* me, they say, to answer Mr Scott's question, whether or not I referred to him as the person who did so ? I have no doubt the Papists of the present day are very willing to employ the old Popish argument of fines and imprisonments, and worse, if they could, against all whom they cannot otherwise confute ; and if they had the inquisition at command, they would no doubt silence me. It seems there is no resource left them, but to appeal to some criminal tribunal ; for they find that arguments and facts are all against them. It is my happiness, however, to live in a country in which there is no inquisition ; and therefore I shall, without fear, produce my facts, as I have hitherto done my arguments, leaving the reader to judge how far my assertions are proved by them.'

"I beg your attention to the language in that passage. Observe that was in September, 1818. Mr M'Gavin holds out a bold challenge to his opponents to come forward. He had been told of certain facts—and he says, when I am called upon judicially I shall give the names of the parties concerned.

"Fourteen months elapsed without any notice of those pretended libels. To those fourteen months I may take the liberty of adding seven or eight more, which elapsed before any action was brought. I know the pretence upon which this is attempted to be justified. But observe the effect this delay had upon this trial. This population—this Irish Catholic population in Glasgow, is migrating—is continually changing,—and many, who were then resident in Glasgow, are no longer in Scotland—the persons from whom Mr M'Gavin had his information in September, 1818, are now gone beyond his reach—and those persons were under the pastoral influence of Mr Scott himself, and the influence of all the office-bearers in that church —they were the labourers who had paid their money in that manner, and were gone before Mr Scott found it convenient to institute his action.

"The first thing Mr M'Gavin did, was to state the very particulars of the information which he had received, without giving the names of the parties ;—and he stated, that when called upon judicially, he would name the persons, and would be prepared for his defence. Then his opponents allowed a long time (nearly two years) to elapse, till the witnesses were gone—and of those who remained, their memory failed them in many instances, as might have been expected. Then the pursuer found it convenient to bring this action.

"You cannot dispossess yourselves of that fact. We are told, the delay was a proof of the pursuer's indulgence,—that he was unwilling to bring the matter into a court of justice. That will not do. He began by writing to demand an answer to his question, whether he was pointed at in the paragraph which he quoted—and they tell you, the answer was direct —that it was imputing to him the charges in that paragraph. If so, then how can Mr Scott pretend, that, after being so defied, the subsequent delay was mere indulgence, and proceeded from liberality, in his being unwilling to bring Mr M'Gavin before a court of law.

"When you thus see, then, the nature of this advantage of the pursuer,—his undue advantage over us as to the question of fact,—you will properly give effect to such a remarkable circumstance.

"About the end of the fourteen months, a circumstance occurred, not imputable to Mr M'Gavin, which renewed the subject for a little. You remember, that, during the whole interval, from September, 1818, to the month of November, 1819, Mr M'Gavin had been publishing weekly, a Number of *The Protestant*. He had been going on upon the general subject of the Catholic religion ; clearly showing that he did not write that book from malice to Mr Scott, but was occupied with a far deeper matter of importance to himself. After his challenge, he went on with his general subject, thinking little of Mr Scott or his chapel. He went on with *The Protestant*, a work which does high honour to his talents and his knowledge of the subject.

"You see, upon the face of the Issues, that a letter was addressed to him from a respectable person, who says,—'Glasgow Town's Hos-

pital, September, 1819.' (The learned counsel read Mr Sym's letter, which need not be repeated here. It may be seen in the Issues, page 6th of this Report.)

"They have not pretended that Mr M'Gavin had the smallest concern either with the preparation of that statement, or with the inquiry which had been instituted by the committee of the Town's Hospital. The committee had made the inquiry, and, unasked, they send him this statement as to this particular instance. Mr M'Gavin has an interest in the Hospital, as a contributor to its funds, which are raised by assessment on the citizens of Glasgow. He received that letter after fourteen months' acquiescence by Mr Scott in his previous statements; and it was of such a nature, that it was his duty, treating as he was of such subjects, to lay it before the public, and he did so, as would appear from the 9th page of the Issues. And it came to his knowledge that the 8s. had been restored, and which has been admitted this day.

"What followed upon this publication? Was all the indulgence, the kindliness of Mr Scott, at once done away? And did he come forward directly to accuse my client with having made a false accusation against him? No. That was published in the 72d Number, on the 27th of November, 1819, and there was no action raised until the month of May, 1820.

"Thus, after having acquiesced for fourteen months in the previous statements, he now let this stand for six months more, without either making a contradiction of it, or bringing his action. After all that time had elapsed, he brings his action.

"In the meantime, soon after the publication of the ninth Number of *The Protestant*, in 1818, a work was set on foot, which was called *The Catholic Vindicator*. That *Catholic Vindicator* is admitted to have been published under the direction of a committee of persons belonging to the congregation of Mr Scott, by a person of the name of Andrews; and in it, every possible term of reproach which the English language could furnish, was raked together to assail the personal character of Mr M'Gavin. He was denounced as a shuffling, profligate, and lying opponent. He was called a convicted forger, a defender of adultery, and protector of an adulterous strumpet. As such he was actually placarded on the corners of the streets, under the direction of a committee belonging to Mr Scott's congregation, as you may see by these handbills, which some of pursuer's witnesses have authenticated. The reproach of being a favourer of adultery was applied to Luther at first; but my client was put upon the same footing. He was, besides, termed a forger,—a retailer of falsehood,—and it was said, his authorities were not a tittle better than himself.

"I am not imputing this to Mr Scott."

Lord GILLIES—"And therefore, I think, we have nothing to do with it."

Mr MONCREIFF—"I shall read an extract or two.—'*The Protestant* may endeavour to represent this affair as "of no importance whatever" to the question before us; but the reflecting reader will not be put off by such shufflings. In all cases of accusation, the *character* of the accuser must be taken into consideration; and if he and his witnesses are found to contradict each other; if he is detected in *forging* evidence to convict the accused, every sensible man will conclude, that his cause is *a bad one*, by his having recourse to such base means to support it; and that the system which he attacks is not so vile as he makes it, or more honest means would be resorted to by him to justify his charges. The man who has the vindication of *true religion* at heart, will never ally himself to *falsehood;* but the wretch who seeks to blacken his neighbour's character, from motives of malice or revenge, or any other bad passion of the mind, will employ any means to gratify his wicked propensities, and thus dig a snare for his own feet. Into such a snare has *The Protestant* tumbled himself; and, in the words of our courts of justice, I say, "God send him a good deliverance."' But I need not go through all such passages. I merely mention them to draw my inference to you—to let you see the progress of the controversy—and how Mr M'Gavin was provoked to it. He was provoked by others, who came forward to supply the places of *Amicus Veritatis* and *Pax*, and to carry on the controversy with a still more unmeasured hostility. You see by the affidavit of Andrews, that he was solicited by persons of Mr Scott's congregation to write against Mr M'Gavin; and that these persons became bound to him for the expense of publication, and took the charge of circulating the work.

"But, I must state, it is not by any means clear Mr Scott is free from responsibility in the matter—for he did, within his chapel, recommend to many of his congregation to purchase up that work. This admits of two constructions. One is, that it had sold badly; and that was just attaching himself to it as a thing that had been set on foot for his interest. And if he disapproved of it, it was that it was making attacks on my client which would not stand inquiry. Notwithstanding he could not be rendered liable directly as author and publisher, he was thus responsible. He was giving his sanction to the propagation of the most odious calumnies against Mr M'Gavin's personal character.

"Of all those attacks, Mr M'Gavin took no notice but in argument. And, when he published the statement sent him by Mr Sym, I submit to you whether he did publish that statement maliciously. Was he not in *bona fide?* If that was not feasible ground on which he proceeded, where could a man find it? It

will be for Mr Sym to point out the nature of the information he received, and we shall see how far it has been proved that the statements were true.

"My friend, Mr Cockburn, says, we are not entitled to enter into this,—but that is altogether a mistake. We have not a special Issue here—but we have a title to show Mr M'Gavin had reasonable ground,—that you may know whether he did maliciously act or not—and to enable you to estimate correctly, and with propriety, the claim of damages. And therefore, we shall be entitled to enter into that question, —and you will find the substance of the statement is perfectly true.

"A story was given by my friend, about the husband of this Mrs Hanlin, of which we never heard before. He has not proved a word of it. In point of fact, the thing happened substantially as Sym stated it—for, if there was not sufficient information, Mr M'Gavin had received such reasonable information as entitled him to believe that the statement which he published was true.

"The work of *The Protestant* (I do not know that it is finished yet) was continued from laudable motives. The profits had been applied to purposes of charity—and Mr M'Gavin had bestowed his time and labour on the work, chiefly with a view to the interest of the subject, and to his earnest desire to make his argument as ample as possible.

"Mr M'Gavin paid over £150 to charitable purposes (and great part of it went to Irish Catholics) before any action was instituted—and you are to judge whether this was a person who wrote for mercenary purposes, or who sat down deliberately to destroy the peace of his neighbour, from no other motive than malice. From the history I have given of *The Protestant*,—it proceeded originally from accident,—it was forced on by the attacks of others,—it continued without any allusion to Mr Scott, until he obtruded himself on Mr M'Gavin by his letters.

"Now, having come to the raising of the action, I must take notice of the view which my friend finds it convenient to give of that of which he says my client accused Mr Scott. He says, we are accusing him of an indictable offence,—and, he says, why did we not resort to a public court of justice?

"This is an entire misconception of the case and of the controversy; and, had the offence charged been such as my friend alleges, it had rested with the public prosecutor, not with Mr M'Gavin, to bring Mr Scott to account.

"My friend says, it is a *question* of private calumny. It is so. But if you can bring your minds to say, it is a *case* of private calumny—if you can bring your minds to say, you can infer malignity here,—I should be much astonished. I cannot believe it is a result to which you will ever come.

"To say we accuse Mr Scott of an indictable offence, and should apply to a court of justice, is absurd. For Mr M'Gavin never did impute to Mr Scott, or any body else, any thing that could be construed into a charge of that description. And that leads me to explain Mr M'Gavin's views connected with all the details of his argument.

"It is a doctrine of the Catholic Church, according to the first authorities at the time of the Reformation, that not only edifices for public worship were sacred, but that there was positive merit on the one hand,—merit for the salvation of their souls,—in contributing to their utmost possible means to the pious purpose of erecting such magnificent edifices; and that, on the other, there was demerit, to the peril of their souls, in refusing so to contribute when the work had been set agoing,—or even when there is a design of making such erection,—and the priest has enjoined that they should contribute.

"It was no invention of Mr M'Gavin's—it was no imputation on Mr Scott, to say that he believes in that doctrine, as one of his own church,—still less was it to say, that the poor people under his charge must be influenced by his directions,—and that, therefore, when such a thing had been enjoined on them, they would have, to the utmost extent of the means in their hands, so employed them, instead of employing them to the support of their families,—and that they would have entertained the greatest dread if they did not so contribute after such injunctions from the priest.

"I am not going to detain you with a dissertation on this subject; but I shall read two sentences from Cardinal Bellarmine, with reference to the case of the widow's mite. That it is erroneous, every one of you will perceive: —'The widow,' &c."

[The words were not taken down as they were read; but the purport of them was, that it is the duty of Christians, however poor, to devote their last farthing for the glory of God, as the poor widow did; and that it is not only a duty paramount to all others, but it is peculiarly meritorious to contribute our last mite for building churches to God's glory.]

"There is," said Mr Moncreiff, "one side of the proposition. It is a Christian duty, and it is meritorious in the sight of God, and contributes to the salvation of the soul, for persons, however poor, to give their last farthing for the building of churches. Then, on the other side, there is the demerit of neglecting to do it. The Protestants urge against them the passage in Matthew, where it is said, those who do not feed the poor should be condemned. In answer to that, Bellarmine says, 'The less sinners are,' &c."

[Here again the Reporter does not give the passage verbatim; but it was to this effect:—the less sinners are those who do not feed the

poor, and do other acts of charity; and the great sinners, or the greatest of all sinners, are those who do not contribute for the building of churches.]

"There is the Catholic doctrine of Bellarmine. And do you put yourselves in the case of Mr M'Gavin for an instant, with the belief, that that is the doctrine maintained by them, and see what is the doctrine maintained by him. What he says is,—you Catholics hold this tenet, that there is merit in the building of a church,—that you must not refuse your aid to the last mite, like the widow in the passage referred to. Now, he saw around him thousands of poor Irish labourers, requiring charity to enable them to live at that period—and he saw the most magnificent building, that had been seen in Scotland, erecting in Glasgow, and erected, as I shall show you, with the twopences and threepences of those poor labourers.

Now, how could any man reason upon this case without reasoning in this way? They are taught to believe, by their ghostly or spiritual father, that they must contribute to the chapel,—nay taught, as they must have been by their fathers, to believe all the doctrines of the Catholic Church, was he not entitled to assume they believed this also? And he was told they did contribute to this chapel, and collectors were set over every cotton and other public work in Glasgow, that they should receive the contributions. If he saw that, how could he but believe those men acted on the compulsion of the mind, which is more strong than any other compulsion? They believed what all their spiritual fathers had been always inculcating, and it was impossible Mr M'Gavin could have judged otherwise.

"They tell us it was a voluntary contribution. This is true in one sense. In this land of freedom, Mr Scott could not have forced them, if they were unwilling to pay. In that sense, Mr M'Gavin never did say they were forced to pay. What he said was, and he says it still,—that, under the influence of their religion, and the belief they were doing God service and saving their souls, they were called to contribute under intellectual compulsion.

"Those men (those of the collectors who were examined to-day) tell us, they asked what a man would contribute—but they know, at the same time, that such is a Papist's faith, it is his indispensable duty, as he values his soul, to pay contributions for such a purpose.

"Such is the true, just, and clear view of the case. What Mr M'Gavin reasoned against was, that destructive doctrine, (as I can say to you,) that destructive doctrine of the imagination, that, by the paltry exercise of contributing to the erection of a fine chapel, they were to save themselves from perdition, to which, we know, all mankind are doomed, unless redeemed by sovereign grace. It was against that perilous doctrine he was writing. It is there he brings to the test the point, that those men had been compelled to contribute to this object, under the persuasion they were otherwise endangering their immortal souls.

"I know there is another part of the charge, relating to the refusal of church privileges—but I thought it right, at first, to refer to what I have stated.

"When this action was raised, my client was beset with difficulties. The nature of the population being migratory, a great many were gone who could have proved the facts.

"And, on the other side, are any of you ignorant that, in the Roman Catholic church, there is an influence, a silent influence, of the priest over the people, that goes far beyond any thing that is known to us in Protestant lands? Are you ignorant of the terror under which witnesses would come forward to support the case of Mr M'Gavin,—witnesses under the pastoral care of Mr Scott,—supposing them still in the place?

"None of you could be insensible of such difficulties. Mr M'Gavin could only get direct evidence of his facts, from persons subject to such overwhelming influence.

"Then observe the difficulty arising from the failure of witnesses' memory, when we come to the trial.

"We supposed, when coming to court, Mr Scott would have laid open to us all the information we could have expected. We see lists on the table of all the contributors. We believed such lists must have been preserved, and we demanded that those lists should have been produced, that we might see who the persons were who had contributed, and thus have been enabled to see whether it was true, to a great extent, that money had been so produced. But Mr Scott was a great deal too well advised, to accede to this motion. He said no—you must make out your case by such evidence as you had at the time, and I will not allow you to give other evidence. But, might not a man have good evidence as to general facts, and even as to particular facts, and yet be disabled from proving them, unless he get possession of documents? But this was overruled. What, then, are you to think of Mr Scott claiming those large damages on the ground of malice? If conscious there was no wrong, he should have produced the lists at once.

"It was a miserable apology to say, you will go and tamper with the witnesses. When we shall have given you evidence of the character of Mr M'Gavin, you will see this. Therefore that excuse will not pass—and, when you are sitting there, to determine as to damages, you will not lay out of view, that Mr Scott has taken advantage of the law in this matter, and has had the advantage of delay in bringing the action.

"We did give in our answer to their condescendence, in which we made averments as to

more cases than appear in the Issues,—because time and number, &c. were objected to, till at last we were limited to the cases now before you. But that will not confine us in our proof to those particular instances, because we are entitled to prove the general reputation of the facts, as it existed at Glasgow, for our *bona fides*, and for estimating the claim of damages.

"After the condescendence was adjusted, and the Issues settled, we got a diligence to recover those lists, and we recovered them just about fourteen days ago. You will see, at once, in what advantage that places a party—he had it in his power to give notice of this trial, and we were under the necessity of making investigation over 4037 names in those lists, and to come here prepared to meet statements he might think proper to prove, not one of which he had given notice of before.

"Nor is there any date to all those books that are upon your table.* There had been collectors from 1813 down to 1816 and 1820, at the time those persons so contributed.

"When the books were first produced, they could not be examined till afterwards,—and then dates were wanting,—and then another examination was applied for, for the purpose of seeing whether Mr Scott had any books that could show the dates. This examination took place on the 15th of June, 1821, and I shall read the deposition.†—'Appeared the pursuer, who, being solemnly sworn and examined as a haver, and called upon to produce all books, or writings, tending to instruct the dates of contributions, to the erection of the Roman Catholic chapel, Glasgow, Depones, that he is not in possession of any books, or other documents, tending to instruct the dates of the contributions to the erection of the said chapel; having, when formerly examined as a haver, exhibited and produced the whole documents of the description called for in his possession. That he is not aware that it is usual to affix particular dates to subscription papers, and he was not in the habit of writing the dates on the contribution papers, which he from time to time received from the different collectors. That the contributions were begun about the middle of August, 1813, as far as he remembers; and the last were received about the end of December, 1816. And being specially called on to produce any cash-book, or other book, or writing, in which he marked the sums contained in the Inventory, No. 1. of the productions formerly made, or any part thereof, specifying dates in reference to the said contributions, Depones, that he is not possessed, and to the best of his knowledge, never was possessed of any books, or other documents, specifying the dates of the said contributions, further than may appear from the productions formerly made, particularly No. 1. of Inventory, No. 1. of said productions. And being specially called on to produce copy of his deposit account with any bank in which the sums received, as contributions, from time to time, were entered, or the original of said deposit account, tending to show the dates of such depositions from said contributions, Depones, that he declines producing the deposit accounts called for, because none of them have any tendency to instruct the dates of the said contributions, in consequence of the money contributed from time to time having been received in small sums, and having been partly paid away without being lodged in any bank, and when so lodged, having been mixed with the other cash deposited in bank by the Deponent, on the account of other individuals, and with money borrowed for the erection of the chapel. And being further specially called on to produce the different settled accounts with the contractors, for the erection of the chapel, paid from the contributions so received, tending to show the dates of those contributions, Depones, and declines producing the settled accounts called for, because they cannot, in any way, lead to instruct the dates of the said contributions; the first payment having been made in June, 1814, previous to which date, money

* There is one exception which Mr Moncreiff overlooked. The books are about a hundred in number, and upon a corner of the cover of *one* of them, *viz.* Inventory, No. 2. Book, No. 1. is the date, Sept. 12th, 1819.

† For the sake of connection, it is proper to insert here Mr Scott's first deposition, when he delivered the books, of which the dates were wanted.

"*At Glasgow, the 4th day of June*, 1821 *years.*

"Appeared the pursuer, Andrew Scott, who, being solemnly sworn *ut supra*, and interrogated, and called upon to exhibit the lists of contributors, or amounts of contributions, towards the Roman Catholic chapel, lately erected in Glasgow, Depones, and exhibits the whole of the documents of the description called for, in his possession, as per Inventories, Numbers 1, 2, 3, marked by the Deponent and Commissioner, as relative hereto. Farther depones, That the exhibits now made, as contained in their respective parcels, contain the lists and amounts of the whole contributions towards the Roman Catholic establishment in Glasgow, made in Glasgow, or the adjacent counties, down to the present month. And being specially called on, to produce a certain letter, alleged to have been written by Bishop Paterson, the Roman Catholic priest, now, or lately, officiating at Paisley, to the Deponent, shortly after the Deponent had been applied to, to baptize the child of John Drain, depones, That he has not any such letter in his possession, neither does he know, or suspect, where any such letter may be, nor has he destroyed, or fraudulently put away, any such letter: That he made particular search among the letters which he received from Bishop Paterson, and which have been preserved, and he found no letter having any reference either to John Drain, or his child, mentioned in the Interrogatory: That he has not withheld, fraudulently put away, or destroyed, any of the writs called for; neither does he know, or suspect where any of the documents called for may be, unless they are in the possession of the collectors; and all this is truth, as he shall answer to God.

(Signed) ANDREW SCOTT."

had been borrowed for defraying the expense of the erection, and because the production of the said accounts would unnecessarily expose the credit of the establishment. All which is truth.'

"Here, you observe, Mr Scott swears he is not in possession of any books of accounts specifying dates; yet, you observe, it has been proved this day, by two or three of his own witnesses, that he was possessed of a book of accounts, in which the whole of the money collected was entered. The collectors swore, most of them collected once a fortnight, and that then Mr Scott marked the sums in a book. Yet Mr Scott says there are no books or documents specifying dates.

"When I call a pursuer as a party haver of writings, and he does not give a satisfactory answer to demands of papers, I am entitled to represent to you the failure as matter of conclusive presumption against him.

"You see, I got a diligence for books tending to show the dates. I asked him to produce all books or accounts for this purpose, and he swears he is not in possession of any such—and yet his witnesses say, he had a book in which the contributions were entered. He did not tell he had a book without dates. He makes himself judge of that matter, whether he was to mention that or not. He leaves us without the means of seeing that book, or of knowing, through any other person, whether it could have availed us or not.

"We called also for his account with the bank in which he deposited his money, which would have shown, to some extent, the year or months in which those contributions were raised, —and he declines to produce the account with the bank, pretending the money was mixed with other money—an answer away from the purpose—because, although we could not have ascertained how much of the money was of John and James, we could have shown the periods in which the large contributions were raised from that poor and starving congregation.

"We demanded his account of expenditure to the workmen—and the pursuer declines to produce that account too. He says it would expose the credit of the Institution—he will not give us in that account either.

"Thus, those funds had been raised upon those books, not one of which has a date,—and then entered in a book, which contains no date from beginning to end. The money had been deposited in a bank, and he will not show us the bank-book ;—the money had been expended on workmen, and he will not show us the account of expenditure.

"Mr M'Gavin had said, he had no doubt of the faithful expenditure of the money. He only wished to ascertain the dates, from which he would have been enabled to instruct more particularly than he might otherwise be enabled to do, that the money was raised from a poor and starving population.

"And Bishop Cameron stated the management was subject to his control. Mr Scott was only a trustee; and that he (Bishop C.) examined and doquetted the books. Now, I appeal to you, who are merchants, as matters were subject to the control of Bishop Cameron, do you believe the Bishop was so easily satisfied with those accounts that he did not require dates ?

"And, for Mr Scott's own satisfaction, how could he feel satisfied, holding all this money, and having the distribution of it, how could he feel satisfied in keeping books without dates ?

"I fear I detain you long,—but I cannot help it, from the nature of the case.

"Having explained the general nature of Mr M'Gavin's view, I come to explain what remains of the defence.

"The question is, whether what he is charged with was done maliciously, or whether he acted *bona fide* in what he did.

"We shall lead to you in evidence, in the first place, the general character of Mr M'Gavin —I do not mean that sort of general character which any man, in a respectable condition, may obtain—we shall prove that Mr M'Gavin— [The Reporter is sorry he did not get all Mr Moncreiff's words here taken down. The statement was, in the strongest terms, in favour of Mr M'Gavin's character, mentioning his active exertions for the comforts of the poor, and his zealous endeavours for their education and religious improvement.] "He is a man most remarkable for attention to the interests of the people among whom he lives. He has given a great deal of his money into those voluntary contributions, which were required in the difficulties of Glasgow. He has given a great part of his time to the promotion of Christianity. You know, that in 1816 and 1817, the labouring population was near starvation, and that it required large contributions to preserve them from the utmost wretchedness, and that it was at Glasgow the distress was most felt. Later years were not quite so bad; but, even in these years, large contributions were required. In all those matters, Mr M'Gavin was the secretary, and a principal manager of the contributions. He gave his time and property for the purpose of doing service to the poor, many of whom were Catholics. We shall prove to you, he was the last man that could dream of harbouring a malignant spirit against any individual. It was not intended by him to do any injury to Mr Scott. But I shall not enlarge upon that,—you will hear it from the witnesses. But more—he has a deep interest in the public charities; although in the Town's Hospital he has no management, which is committed to a Committee. He knew and perceived, that in point of fact, the labouring population were in the greatest distress in those years. He knew

the principles under which they lived—he knew the general belief, that poor Catholics had been led, notwithstanding their pressing wants, to subscribe and give their money to what they believed to be a pious and necessary work. And then there was Mr Sym's letter, which came after all his information, giving him strong confirmation of every thing he had heard before.

"When we pass from that to what actually took place,—I state, first, we shall prove (it has been stated by one witness already) that Mr Scott, actuated by the principles under which he lives and acts, did state from the pulpit, upon more occasions than one, the necessity of those persons contributing to the erection of the chapel,—and that he did make denunciations against individuals, requiring them, under the strongest statement of the consequences, to come forward with contributions.

"A witness said, he alluded to some who spent their money in drinking or otherwise. That was a thing naturally to be noticed—but it does not alter the case before you. He would naturally say, that those who went a drinking, instead of contributing to the chapel, were guilty of an offence. But the very denunciation in the pulpit, of persons by name, for not contributing towards the erection of the chapel, (with whatever it might be coupled,) does infer a threat, and is as compulsory a proceeding to raise money as any thing can be. What would it be thought, in a congregation here, or any where else, if a clergyman should denounce persons for not having contributed for any purpose. Even there it would be nothing to what it would be in this case. Here an individual would judge for himself—he would be under no fear that he would suffer the perdition of his soul by refusal to comply with the recommendation. But those poor people were in a very different state of mind —and such an address to them, however coupled as it may have been, demonstrates a compulsory spirit was at work. And, we shall prove, the address was not only against individuals, but coupled with denunciations against all in arrear.

"Passing from that, let us come to the actual state of the contributions.

"We were told, that, at the worst, the money levied by Mr Scott, from all the Catholics in Glasgow and neighbourhood, came to little more than a halfpenny a-week from each. You must have distinguished the fallacy of this— for the Catholic population, *including the women and children*, is only 8245. My friend's argument went upon the supposition, that all these were contributors, or capable of being such; yet he states, that the largest number of subscribers was only 4037. Bishop Cameron estimated the number of nominal Catholics from 14,000 to 18,000, upon reports which he had heard. However that may be, take the population at fourteen thousand, you will find the four thousand would have taken all the men, and more than were in constant attendance on this chapel, for Bishop Cameron said, those who attended to their religious duties did not exceed two thousand.

"You see 4037 contributors in the lists, and the sum of £5,500 was raised, according to the statement of Mr Scott, within two or three years. He says, the contributions were nearly ended in 1816,—though there was a contribution after this for the house, for which the sum raised was £687 18s. 3d.

"Besides this, you will observe, there were contributions at the chapel doors,—payments for marriages, baptisms,—perhaps for confessions,—and farther sums were borrowed—and there is an arrear at this moment, which there are no means of liquidating, except by a continuance of the same system of collection.

"The method followed for raising this money was different from any you ever heard of. They divided those persons into districts, and set collectors over them. One was placed over every public work. He did not go once and say, give me what you can, and I shall not come back again—but he goes once a fortnight, and requires them to pay a sum of money. The collectors examined say, they asked them to pay what they could, and no more. But they are interested, and we could not expect them, if they used extortion, to come here and swear they did so. They are interested witnesses, and only three or four of them were brought here. There were upwards of 50 or 60 in waiting. Some might have used extortion, and not others. They collected an immense sum of money in shillings and sixpences, once a fortnight.

"I have a state of the contribution, and you will see what is the just inference. The number of contributors who paid £10 and upwards, was 27. That would only make £270, supposing at £10 each. The number of contributors who paid from £10 to £7, was only 45;—those from £7 to £5, 61;—those from £5 to £4, 168. From £4 to £3, 248 persons contributed;—from £3 to £2, 401 persons;—from £2 to £1, 749 persons;—from £1 to 10s. 692 persons;—from 10s. to 5s., 597;—and under 5s., 1049 persons.—Now, I ask you, if you can suppose, that, in the years in which this collection was going on, it was possible to collect from 4037 persons—or, deduct the two or three hundred, or perhaps, 1000 persons, till we come to those who paid in single shillings,—do you suppose £5000, or nearly so, was collected in shillings, once a fortnight, from labouring people, without occasioning them great distress? There is a *prima facie* case against them. It is not to be imagined, those poor labourers could have spared 1s. or 6d. in a week, in such a manner, and at a time of general starvation among the labouring classes.

"This leads me to call your attention to the most essential fact, that those contributions were levied in those very years when contributions were raised in Glasgow for the support of the lower orders. What are you to think, then, of a collection which, in those years, was taken from persons who were receiving contributions from the public? Would not you say, that the money so contributed for the support of the labouring poor, was carried to Mr Scott for building his chapel? We shall prove that numerous paupers, upon the roll, did contribute in those years to the erection of the chapel. They were receiving sums from the voluntary contribution of the public, on account of their poverty, and, at the same period, were under the necessity of paying towards the erection of the chapel.—There were even paupers on the Hospital list, who, at the same time, were contributing towards the erection of this chapel. —And how, then, I ask, could any one be said to be guilty of malice, by stating that the money was extorted from a poor and starving population?

"Having gone thus far, I come to the special Issues, upon which I shall say a very few words.

"The first which we shall prove, is the 6th Issue, that which stands at the foot of the tenth page of the printed Issues in your hands. My friend on the other side of the bar made a faint attempt to touch it.—You were told it was positively denied. The Issue is: 'Whether, in the year 1814, the pursuer did apply to Mr Haughton Fleming, or to Mr Bowman Fleming, who carried on a dye-work in Hutchesontown, Glasgow, to retain in their hands, a portion of the weekly earnings of such Catholics as were employed in their works, to be applied toward building said Roman Catholic chapel.' They deny that Mr Scott applied to those gentlemen, asking them to retain the wages of the labourers:—and they called two witnesses who told you they saw Mr Scott at the manufactory. What was the use of calling those persons, I know not. You will hear from Mr Fleming that he refused to comply with a request made by Mr Scott, for the purpose of retaining part of the wages of his workmen. And you will be able to apply this to the whole colour of this case.—Mr Haughton Fleming is dead. But we shall prove by his brother quite enough to stand upon that Issue.

"To go back to the case of Courtney,—you see the question is, 'Whether, on or about the month of October, 1814, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Henry Courtney, labourer, lately in Anderston, and now in Cowcaddens, Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and one of the contributors to the Roman Catholic chapel aforesaid; because he, Courtney, was in arrear of his contribution, until the said Courtney should pay the said arrears to the collectors for the chapel? And whether, at or about Easter, 1815, the pursuer did refuse confession to the said Courtney, because he had not paid his contribution to the said chapel?'

"You will find we shall prove this case directly, and my friend opposite seemed to be aware of that.

"Then you come to the case of M'Geechie, —'Whether, about six years ago, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of Philip M'Geechie, now in Manchester, late resident in Glasgow, a person of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and a member of the pursuer's congregation; because the said M'Geechie was in arrear of his contribution to the said chapel?'

"With regard to that case, I conceived it was my duty to admit, that, upon their evidence, it would be impossible for me to ask a verdict from you upon that Issue.—[The defender's agent signified, that they did not mean to abandon that Issue, considering it proved by Robertson on his cross-examination.]—They have proved (continued Mr M.), that M'Geechie stated to a witness that it was some time before he was tried, that he had gone upon one occasion with Robertson to Mr Scott about a child —but they are not entitled to tie us down upon this Issue. It is not whether before a particular date, but whether about six years ago, which is a general term, the fact occurred.—If so, you see the evidence. Robertson was a confused witness. With some difficulty I was able to extract the fact from him, that Mr Scott complained of M'Geechie not having attended church. But it is proved he did also expressly state he would not baptize the child unless M'Geechie paid 5s. to the chapel.—And Robertson remonstrated, and said the child might die and go to hell, upon which Scott's answer was, that was not his business.—They prove Robertson went with M'Geechie to Scott—and then we have what Robertson said passed.

"It is one of our misfortunes to have to resort to those low persons. Placed in that situation, what could we do? We wanted M'Geechie, but we could not find him—they did not tell us he was at Lancaster. We have brought all the evidence we could—and I leave it to you to judge of the case from the evidence —considering the difficulty of our getting that evidence, it is most material in favour of the truth of it, that it was extracted from the witness, apparently against his will.

"Then we come to the case of Drain,— 'Whether, on or about the month of June, 1818, the pursuer did refuse to baptize the child of John Drain, weaver in Duke Street, Glasgow, one of the contributors to the Catholic chapel aforesaid, because the said Drain was then in arrears of his contribution to said chapel?'

"We were told he married one woman, and afterwards another:—there is not a particle of evidence to show this—and Drain is not inca-

pacitated as a witness. We shall be able to prove that application was made to Mr Scott for baptism, and that he refused, on the ground of the contribution not having been paid. On his refusal, a different person was gone to, who baptized the child. That has been proved by the pursuer, and we shall prove how that happened.

"Whether Mr M'Gavin acted with falsehood and malice, is the question for you to determine. And that will never go down with the world if Mr M'Gavin was well-founded in the statement that those things happened—nor will you give damages against him in this civil court.

"But, look at the beginning, progress, object, and scope of the whole of his writings: the interest he regarded was that of the public, and not his own interest. Look to the long period during which he has devoted himself to the most praiseworthy labour. Although it may appear to you that passages are perhaps made too strong; looking at the whole scope and connection of what he wrote, it is impossible for you to say the passages were written from motives of malice.

"I already explained to you how much evidence has been lost to us, and how the delay in bringing the action prevented us from proving many more facts which had come to Mr M'Gavin's knowledge.

"The work of Mr M'Gavin is now in two volumes. It has been matter of honourable labour to him. It evinces uncommon talents, learning, and industry; and none can read it without thinking that it does the highest honour to his heart, and proves the true sincerity of religious feeling by which he has been actuated."

[From the fatigue of incessant writing for eleven hours, together with the suffocating heat of the place, the short-hand writer was taken ill, and obliged to retire, at the conclusion of Mr Moncreiff's speech, which was delivered throughout in a style of most impressive eloquence. What follows is taken, partly from newspaper reports, and partly furnished by the recollection of gentlemen who were present. The defender, Mr Sym, sustains the disadvantage of not having a report of Mr Murray's speech in his defence, for in the newspapers, there is only the following short notice:—"Mr Murray then addressed the Jury for the defender, Mr Sym, and contended that there was no ground for making his client a party in the cause, as, in writing the letter contained in the third Issue, he only acted in the discharge of his official duty." And Mr M'Gavin sustains the disadvantage of not having the evidence of his witnesses taken down so strictly *verbatim* as was that for Mr Scott. This a discerning public will be able to appreciate; and they may rest assured, that if they have not all the words, and the very words that were deponed, the utmost pains have been taken to prevent the admission of a single idea but what was distinctly sworn to; for which purpose the manuscript was revised by several gentlemen of both Edinburgh and Glasgow, who were present at the trial.]

The first witness called for the defence, was HENRY MONTEITH, Esq., M.P. Examined by Mr MONCREIFF.

Q. Have you been long acquainted with Mr M'Gavin?—A. I have been acquainted with him for several years.

Q. Has your acquaintance with him been in public or in private life?—A. In both, but chiefly in public.

Q. Does it consist with your knowledge, that he has been very attentive to the state of the poor, and has taken an active part in promoting public charities in Glasgow?

Mr COCKBURN—"Don't answer that question."

Here a good deal of conversation took place between the counsel on both sides, and the Lord Chief Commissioner, which issued in the objection being sustained; and evidence was not allowed to be led on the subject of the question put to the witness, or on the general good character of Mr M'Gavin; on which a bill of exceptions was taken by Mr Moncreiff.

The Rev. Dr M'GILL, professor of divinity in Glasgow University, was next called; but as his evidence bore upon the same points, he was immediately allowed to withdraw.

The depositions given by the pursuer, Mr Scott, when examined as a haver, under the authority of the Jury Court, were then tendered in evidence, and desired to be read to the Jury; but it was maintained by the counsel for the pursuer, that these depositions could not be read in evidence at the trial; and the court sustained their objection. They were accordingly not read; on which a bill of exceptions was again taken for the defenders.

The defender's counsel then tendered in evidence, certain receipts for money given by Mr M'Gavin, out of the profits of his publication, (*The Protestant,*) which receipts had been previously lodged in process.

Mr COCKBURN—"These cannot be received in evidence. They do not bear to be from the profits of *The Protestant.*"

Mr MONCREIFF—"Hand the parcel to the bench."

The Lord Chief Commissioner having read one of the receipts, said, "This bears to be part of the profits of a work entitled *The Protestant* "

Mr COCKBURN—"We don't know that it *is* so."

The objection was sustained.

The first two volumes of *The Protestant* were given in without objection. *The Catholic Vindicator* was offered in evidence, but objected to on the ground that no Issue was made concerning it. The objection, however,

not being pressed, the *Vindicator* was received; as were also the handbills announcing its publication, with the contents of the weekly numbers.

ALEXANDER BUCHANAN was then called.

Mr MURRAY—Are you superintendent of the poor in Glasgow?—A. I am, under the managers of the Town's Hospital.

Mr COCKBURN—I have a question or two to ask this witness. Have you not been employed as an agent for the defender, Mr M'Gavin, to procure evidence for him in this cause?—A. Never.

Mr MURRAY—How long have you held the office of superintendent of the poor, connected with the Town's Hospital?—A. For several years; I think, since 1815.

Q. Is it your duty to visit the poor, and make yourself acquainted with their circumstances?—A. When persons apply to the Hospital for relief, I am instructed by the committee to visit them in their own houses, to inquire into their state, and to report.

Q. Were you acquainted with the condition of the poor and labouring classes, in the years 1815, 1816, and 1817?—A. Yes; well acquainted with it

Q. Was not that a period of great distress among the poor and labouring people in Glasgow and the neighbourhood?—A. It was a time of very great distress, from want of employment for labourers, and the dearth of provisions. A large sum was raised for their relief by public subscription.

Q. Was it, during that period, generally reported and believed, that poor labouring persons were contributing for the building of the Roman Catholic chapel in Glasgow?—A. That was reported, and believed very generally.

Q. Did you ever learn that poor persons did contribute?—A. When I visited applicants for the Hospital charity, whom I knew to be Catholics, or who told me they were so, I sometimes put the question, Whether they were subscribers to the chapel? and many have told me that they were. I have the Hospital books here, and can give the names of several.

Q. Do you know one Widow Hanlin?

Mr COCKBURN—"Don't answer that question."

Mr JEFFREY argued, that the defender was not entitled to go into a proof of that case, seeing he had not taken an Issue upon it. "We offered him," said he, "an Issue on that point, and he declined it." Defender's counsel gave signs of dissent, but they did not reply to the assertion. The objection was sustained, and the witness was allowed to withdraw. He had brought in with him a large bundle of books, apparently for the purpose of reference, had he been examined as to particulars.*

BOWMAN FLEMING, Merchant, was called.

Mr MONCREIFF—You were about the year 1814 proprietor of a dye-work in Glasgow?—A. I was a partner of a company that had such a work in the neighbourhood.

Q. Were there Catholics employed in the work?—A. Yes, there were several who professed to be such.

Q. How many?—A. I believe from a dozen to twenty.

Q. Did you ever see Mr Scott, the Catholic priest, about the work, or calling upon the workmen?—A. No: I was not often there. My brother, Haughton, had the management.

Q. Was he a partner in the concern?—A. He was.

Q. And is since deceased?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know if Mr Scott ever applied to him about the workmen subscribing to the new chapel?—A. My brother told me that he did apply.

Q. What did he tell you?—A. That Mr Scott called upon him, and requested him to retain a part of the weekly wages of the Catholic workmen, to be applied towards the building of the chapel. My brother wished to know whether I thought he should comply with Mr Scott's request; and I said, I thought he should not.

Q. Did you give your opinion immediately, or take time to consider of it?—A. I thought the thing so improper, that I instantly said I would not consent to it.

Q. Were any of the men's wages then stopped on that account?—A. Not that I know of.

HENRY COURTNEY, labourer.

Q. Were you a member of Mr Scott's congregation about the year 1815?—A. I was.

Q. Had you a child to baptize, and did you apply to Mr Scott for baptism?—A. Yes.

* It now appeared that the defenders, or rather their counsel, had not been aware that the mode of defence they were pursuing was inadmissible, according to the rules of the Jury Court; the court itself being new in Scotland, and this a novel case, the first of its kind. The defenders were libelled for having *falsely* and *maliciously* made certain statements. They very naturally presumed, that if they could prove these statements to be true, it would rebut the charge of their falsehood at least, and they never doubted but they would be allowed a proof on the import of all the seven points at Issue. Widow Hanlin herself was among their witnesses, and would either have proved or disproved the story relating to herself, had she been examined upon it; but this was not consistent with the rule. The defenders were confined in their proof to the last four Issues, which shut them up from the examination of a great number of their witnesses, as to the facts bearing upon the matters libelled in the others. It will naturally be asked, Why did not the defenders take Issues for themselves on these points? But this the court would not grant without a particular condescendence on names, time, place, and circumstances, which the defenders could not make out, without access to the pursuer's subscription lists. They applied for a diligence to recover these before the Issues were adjusted; but this was opposed by the pursuer, and refused by the court. They afterwards obtained a diligence to recover these lists, and did recover them, but the Issues being now fixed, they could not found an Issue upon them.

Q. Did he refuse to do it, and for what reason?—A. He said, I was behind in my subscriptions for the chapel, and that before he would baptize the child, I must pay five shillings.

Q. Did you pay the five shillings then?—A. I went home and told my wife what passed. She was still in bed, not recovered; and we had only three shillings in the world.

Q. When was it that you called on Mr Scott?—A. On a Saturday evening.

Q. Did he afterwards baptize your child?—A. Not till I had paid the five shillings. I borrowed two shillings from a neighbour, paid the money, and had the child baptized on the Sunday.

Q. Did you give the money to Mr Scott?—A. No; it was to the collector.

Mr COCKBURN—Do you still belong to Mr Scott's congregation?—A. No; I left him soon after.

Q. What was the cause of your leaving him?—A. I was not able to pay for a seat; and he told me to go and sit with the poor people.

Q. And you did not like that?—A. No.

Q. And you took offence, and went away?—Answer not distinctly heard.

Q. What church do you now belong to?—A. I have not taken up with any yet.

Some questions were put by the court, which witness answered in nearly the same terms as above

MARY MORGAN, wife of Henry Courtney, was called.

LORD GILLIES—"Call back Henry Courtney." He was called, but was out of hearing.

Mary Morgan corroborated her husband's evidence, as to his coming home one night, while she was still in bed, unrecovered from her lying-in, and telling her that Mr Scott would not baptize the child unless he would pay five shillings. She knew that there was only three shillings in the house. They were very poor. She did not know where he got the two shillings; but she understood that he had paid the money on Sunday morning, as the child was taken away to be baptized.

JOHN DRAIN was called, but as he was to be brought from Edinburgh jail, to which he had been conveyed from the jail of Glasgow, some delay took place. In the meantime appeared his wife, ISABELLA SCOTT, *alias* Drain.

Do you recollect going with your husband, in the year 1818, to Mr Scott to get a child baptized?—A. Yes.

Q. Did Mr Scott refuse to do it?—A. I stood in the lobby, with the child in my arms, while my husband went in to ask him; and he came out, and told me that Mr Scott would not do it without money, which we had not to give.

Q. Was the child sick?—A. It was very ill. We thought it was going to die; and were very anxious to have it baptized, so we went immediately to Paisley, and had it done there.

Q. Who baptized it in Paisley?—A. It was either Bishop Paterson, or the Catholic priest there. I am not sure which. I never saw him before.

Q. Would you know the person if you saw him again?—A. I suppose I would.

Bishop Paterson was requested to stand up.

Q. Is that the gentleman?—A. What, that lusty man? No; that is not the man.*

John Drain not being yet arrived, it was proposed to call some other of the witnesses.

SEPTIMUS ELLIS, Esq.

Q. You have taken a good deal of interest in the supply of the poor in Glasgow?—A. I have had a good deal to do in that way.

Q. Do you know what was the state of the poor and labouring classes in the years 1815, 1816, and 1817?—A. They were in great distress indeed, during these years, from want of employment and dearth of provisions.

Q. Was it then generally reported and believed in Glasgow, that the Roman Catholic chapel was built in a great measure at the expense of the labouring poor?—A. That was a subject of general conversation at the time; and it was very generally believed.

Q. Do you know that Mr Scott refused the sacraments to those who did not contribute to the building?—A. With regard to that I cannot speak from my own knowledge.

Messrs. JAMES CLELAND, ROBERT DICKIE, HENRY LEISHMAN, ROBERT HOOD, GEORGE SWANSON, and MICHAEL MILLER, all deponed to the same effect as Mr ELLIS, with regard to the great poverty and distress among the labouring classes, in 1815, 1816, and 1817, and that it was then very generally reported and believed in Glasgow, that poor labourers were contributing for the Catholic chapel.

JOHN DRAIN.

Q. Had you a child by Isabella Scott, in 1818?—A. Yes.

Q. And did you take it to Mr Scott for baptism?—A. The child was very ill and like to die; we were very anxious to have it baptized; and had travelled all the way from —— [it is believed Girvan was the place.] I applied to Mr Scott, and he would not do it, unless I would pay ten shillings.

Q. Were you regularly married to Isabella Scott?—A. No.

Q. Did Mr Scott know this?—A. He asked me about my marriage, and I told him that it was irregular, and that I had paid the fine on that account.

Q. Well, what did he say then?—A. He said,

* Bishop Paterson proved from the baptismal register kept at Paisley, that John Drain had a child baptized by Mr M'Lachlan, the officiating priest there, the 30th of July 1818. See page 41.

if I could afford to pay twenty-five shillings for an irregular marriage, I could easily afford ten shillings for the house of God. I had not the money, and I came away. We went to Paisley, and had it baptized there.

Q. Who baptized it in Paisley?—A. I am not sure of his name.

Q. Look at that gentleman, (pointing to Bishop Paterson,) Was it he?—A. No.

CROSS-EXAMINED.

Q. Have you not been for some time in Glasgow jail; and are you not now a prisoner?—A. Yes.

Q. What were you in jail for?—A. I was with some persons who had a web not rightly come by. They gave me the blame of it, and I was taken up.

Q. Were you not a deserter from the army?—A. I did desert; but I took the benefit of the king's proclamation, and have the protection in my pocket.

Q. Were you married to Christian Mure?—Mr Moncreiff objected to the question.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER—"You need not answer that question, unless you please."

Witness admitted that Mure had been called his wife; but as to his being really married to her, he said, I leave you to prove that.

The case being thus closed for the defence, Mr JEFFREY rose to reply. He spoke, with great eloquence and animation, for nearly two hours. The publisher has not seen a distinct report of this speech, and he believes one does not exist, which he regrets exceedingly.* Mr Jeffrey dwelt at considerable length on the deficiency of the defenders' proof. Mr Fleming, he said, was but the ghost of a witness, as he repeated only the testimony of his deceased brother. He knew what the law was on that point, but did not commend the wisdom of it. In the Issue concerning Courtney, he said, there was only one witness, Courtney himself, which was not sufficient evidence. The testimony of his wife was nothing at all, as she only spoke from hearsay. He laid great stress on the bad character of Drain, from which, he said, little dependence could be placed on his testimony. As for the case of M'Geechie, he observed, that his learned friend (Mr Moncreiff) seemed about to give up that, when an evil influence from behind (where the defender sat) induced him to persist in it, though supported only by the contradictory testimony of the man Robertson.

The learned gentleman commented at considerable length on the monstrous statement of Mr M'Gavin, that the extortions practised by Mr Scott had amounted to nearly £20,000, while it was proved in court that day, that the total amount levied by him from persons of all descriptions, in and about Glasgow, was under £6000. He animadverted, with great severity, and in a manner peculiar to himself, on the spirit manifested by Mr M'Gavin, whom he designated a twopenny scribbler, a lay-divine, a would-be-theologian, a mercantile polemic, &c. &c.; and when he concluded, he was loudly cheered by the crowd that occupied the back part of the hall, at which the Lord Chief Commissioner expressed his displeasure.

LORD CHIEF COMMISSIONER in summing up, directed the Jury to compare the Issues with the evidence which they had heard. There were some of the facts libelled, particularly in the second Issue on which no evidence at all seemed to be led, though the case of the men at the public work, part of whose wages the pursuer is said to have asked to be retained, appears to have evidence in support of it, in the testimony of the witness, Fleming, adduced in proof of the sixth Issue. His Lordship said, he had consulted his brethren, before they left the bench, (they not finding it convenient to stay till so late an hour,) and they were of opinion with him, that one witness, swearing distinctly to each of a series of Issues like the present, was legal evidence of the general fact to which they related. It was objected to the evidence of Fleming, that he reported only the words of a deceased person; but according to the law of Scotland, that was legal evidence. The evidence of Courtney, he said, was corroborated so far by his wife, that she spoke distinctly to circumstances connected with the fact, which were within her own knowledge. Drain was not a very reputable witness; yet, as he was not convicted of any crime, his testimony could not be refused; and it was besides corroborated by that of Isabella Scott. There seems to be no evidence in proof of the fifth Issue, that relating to M'Geechie, for besides the confused appearance of the witness, Robertson, it is clear the thing could not have taken place later than 1813. It is your duty, Gentlemen of the Jury, to weigh the evidence which has been adduced before you, on both sides of the question, and to give a verdict, according to your consciences, between, I believe, a respectable gentleman on the one hand, and a very worthy clergyman on the other.

* The following advertisement was published in the CLXI. Number of *The Protestant*, on the 11th of August. "The speech of Mr Jeffrey alone occupied about two hours; and from his amazing rapidity, I suppose, it must have contained fifty thousand words, many of them new, and curiously compounded. I wish it were possible to recover them all, or even a tithe of them; and I hereby intimate, that if any of the gentlemen who were present, and took notes, will furnish me with a correct report, I shall cheerfully allow a handsome remuneration for his trouble, provided I receive it by the 1st of September." And Mr Dow, the short-hand writer, was requested by letter, to apply to Mr Jeffrey, to see if he would draw up, or dictate a report of his speech, for the expense of which Mr Dow was authorized to go to the extent of twenty guineas; but from some cause or other, such report could not be obtained.

The Jury retired for upwards of an hour. A little before five in the morning they returned to the box.

CLERK of COURT—"Gentlemen, are you agreed in your verdict?"

A JURYMAN—"We are agreed."

CLERK—"What is it?"

FOREMAN of the JURY—"The Jury find for the pursuer, against the defender, Mr M'Gavin, damages £100; against the defender, Mr Sym, £20; and against the defenders, A. & J. Duncan, 1s."

THE END.